

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1923

THE INFLUENCE OF DANIEL

A large part of the difficulty which confronts us when we consider the origin of a writer's ideas meets us also when we try to trace the influence of these ideas upon succeeding literary productions. The seeming traces may have come from some other source than the one supposed, or they may be original in the mind of the later writer without any real, or at least conscious, knowledge of the work of the preceding author. If the two works be from approximately the same period of time, or if the circumstances of the two periods of time were substantially the same, the same or similar *Zeitgeist*, or spirit of the times, would naturally produce the same or similar thoughts and expressions of thought. For example, the ennui, the *Weltschmerz*, the disgust with the world and its gifts, and the despairing flight of the soul to its refuge in God, which are manifest in the book of Ecclesiastes, may have been equally characteristic of any period of outward natural prosperity, coincident with moral and spiritual decay. The moralists of the old Egyptians of the Fifth Dynasty, such as Ptahhotep and Imhotep, as well as the Roman satirists, such as Juvenal and Seneca, bear witness to the fact that the soul of man can not be satisfied with mere earthly grandeur and material success. The Aramaic fragments of Achikar as well as the Jewish proverbs of Solomon, Hezekiah, Ben Sira, and Wisdom, exhibit in like manner the vanity of earthly greatness and the transitoriness of human friendship, wealth and happiness. How much, if anything, the Greek philosophers may have derived from the Egyptians, Babylonians, Hindoos, and Hebrews, we may never

be able to determine. The Greeks assert that Pythagoras, Plato, and Aesop, were all influenced by oriental savants. In the case of Aesop, this assertion is confirmed by the recent find of the Aramaic fragments of Achikar. In view of the fact that Herodotus, Xenophon, and many other Greek historians, made known to the Greeks much of the history of the oriental nations and that this knowledge was increased by contributions to national history such as those of Berossus, Manetho, Nicolaus of Damascus, Dius of Tyre, Menander and Josephus, it is most probable that the philosophical ideas combined with the proverbs and the wisdom literature of the Hebrews, Arameans, Egyptians and others would also have been communicated to the Greeks by hearsay if not by writing. Since scarcely one in a thousand of the writings of the Greeks and hardly any of those of the orientals have come down to our day, it is impossible for us to judge of all the literary influences which may have shaped the thoughts and forms of expression of the few writers who are known to us.

So, in like manner, to attempt to show the influence exerted by a given writer upon his successors from the scanty literary material which we possess is futile. It is doomed to failure because of the paucity of the material at our disposal. And the failure is more sure in the case of the literature of the Egyptians, Persians, Arameans, Phoenicians and Hebrews than it is in the case of the Greeks and Romans, because in the case of the former, the content and extent of the literature known to us is much less and in some instances almost nil.

When we come to investigate the influence of Daniel upon succeeding generations we must remember, then, that there are in our possession from the period between 550 and 150 B. C. but a very few Hebrew works at most which could possibly have been subjected to this influence and that for a long period of time there is not known to us a single literary production of any kind in which such influence could pos-

sibly be found, or at least, be justly expected to be found. Before going further into the discussion of this subject, let us first state the objections made to the early date of the book of Daniel on the ground that the influence of its ideas cannot be traced in the literature of the Hebrews which precedes the time of the Maccabees.

OBJECTIONS OF THE CRITICS

Dr. Cornell says: "If Daniel has been composed by a contemporary of Cyrus, we should necessarily have expected that so peculiar and highly important a work would have shown some evidence of its being known and used. When one sees how echoes and reminiscences of Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Deutero-Isaiah, are traceable in all the literary productions that were written after them, the same results would be looked for from Daniel. But nothing of this is to be discovered."¹

Professor Bevan holds that, "On the supposition that the narrative of Daniel is historical, it is marvelous that it should be passed over in utter silence by all extant Jewish writers down to the latter half of the second century B. C., that it should leave no trace in any of the later prophetic books, in Ezra, Chronicles, or Ecclesiasticus."² And he adds, "In order to realize the true state of the case we should consider how easy it would be to refute, from Jewish literature, anyone who asserted that the book of Isaiah or that of Jeremiah was composed entirely in the Maccabean period."³

According to Dr. Driver, ". . . it is undeniable that the doctrines of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection, and of a judgment of the world, are taught with greater distinctness, and in a more direct form, than elsewhere in the Old Testament and with features approximating to (though not identi-

¹ *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, p. 386 b.

² *The Book of Daniel*, p. 12.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 13.

cal with) those met with in the early parts of the Book of Enoch, c. 100 B.C.”⁴

It was the view of Farrar that, “Admitting that the pinnacle (of eminence, assigned to Daniel of which the Dean has just spoken in the preceding context) may have been due to the peculiar splendor of Daniel’s career, it becomes less easy to account for the total silence respecting him in all the books of the Old Testament, with the Prophets that were contemporary with the Exile and its close, like Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi; and with the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, which give us the details of the Return.”⁵

ASSUMPTIONS

These objections are all based upon the following *assumptions*:

I. That if there were no traces of the influence of Daniel found in pre-Christian literature till 165 B. C., the book of Daniel could not have been written till then.

II. That, as a matter of fact, there is no trace of the influence of Daniel in pre-Christian literature till 165 B. C., the implication being that after that date the influence is much more marked.

III. That this literature is of such a character that we would have expected to find traces of this influence, provided that Daniel had written as early as the latter part of the sixth century B. C.

IV. That the same measure of influence would be expected from Daniel as from other books, especially Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and Deutero-Isaiah.

V. That because the ideas of Daniel and those of the First Section of Enoch approximate, they must have been from the same time.

⁴ *Introduction to Literature of the Old Testament* (abbrev. LOT), p. 508.

⁵ *The Book of Daniel* (Expositors’ Commentary), p. 11.

ANSWERS TO ASSUMPTIONS.

We will discuss these assumptions under the following heads: (1) the alleged silence of the pre-Maccabean literature; (2) the traces of the influence of Daniel up to 200 B. C.; (3) the traces of the influence of Daniel from 200 B. C. to 135 A. D.; (4) a comparative study of Daniel's influence; (5) the approximation of Daniel and Enoch.

I. THE ARGUMENT FROM SILENCE

In answer to the first of these assumptions, let it be said that it would not be necessary to admit that Daniel could not have been written in the sixth century B. C., even if no trace of it were to be found in the pre-Christian literature before 165 B. C. No one knows enough about the history and literature of that time to be able to make any such assertion upon the basis of evidence. We can gather from the contents of the book itself that it was most probably written at or near Babylon. This conclusion is rendered almost certainly conclusive by the character of the language in which the book is written.⁶ What convincing reason have we, then, for supposing that a book written at Babylon about 535 B. C. *must* have been known to Zechariah and Haggai writing at Jerusalem about 520 B. C. in the second year of Darius Hystaspis (Hag. i. 1, Zech. i. 1)? It was not the age of printing presses, nor of the rapid multiplying of copies. Besides, we can see good reasons why Daniel, the trusted servant of Cyrus, might not have desired to publish a work which predicted—in unmistakable terms—the eventual overthrow of the kingdom of Persia. Such a publication would certainly have done no good, either to Daniel or to the people of Israel.

Further, Daniel was commanded by the angel to shut up and seal the book until the time of the end (Dan. xii. 4, 9). Whatever these words mean, they would certainly indicate

⁶ See article on "The Aramaic of Daniel" in *Biblical and Theological Studies*, by the Faculty of Princeton Theological Seminary, 1912.

that the book of Daniel was not intended so much to meet the immediate religious needs of the Israelites, as to serve the wants of future generations. According to the book itself (ix. 24, 25) the vision and prophecy were to be sealed until Messiah-Prince should come. It is possible therefore that the book was preserved in secret until the time of the Maccabees when it was thought that in some prince of the Asmonean line the predicted Messiah had at last come unto his own. If it be said in reply to this, that we have no record of any such publication in the time of the Maccabees, a sufficient answer is, neither have we any record of the existence of the pseudo-Daniel of the critics nor of the publication of his work at that time.

It will be seen from the above that we are not prepared to admit that the book of Daniel was not written in the sixth century B. C., even though it may not have been known to the Jewish Palestinian writers of the time from 535 down to 165 B. C. But, we go further and affirm that it is not necessary to suppose that they were not acquainted with the work because they have not cited from it, nor shown any traceable influence of it. There are few citations in any of these works from any of the works preceding them. There are few traces of previous authors to be found in any of the literature of these times, Ecclesiasticus alone excepted. They were too full of the important matter which they were describing and of the messages from God which they had to deliver, to be pre-occupied with the thoughts and messages of the prophets and holy men that had preceded them.

II. TRACES OF DANIEL'S INFLUENCE ON HEBREW LITERATURE UP TO 200 B. C.

Having thus repudiated at the start any presupposition of the critics with regard to the date of Daniel based upon the possible absence of traces of Daniel's influence on the pre-Christian writings, let us now examine whether after all there are traces of the influence of the ideas of Daniel in any

part of this pre-Christian literature; and if in some parts of it there are no traces, how we are to account for this fact.

And first, let us ask what are these pre-Christian books to which the critics appeal? It will be admitted by all that they embrace the books of Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi, Esther, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Chronicles. To these, some of the critics would add Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs, and some of the Psalms; while others would also add Joel, Jeremiah, and many parts of other books, such as the priestly part of the Pentateuch, commonly denoted by P, the larger part of the book of Proverbs, parts of Isaiah and Nahum, the larger part of the Psalter, and even Job.

1. Taking up first of all the works which are admittedly from the period between 538 and 200 B. C., let us inquire whether any trace of the ideas of Daniel can be found in them; and if not, why not. In treating of this subject we shall confine ourselves to the four marks of influence the lack of which is said by Dr. Driver to show that Daniel was not written till the middle of the second century B. C., i.e., angels, resurrection, judgment, and the Messiah.

a. Beginning with Haggai, we observe that this short book of two chapters is taken up entirely with the affairs connected with the rebuilding of the temple, and that it contains several messages from Jehovah directed to Zerubbabel, the governor of Judah, to Joshua the High Priest, and to the rest of the people urging them to build the house of the Lord. Yet even here we find in chapter ii. 7, 9, 22, 23 statements concerning the overthrow of the kingdoms of the nations and the establishment of the peace of Jehovah in his temple at Jerusalem. This overthrow of the kingdoms of the nations may be compared with Dan. ii. 44 where it says that the Lord God shall set up a kingdom which shall break in pieces and consume all the kingdoms of the earth. Since Haggai does not speak of the resurrection, nor of the judgment, nor of angels, no one can tell what his ideas on these subjects may have been. Certainly it is not fair to say that they must have been differ-

ent from those of Daniel. Haggai says that the word of the Lord came unto him and that he had a message (*mal'ekhuth*) from Him. He calls himself also, an angel or messenger (*mal'ak*) of Jehovah, a phrase peculiar to himself, putting us in mind of the *mar shipri* of the Babylonians just as the word for message recalls the *shipru* with which the gods of Babylonia communicated their will to men.⁷

b. In Zechariah, however, we find the use of the vision method which characterizes Daniel (as in i. 8, 18, ii. 1, iii. 1, iv. 1, v. 1, 6, vi. 1); but he says that the word of Jehovah came unto him (as in i. 1, vii. 1, 4, 8, viii. 1, 18) and speaks of the burden (*massa'*) of Jehovah (ix. 1, xii. 1). He makes frequent mention of the Messiah and of his kingdom, (vi. 12, ix. 9, xiii. 1) and speaks of the angel who was talking with him and of another angel who went out to meet him (ii. 3). He speaks also of Satan and of the angel of Jehovah (iii. 1), and of the holy ones (xiv. 5). He speaks of a judgment of Jehovah and his saints upon the nations and of the establishment of the kingdom of God over all the earth. Of the specific doctrines of Daniel of which Dr. Driver speaks, all but the resurrection are mentioned in Zechariah. On angels and the Messiah the statements of Zechariah are even more explicit than those of Daniel. Of the doctrines mentioned by both Zechariah and Daniel the latter is more explicit on the judgment alone.

c. Malachi does not mention the resurrection; nor does he speak of angels, unless Malachi itself means "my angel." He does speak, however, of the Messiah as the messenger or angel (*mal'ak*) of the covenant (iii. 1) and as the Sun of righteousness who should arise with healing in his wings (iii. 20 AV, iv. 2 in the MT); and of the judgment in chapter three.

d. The books of Ezra and Nehemiah are taken up with geneological and historical matter connected with the build-

⁷ Haggai mentions no proverbs; does this prove that there were no proverbs before Haggai?

ing of the wall of Jerusalem and with the reforms of religion in Israel. Being filled with the accounts of such earthly matters, they say nothing about resurrection, angels, judgment, or Messiah. What the author, or authors, may have thought on these subjects, is not even hinted at. This does not imply that they had no thoughts on these subjects, nor, if they had thoughts, that they did not agree with Daniel. Nor does the fact that they do not mention Daniel imply that they did not know about him any more than the fact that they do not mention Isaiah, Hosea, and the other prophets, implies that they did not know about them.

e. The books of Chronicles, however late they may have been written, do not, except in the last four verses, bring down the history of Israel later than the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. In a history such as this there was never any occasion for the author's speaking of the resurrection, nor of the judgment, nor of the Messiah. Incidentally, he mentions Satan as having stood up against Israel and tempted David to number Israel (1 Chr. xxi. 1).

f. Esther treats of but one subject, the origin of the feast of Purim. The writer of this book never mentions the name of God. We might as well infer from this omission that he did not know about God as to infer from his omission of all reference to the resurrection, angels, etc. that he had no opinion on these matters. It seems wonderful, that if the author of Daniel lived in Palestine, as the critics say, at about the same time that the author of Esther did, he should have been so influenced by the Persian religion as to adopt from them his ideas about resurrection, judgment, angels, and Messiah; whereas a writer that knows so much about Persia, as it is admitted that the author of Esther did,⁸ should never have referred to any of those ideas at all. In view of the frequency with which the Behistun and other Persian inscriptions mention the name of God, it is remarkable also that this Jewish writer should never refer to him. Evidently, the

⁸ Hastings, *Dictionary of the Bible*, I, 774.

influence of the Persian conquerors upon the religion of their subjects was not so great as some would have us imagine.

It thus appears that of the books (Chron. Ezra-Neh. Esther, Zech. Haggai, and Mal.) which according to the traditional view were written after 538 B. C., Chronicles, Zechariah, and Malachi, mention angels; Zechariah, Haggai and Malachi refer to the Messianic times, and to the judgment.

2. According to the critics, Joel, Jonah, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Canticles, the document P, most of the Psalms, Job, parts of Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Micah, Obadiah, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Nahum, and Proverbs, were also written in post-exilic times. Of these the following mention one or more of the four subjects under discussion:

- (1) Messiah, or his Kingdom—Joel, Psalms, Micah.
- (2) The judgment—Joel, Psalms, Obadiah, Isaiah.
- (3) The Resurrection—Job, Psalms, Isaiah.
- (4) Angels—Psalms, Job, Isaiah, Ecclesiastes, Proverbs.

The following mention none of the four subjects:

- (1) The passages, or parts, of Nahum, Hosea, Amos and Zephaniah alleged to be post-exilic.
- (2) The books alleged to be entirely post-exilic, such as Jonah, Joel, Canticles and P.

It is obvious, that if the failure of these documents to mention any one of these four subjects proves that Daniel did not exist, it proves also that JE and Isaiah did not exist; for both JE and Isaiah mention angels and Isaiah certainly refers to the Messiah. That documents say nothing about a certain subject proves nothing as to the ideas of the author of the document upon the subject not spoken of by him. An author cannot say all he knows in every book he writes.

a. Taking up the books and parts of books which some critics claim to have been written between 538 and 200 B. C. (such as Jonah, Joel, and parts of Isaiah), the general remarks may be made with regard to them that: (1) As respects angels, it is true that no influence of Daniel can be dis-

cerned in them. For they never mention them at all. But if this failure to mention angels proves that they did not know about the book of Daniel (i.e., supposing it could be shown that they were written in the period between 538 and 300 B. C.), it would prove also that their authors were ignorant of J and E, of the first part of Isaiah and Ezekiel and Zechariah, all of which mention angels. In other words, it would prove too much; the critics themselves being judges. For none of them would place J and E and Zechariah and Isaiah vi. after their alleged dates for Jonah, Joel and Isaiah xxiv-xxvii. It would be remarkable, also, that the Persian doctrine of angels should be accepted in the second century under Greek rule rather than under Cyrus. (2) As to the resurrection, neither Jonah nor Joel alludes to it. What they may have thought about it or whether they thought of it at all, they do not state and we cannot possibly know. Consequently, it is evident, that we cannot make a comparison between their view of the resurrection and that of Daniel. All we can say is that in the small fragments of their works that have come down to us, they do not talk upon this subject. A large part of the literature written about the Old Testament would never have been written, if the critics had only remembered, that we have no way of judging from the few chapters which most of the Old Testament writers have handed down to us, what their views were upon the countless subjects which they never treat. But let us examine the subject more in detail.

b. If we place, as many of the critics (e.g. Budde) do, the book of Jonah in this period we find that Jonah makes no reference to any of the four doctrines which Dr. Driver propounds as characteristic of Daniel. Neither resurrection, angels, general judgment, nor the Messiah, is evenly remotely referred to in the whole work. The only judgment hinted at is an earthly one, consisting of a threatened destruction of Nineveh. Sheol is mentioned in chapter two, but only figuratively in describing the descent of Jonah into the depths of the sea. If it could be proven that Jonah was

not written till post-captivity times, his silence with regard to Daniel might possibly have some significance. But that remains to be proven. Moreover, even if it could be proven that Jonah was later than 500 B. C., an argument as to whether Daniel was earlier or later than Jonah could not be made on the basis of these four doctrines, since Jonah has made no allusions to them.

c. In Isaiah xxiv.-xxvii. we find an apocalypse which Dr. Driver refers to the early post-exilic period:⁹ (1) because, he says, modern critics are generally agreed that it lacks a suitable occasion in Isaiah's age, (2) because in literary treatment it is in many respects unlike Isaiah and (3) because the thoughts are different from Isaiah.

Before calling attention to the teachings of this passage on the four subjects which, Dr. Driver says, were developed by Daniel, I cannot refrain from remarking upon the kind of evidence put forth by the critics and accepted by Dr. Driver as sufficient to form their conclusions. "Modern critics are agreed" forsooth! But on what grounds are they agreed? Does anyone of them know enough about the age of Isaiah to say that this passage was not suitable to his times? Where do they get their information? There is none, except what is contained in the Old Testament itself and in the few references to the Jewish history of that period that are contained in the Assyrian and Egyptian documents.¹⁰

⁹ LOT, p. 221.

¹⁰ Duhm limits the genuine prophecies of Isaiah to i. 2-26, 29, 31, ii. 2-4, 6-19, 21, iii. 1-9, 12-15, iv. 1, v. 1-14, 17-29, vi. 1-13, vii. 2, 8a, 8-14, 16, 18-20, viii. 1-18, 21, 22, ix. 2-7, 8-14, 17, x. 4, 5-9, 13, 14, xi. 1-8, xiv. 24, 25a, 26, 27, xvii. 1-6, 9-14, xviii. 1-6, xx. 1, 3-6, xxi. 16, 17, xxii. 1-9a, 11b-14, 15a, 16-18, xxviii. 1-4, 7-29, xxix. 1-4a, 5-7, 9-10, 13-15, xxx. 1-7a, 8-17, 27-32, xxxi. 1-4, 5, 8a, 9b, xxxii. 1-5, 9-18, 20. Cheyne limits the genuine parts of Isaiah to i. 5-26, 29-31, ii. 6-21, iii. 1-4, 5, 8, 9, 12-17, 24, 41, v. 1-14, 17-25b, vi. 1-13, vii. 2-8a, 9-14, 16, 18-20, viii. 1-18, 20b-22, ix. 8-13, 16, x. 4, 5-9, 13, 14, 27-32, xiv. 24, 25a, 26, 27, 29-32, xvi. 14 (from *within*), xvii. 1-6, 9-14, xviii. 1-6, xx. 1, 3-6, xxi. 16, 17, xxii. 1-9a, 11b-14, 15a, 16-18, xxiii. 1, 2, 3, 4, 6-12, 14, xxviii. 1-4, 7-19, 21, 22, xxix. 1-4, 6, 9, 10, 13-15; xxx. 1-7a, 8-17; xxxi. 1-5a (to *birds*): all that remains consist of editors' additions or post-exilic insertions. That is, out of the 1295

According to Cheyne and Duhm, the genuine verses of Isaiah, 269 to 307½ in number, cover the period from 740 to 701 B. C. From the earlier part of this period, we have the prophecies of Hosea 746-734 B. C., several passages of which are held by certain critics to be later additions, partly on the ground that in their opinion they express thoughts alien to Hosea's position, partly because they are supposed to interrupt the connection of thought. From the later years of Isaiah we have the prophecies of Micah. Here, again, the critics find that much material has been interpolated, such as part, or all, of chapters iv and v. These interpolations, or additions, are alleged on the ground that to the critics they seem to be "inconsistent," "not to harmonize," or "difficult to reconcile" with the portions they admit to be genuine. Chapters xv-xx of 2 Kings treat, also, of the times of Isaiah. But, since large portions of these chapters are supposed to be "the work of a prophet writing in the subsequent generation,"¹¹ it is left to the judgment of each critic to determine how much of them is reliable history. The books of Chronicles, so far as they contain matter additional to that of Kings, need not, in the opinion of the critics, be considered, inasmuch as "it does not seem possible to treat them as strictly and literally historical."¹²

Having thus rejected more than half of the records attributed by the sources to the period from 740 to 700 B. C., because it does not seem to them to be consistent with what they think to be genuine, the critics proceed to give us their view of what Isaiah and his contemporaries thought. The amusing thing about this method of procedure is, that those using it do not seem to see how absurd it is. The serious

verses attributed to Isaiah by the Massorettes, Duhm accounts 307½ and Cheyne 269 to be genuine. They deliberately throw out from three-quarters to four-fifths of the entire book without any documentary or even circumstantial evidence except that which is to be derived from their own precarious theories or opinions of what Isaiah ought to, or might have, written.

¹¹ LOT, 197.

¹² *Ibid*, 532.

thing about it is, that they do not see how wicked it is. To change a document for a purpose is not permissible in the ordinary transactions of life, nor in the editing of letters and other literary documents. In legal phraseology, it is called falsification, that is, "the intentional alteration of a record, or of any document so as to render it untrue," or different from what the original writers wrote.

In all this, I am not intending to cast a slur upon any well directed attempt to arrive by means of manuscripts and versions, or even by means of established principles of textual criticism, at the correct original of the Scriptures, nor to reflect upon any sincere endeavor to get at the right meaning of them; but I do intend to protest against the tacit claim on the part of some, without any superhuman knowledge, who pretend to be able to interpret the Mene-mene-tekelp-harsins of ancient history. Before any one has the right to deny that Isaiah xxiv-xxvii had a "suitable occasion" in the age of Hezekiah, he must know thoroughly the history of the period in which Isaiah lived. No one knows thoroughly that history. Therefore, no one has the right to deny that these chapters may have been written by Isaiah.

Again, it is said, that the literary treatment is unlike that of Isaiah's. Of course, the critics mean by this statement, that the literary treatment of chapters xxiv-xxvii is unlike that of the parts of Isaiah which they recognize as genuine. Here, once more, a caveat must be made. For even at the risk of appearing to reflect on the literary judgment of the eminent critics who make this assertion, I am constrained to express the opinion, that they do not know enough of the literary possibilities of a writer of the imagination and versatility of Isaiah to affirm that he could not have employed styles differing as much as are claimed to appear in various parts of the works bearing his name. Of the style of Ezekiel, or of Jeremiah, we might form a correct judgment because of general sameness. But a gifted genius like Isaiah transcends all ordinary canons. He must be compared, not to

Johnson, or Macaulay, with their stereotyped and stilted style; but rather with him "whose soul was like a star, and dwelt apart" who had "a voice whose sound was like the sea," now moving in majestic numbers as he narrates the speech of Satan to his marshalled hosts of embattled angels, now swelling in joyful paeans to the heaven-born Redeemer, now sounding in reverberating denunciations the doom of Waldensian persecutors, now booming in the grandiloquent prose of the *Areopagitica* in praise of that liberty that he loved so well; but, again, moving along in his *History of England* with scarcely a break to the monotony, or sinking to the almost frozen stiffness of the *Common Place Book*. Milton's *Note Book* shows that he wrote some of his lines five times before he published them. Macaulay says that he put three whole years upon the production of his *Lays of Ancient Rome*, writing and re-writing until they had reached the highest degree of perfection to which he could bring them. May not Isaiah have elaborated some of his works with more assiduity than others? May he not have cultivated, as we know that Robert Louis Stevenson did, a variety of styles sufficient to express most appropriately his varied ideas? May he not intentionally have put into the sections including chapters xxiv-xxvii the "synonymous clauses," "the alliterations and word-plays" the "many unusual expressions" and all the other features, "which though they may be found occasionally [elsewhere] in Isaiah, are never aggregated in his writings as they are here"? Who knows? The critics think they do. How do they know? How can they know? Have they sufficient evidence to show that they know? We think not.

Lastly, the critics assert that the thought of chapters xxiv-xxvii is different from Isaiah's. There are "points of contact" which show that the author of these chapters "was familiar with Isaiah's writings"; but there are features "which seem to spring out of a different (and later) vein of thought from

Isaiah's."¹³ "Veins of thought" forsooth! and "different veins of thought"! and "later veins of thought"! Beautiful phrases! Empty phrases! Unjustifiable phrases! For by what method of psychological analysis, or historical investigation, have the critics arrived at the conclusion, that Isaiah may not have had different veins of thought at different periods of his life? Who of us has not had in the course of forty years, or less, many new veins of thought, a new philosophy of life, perhaps an altered view of the universe and God? Who of us does not know of many men, who in a score of years or less, have apparently changed their whole attitude toward the scheme of things? That these changes have taken place, we know; but whence and how they came, we cannot always tell. We do not know all the influences that shape and change our own lives, much less the lives of others. But, as to those who have long since been dead, and of whose outer and inner life little information has come down to us, it is, and must be, impossible for us to determine the number, variety, and causes, of their changes of thought, and of the frequency and extent of these changes. How, then, when we go back twenty-five hundred years to the time of Isaiah, can we expect to tell what veins of thought he may have had, and whence and how they may have originated? How can we measure the periphery of the circle of his ideas? How can we sound the depths of his researches, or soar to the heights of his imagination? How can we determine, that he may have discovered certain "veins of thought," but that certain others must have been unknown to him?

And yet, this is just what the critics of Isaiah claim the capacity for doing. They claim to have the ability to distinguish from the thoughts expressed the parts of the present book of Isaiah that were composed about 700 B. C., the parts that are alleged to have been written from 550 to 500 B. C., and the parts that, they say, must have been writ-

¹³ LOT, 220.

ten as late as 400, or even 175 B. C. On the face of it, this claim has the appearance of a hypersensitized egoism.

For, says Dr. Driver, "it is true," that in these chapters, "the author follows Isaiah more than the other prophets"; but, at the same time, "his prophecy contains similarly reminiscences from other prophets," such as Hosea, Amos, Micah, Nahum, and Jeremiah.¹⁴ Dr. Driver fails to inform us, how he knows that Nahum and Jeremiah were not influenced by the writer of these chapters, rather than the opposite, or that all three may not have been influenced by some earlier unknown prophet whose works have been lost. In the case of Nahum ii. 11, and Isa. xxiv. 1-4, the reminiscence (*sic!*) seems to have been confined to the use of the one root *buq*, or *baqaq*,—a very slender support for a literary reminiscence, especially since Hosea and Jeremiah, also, use the same word. Must every one who speaks of the sound of a voice have a reminiscence of Wordsworth's sonnet to Milton, or of Tennyson's *In Memoriam*?

Again, Dr. Driver says, that "the absence of *distinct* historical allusions" makes the question as to what period the prophecy is to be assigned a difficult one to answer.¹⁵ "The unnamed city is most probably Babylon." Yet he adds, "it is doubtful, however, whether the literal Babylon is intended by the author. The lineaments of the city which he depicts are so indistinct and unsubstantial that the picture seems rather to be an ideal one: Babylon becomes a type of the powers of heathenism, which the prophet imagines as entrenched behind the walls of a great city, strongly fortified, indeed, but destined in God's good time to be overthrown." And yet, on the ground of this imaginary picture, the critics attempt to fix the date of these chapters; some placing it as late as about 334 B. C. This could be, says Dr. Driver, because Babylon "remained an important city till the close of the Persian empire . . ." While this is true, yet it was even more true in

¹⁴ LOT, 220.

¹⁵ LOT, 221.

the times of Hammurabi, of Merodach-Baladan (during whose reign Isaiah the son of Amos prophesied) and of Nebuchadnezzar. Always, from the time of Hammurabi to that of Alexander, Babylon the Great was the center of Semitic heathenism. To Isaiah and his contemporaries, it was not merely a type; it was the real, living, Jehovah-defying, centralized and radiating, power of this world. According to the prophecies expressly assigned to Isaiah in the book that bears his name, a large part of his thoughts and predictions were taken up with the future relations of Israel with this crowning city of heathendom. In chapter xxxix. he predicts that Hezekiah's descendents should be taken captive thither; in xl-lxvi, he comforts the people with the assurance of the faithfulness and power of Jehovah and of their eventual return from exile; in xiii-xiv, the ultimate complete destruction of Babylon is predicted. If we believe in predictive prophecy, the whole of the book of Isaiah may confidently be attributed to him. But, granting for the sake of argument all that the critics claim as to the date of Isa. xxiv-xxvii, what effect would this have upon the theory of the absence of the influence of ideas of Daniel on post-exilic literature? If with Dr. Driver, we were to refer these chapters "most plausibly to the early post-exilic period," we might mark the influence of Daniel in regard to angels, the judgment, and the Messianic kingdom. For in xxiv. 21-23, we read that "It shall come to pass in that day, that the LORD shall punish the host of the high ones that are on high—i.e., the angels,—and the kings of the earth upon the earth. And they shall be gathered together as prisoners are gathered in the pit, and shall be shut up in prison, and after many days shall they be visited.¹⁶ The moon shall be confounded and the sun ashamed when the Lord of hosts shall reign in mount Zion and in Jerusalem, and before his ancients gloriously."¹⁷ Again touching the resurrection, we read in xxvi. 19: "Thy dead men

¹⁶ i.e., in judgment. See also xxvi. 21, xxvii. 1.

¹⁷ i.e., in the Messianic kingdom. See also xxvii. 6.

shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for the dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." Surely if we were to place the composition of Daniel at about 535 B. C., and that of Isa. xxiv-xxvii at 525, or after, it would be difficult to escape the conclusion that the latter was influenced by the former.

d. As to the *Priests' Codex* which is put by the critics from 400 to 300 B. C., it will be admitted by all that it contains no intimation of a resurrection, angels, of a judgment following death, nor even of a Messiah. It is noteworthy, however, if the author of this part of the Pentateuch wrote at so late a date (for he is put in the Persian times), that he should have said nothing about a Messiah or about angels, even if he be silent as to a resurrection and an after judgment. The critics may satisfy themselves as to the absence of reference to the latter by supposing that they were first suggested by a Daniel living in the second century B. C., but how on their own principle that the influence of the ideas of preceding authors should be traceable in later ones, will they explain the absence of all reference to the Messiah, and to angels in this great P document? If the absence of all reference to two of the doctrines proves that Daniel did not exist before P was written, the absence of all of them would prove that Isaiah and Zechariah did not exist.

e. The Proverbs of Solomon mention no future judgment, no Messiah, no kingdom, and no resurrection. The word for angel occurs in xvi. 14 where the wrath of a king is said to be as angels of death, and in xvii. 11, "An evil man seeketh rebellion only and a cruel angel shall be sent against him."

f. With regard to Joel, the case is different. It makes no mention of the resurrection or of angels. The Messianic times, however, are described in iii. 28-30 and iv. 18-20, though the Messiah himself is not referred to. The great day of Jehovah (ii. 2) is the main theme of the book. On this

day, the Lord will bring the nations down to the valley of Jehoshaphat and will judge them there. Thither, also, according to iv. 12, the nations, having been awakened, shall come up, when Jehovah shall sit there to judge all the nations round about.

g. At whatever date the critics place the composition of the Song of Songs, it would be preposterous to expect to find in a poetical work of its character, any reference to any one of the four subjects that are said to characterize the book of Daniel. Whatever its symbolical interpretation may be, its strict adherence to the theme of an earthly love that is stronger than death, excludes the expectation of finding any allusion in it, to any of the higher matters which are the theme of Daniel's discourse. This is not a matter of date and influence, but one of subject matter and literary consistency.¹⁸

3. The Apocryphal and other Extra-Canonical Writings of the Hebrews probably antedating the alleged date of Daniel in 164 B. C., are, Tobit, Ecclesiasticus, Achikar, the Aramaic Egyptian papyri, and the Letter of Aristeas. As to the four subjects under discussion, the following traces are to be found in them:

a. *Tobit*¹⁹ says nothing about resurrection, judgment, Messiah or kingdom; but has a great deal to say about angels. Thus in iii. 17 he names *Raphael* who is the *deus ex machina* sent by God to direct the whole plan of God's providence with reference to Tobit and Sara. The belief in guardian angels is expressed in v. 17, 22 and holy angels in xi. 14. Raphael (xii. 15) is called one of the seven holy angels who stand and enter before the glory of the Lord. *Asmodeus*, an evil demon, is mentioned by name (iii. 8 and elsewhere).

b. *Ecclesiasticus* mentions (1) angels (xxix. 28, xli. 2,

¹⁸ For a discussion of the Psalms assigned by critics to this period, see below.

¹⁹ Dating from 350 to 170 B. C. according to Simpson in *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the O. T.*, ed. by Charles. Vol. I, p. 183.

xlvi. 21, and (2) resurrection (xlvi. 12, xlvi. 20, xlvi. 5, xlix. 10).

c. Achikar (500-400 B.C.) is silent on all four subjects and displays no knowledge of the law or of the prophets, nor even of the history of Israel.

d. The other Aramaic Documents from Elephantine are equally silent on these four subjects.

e. Aristeas (200 B.C.) is silent on all four subjects.

III. TRACES OF DANIEL'S INFLUENCE FROM 200 B. C. TO 135 A. D.

For convenience of discussion we shall sub-divide this long period into three divisions: the period from 200-100 B. C., that from 100 B. C. to 1 A. D., and the third from 1-135 A. D.

I. Taking up the Post-Captivity Literature that was, or is thought to have been, written between 200 and 100 B. C., let us see whether the ideas which characterize Daniel are to be found, also, in them.

a. And first, let us consider the Canonical Books or parts of books, that are said by certain critics to have been composed in the second century B. C.

(1) Fifty-seven of the Psalms are alleged by Driver, Cheyne, Reuss, or Robertson Smith, to have been written in the time of the Maccabees. In these psalms, there is no mention of the resurrection, nor of the final judgment. Psalm cxliv. 2 alone speaks of angels; and only cx. 1 and cxviii. 29 refer clearly to the Messiah. In the three psalms (xliv, lxxiv and lxxix) which Dr. Driver puts in these times, there is no reference to any one of the four subjects that, in discussing Daniel, he alleges to be indicative of the Maccabean period, the distinguishing mark of its *Zeitgeist*. Strange, indeed, is it that those who make so much of the spirit of the times, of Persian ideas and Grecian philosophy, in the consideration of Ecclesiastes and Daniel, should be blind to the absence of Persian and Greek influences from the psalms! Think

of it! In none of these fifty-six psalms is Persia, or Greece once mentioned. No king of Persia, or Greece, is named. No Persian, or Greek, word is employed. The phalanx and the elephant, those mighty and almost invincible weapons of Seleucid warfare, are passed over in silence.

But, the absence of all direct and indisputable evidence of the Maccabean origin of these psalms might in a measure be considered negligible, if the critics were unanimous in their conclusions as to what were Maccabean. But, we find that in their conclusions, no two of them are agreed. Cheyne assigns 30 psalms to this period and Reuss 31; but they agree only as to eight of them. Perowne and Delitzsch put Pss. xlv, lxxiv, and lxxix, in Maccabean times; but Cheyne agrees with them only as to Ps. xlv, assigning Ps. lxxiv and lxxix to the time of Artaxerxes Ochus, while Reuss assigns no one of the three to the time of Maccabees. In the midst of such glaring, and, if we follow the subjective methods of their sponsors, such inevitable disagreements, as to the dates of these poetic compositions, one may be pardoned for judging that their methods are inconclusive and their opinions unreliable.

(2) Ecclesiastes, the date of whose composition is placed by Plumptre, Cornill, and Driver, at about 200 B. C., mentions neither the Messiah nor the Messianic kingdom, nor angels, nor the resurrection. With regard to judgment, it represents the author as saying in his heart that God will judge the righteous and the wicked (iii. 17) and as stating that God will bring every work into judgment with every secret thing whether it be good, or whether it be evil (xii. 14); and that the dead know not anything, neither have they any more a reward (ix. 5).²⁰

²⁰ It will be known to most of my readers, that the three great criteria used by the critics for determining the approximate dates of literary documents are the agreements, or disagreements, in reference to history, doctrine and language. One may perceive from the above statement that Daniel and Ecclesiastes both treat of but one doctrine in common, and that they differ considerably even in the treatment of this one. As to history, they never touch on the same subjects. Daniel, indeed, speaks expressly of certain events in the lives of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar,

(3) Up to the present time, Professor Haupt of Johns Hopkins seems to be the only critic who has had the presumption to place any part of the book of Nahum in the Maccabean period. Yet, among the many equivocal grounds which he gives in favor of the late date of parts of this prophecy, he

Darius the Mede, and Cyrus; but Ecclesiastes makes no direct or definite allusion to anyone, save Solomon. When we come to the third criterion, that of language, to which Dr. Driver in his LOT has appealed so frequently and with such an assumption of cocksureness, we find that the disagreements are sufficient to make us doubt entirely the manner in which this criterion is used by the critics. If the *prima facie* and traditional view of the dates of the Old Testament books be correct we would expect the linguistic characteristics of Daniel to agree in large measure with those of Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, and Esther. If the views of the critics were correct, we would expect to find a still closer resemblance between the language of Daniel and that of Ecclesiastes, the so-called Maccabean psalms, and Ecclesiasticus. Now, of the thirty-two words marshalled on pp. 506-507 of LOT to show that the Hebrew of Daniel resembles in all distinctive features the Hebrew of the age subsequent to Nehemiah, we find that twenty-five are found also in other books of the Old Testament. It will be seen, also, that fourteen of the words and seven of the phrases, that is, all but four, occur in Chronicles. Of the remaining four, one occurs in Nehemiah and two in Esther. Of the whole thirty-two, only one word and one phrase are met with in Ecclesiastes and only one word in the fifty-seven so-called Maccabean psalms. On the other hand, of the fifteen words and phrases cited on page 475 of LOT as proof of the late date of Ecclesiastes, not one occurs in Daniel and only one in any of the supposedly Maccabean psalms.

All that is needed to test these almost unbelievable statements is to read and compare the collections of words and references on pp. 475, 506-7, and 387-9 of LOT. And while the gentle reader of these lines is testing these statements, let him read also what Dr. Driver has to say on pages 484-5, 535-540, and 545-547, about the expressions characteristic of Esther, Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah, and he will observe that they agree with Daniel in employing a goodly number of Persian words; whereas, the fifty-seven psalms have not one; and only one, and that of doubtful origin, is alleged to be found in Ecclesiastes.

Furthermore, of the four great peculiarities of the language of Ecclesiastes—the frequent use of nouns ending in *-uth* and *-on*, the employment of the relative *she*, and of the *warw* conjunctive with the perfect—not one is found in the Hebrew of Daniel. So that in the words of Dr. Driver himself (LOT, 473), we may say, that “linguistically, Coheleth stands by itself in the OT.” And since it stands by itself, it shows the futility of attempting, by such methods as those employed by the critics, to determine the date and composition of the documents on the ground of peculiar expressions found in them.

does not even suggest that there is the slightest hint in any verse of Nahum at any one of these four doctrines which are said to characterize the book of Daniel and to be indicative of the second century B. C., and for this good and sufficient reason, that as a matter of fact, not one of them is so much as hinted at in the whole book.²¹

(4) As to the ninety-two, or more of the Psalms of David said by the critics to have been written between 539 and 100 B. C., the following references to the four subjects under discussion occur in them, to wit:

(a) Angels are said in ciii. 20, 21, to be strong heroes that do Jehovah's word and his ministers that do his will. In xci.

²¹ One of the fanciful reasons that Prof. Haupt gives for the late date of a part of Nahum is the word *mephets* occurring in ii. 2. This word means "he that dashes in pieces," and is supposed by Prof. Haupt to refer to Judas Maccabaeus. The plural of the word is found in Jer. xxiii. 18, where it is translated in the English version by "scatter." A noun of the same form is found in Proverbs xxv. 1 in the sense of "maul," or "hammer." This verse is among those that were copied out by the men of Hezekiah from the proverbs of Solomon. If the author of Nahum ii. 2 had employed some derivative of *nakab* "to hammer," there would have been the appearance at least of an argument in favor of Prof. Haupt's view arising from the fact that Judas was called the *Makabi*. This appearance, however, would not be significant of a late date, first, because the words *makkabah* and *makkebeth* "hammer" occur in Isaiah, Jeremiah, and 1 Kings, and also in Judges iv. 21, which many of the critics consider to be about the earliest part of the Old Testament. Now, since a hammer implies a hammerer, it is obvious that *makkabi* might have been used as early as Judges iv. Surely, Jael was a great hammerer.

Secondly, no argument for the late date of a document can be made on the basis of this word, seeing that not merely is it absent from the Old Testament literature—even from the so-called Maccabean portions—but the word, except possibly as a proper noun, is not found in the New Hebrew and Aramaic of the Targums and Talmud, nor in the Syriac.

Since this fancied reference of this one word to Judas Maccabaeus is the nearest approach to objective evidence for the late date of a part of Nahum to be found in the whole of Prof. Haupt's work, our readers cannot imagine with what far-fetched conjectures and might-have-beens, with what flashes of "phosphorescent punk and nothingness" the writer attempts to enlighten us with his subjective lucubrations. Brilliant they often are, but they lack the first principles of science, logic, and evidential value.

11, they are said to keep us in all our ways; and in xxxiv. 8, to encamp around those that fear Him and to deliver them. In lxviii. 17, they are said to be many thousands in number.

(b) As to the resurrection, these psalms have nothing to say, except possibly Ps. xxx. 4.

(c) As to the judgment, there are probable intimations in ix. 7, 8, and 1.

(d) The Messiah is expressly named in ii.2, and is called God's Son in ii. 5, and is referred to in lxxii. 7, 8, cxxxii. 11, and in xxi, xxiv, xxvii, xxx, xxxiv, xxxv, xli, lxviii, lxix and cix.

In the Hebrew text, three of these psalms are without headings, to wit, the first, second, and ninety-first; the fiftieth is ascribed to Asaph, the seventieth, to Solomon, the eighteenth to Ethan, and all the rest, except possibly the one hundred and thirty-second to David.²²

(5) As to chapters xxiv-xxvii of Isaiah that some critics allege to have been written in the Maccabean period, see above pp. 348 ff.

b. In the second place, in the Apocryphal and Pseudepigraphical Books written from 200 to 100 B. C. the following statements with regard to these four doctrines are to be found:

(1) *Ecclesiasticus* mentions angels, but only in references to the narratives in the canonical books. The other three subjects are not even hinted at.

(2) The *Book of Wisdom* calls the manna "angels' food" (xvi. 20), says that the righteous shall receive a glorious

²² In LOT, pp. 384-386, Dr. Driver gives the dates of the psalms as follows: In Books I and II, psalms ii, xviii, xx, xxi, xxviii, xlv, lxi, lxiii, and lxxii, will presumably be pre-exilic; of the rest, many, it is probable, spring from different parts of the Persian period. In Book III (psalms lxxiii-lxxxix), he supposes lxxvii, lxxviii, lxxx, lxxxi, lxxxv, lxxxvi, lxxxvii, to be post-exilic; lxxiv, lxxix, and perhaps lxxxiii, to be Maccabean; and lxiii, lxxv, lxxxii, and lxxxiv, not earlier than Jeremiah. In Books IV and V, he makes ci and cx to be presumably from before the exile, xc and xci possibly so, and cii, exilic; xciii, xcvi-xcix, are either from the latter part of the exile, or soon after.

kingdom (v. 15, 16), rebukes the ungodly for saying that no man was known to have returned from the grave (ii. 1), says that the souls of the righteous shall judge the nation (iii. 1, 8), and the the unrighteous "shall have no hope, nor comfort, on the day of trial" (iii. 18).

(3) *First Maccabees* is silent on all four subjects; but emphasizes the importance of keeping the sabbath, as to which Daniel says nothing.

(4) The *Addenda to Daniel* show no trace of the influence of the canonical Daniel, as far as it affects these four doctrines.

(5) The *Addenda to Esther* represent Esther as saying to the king of Persia, that he appeared to her as an angel of God. (xv. 13).

(6) The book of *Baruch* mentions none of the four subjects, unless by devils (iv. 7) evil angels are meant.

(7) *Judith* is silent on all four subjects.

(8) Fragments of the *Book of Noah* are said to be embedded in the *Book of Enoch*. These fragments are supposed by Prof. Charles to be parts of a work that was written about 170 B. C., though the grounds upon which this early date is assigned to it are not absolutely convincing. They consist mostly of a commentary on the life of Noah as recorded in Genesis, and especially upon chapter vi. 1-4, which treats of the fallen angels, or "sons of God." §§ liv, lv, lx, and lxv-lxix give an account of the flood and of the judgment on the fallen angels; and cvi, cvii of the birth of Noah. The book names nineteen leaders of the rebellious sons of God and four others as leaders of the holy ones of heaven; and mentions Satan and even Satans (vi. 7, ix. 1, liv. 6, lxv. 6, lxix. 2-11). An angel of peace is spoken of in liii. 4, liv. 4, and lx. 24, and angels of punishment in v. 33, lxvi. 1. An angel went with Enoch (Noah?) and angels built the ark (lx. 11, lxvii. 2). There were a thousand thousand and ten thousand times ten thousand of angels, some of whom were called watchers (lx. 1; x. 7, 9, 15).

The day of the great judgment is referred to in x. 6, lx. 6, 25, after which the bad angels will be led off to the abyss of fire (x. 15, lxvii. 12, lxviii. 2), and the Messianic times of righteousness and truth and peace will be established (x. 16, xi. 2). Nothing is said in this book about a resurrection.

(9) The so-called First Section of the *Book of Enoch*, containing §§vi-xxxvi, names Raphael, Michael, Uriel, Raguel, and Azazel (xxii. 3, 6, xxiv. 2, xix. 1, xxi. 5, 9, xxvii. 2, xxiii. 4, xiii. 1) and seven holy angels who watch (xx. 2-8). It mentions the watchers of heaven (xii. 2, 3, 4, xiii. 10, xv. 21), watchers (xvi. 1), holy watchers (xv. 9), and the seven stars of heaven (xxi. 6). It speaks of holy ones (xiv. 25), and of most holy ones (xiv. 23), and calls them eternal (xiv. 1), children of heaven (xiv. 3) and says that they see the glory of God (xxxvi. 4). Evil spirits are called giants (xv. 8), for whom a prison is reserved (xxi. 10). The duties of angels are declared in §xx. The spirit of Abel lives on after death (xxii. 7), and compartments of Sheol exist for the spirits of the dead (xxii. 5, 8-13). In number there are ten thousand times ten thousand angels (xiv. 22).

The judgment is referred to in xiv. 4, xix. 1, xxv. 4, xxvii. 11, and a resurrection is implied in xxv. 6. No Messiah is mentioned.

(10) The Second Section of the *Book of Enoch* embraces §§lxxxiii-xc. Except in a veiled reference in xc. 33, it does not mention the resurrection; nor, since §xc. 37 may refer to John Hyrcanus, does it mention in express terms a Messiah. Angels may be meant by the seventy shepherds. A judgment on the stars and shepherds and blinded sheep is spoken of in §§xc. 24-27.

(11) *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, written according to Charles about 107 B. C., never name Gabriel or Michael, but speak of Satan and Beliar. They speak, also, of the angel of God, of angels of the presence, and of arch-angels and watchers. In Benjamin x. 8, 9, it speaks of the

judgment and says: The Lord judges Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed, and then so shall they judge the gentiles (compare Levi iii. 3). In Ben. x. 6-8, it speaks of a resurrection of the wicked as well of the righteous, saying: Ye shall see Enoch, Noah, and Shem, Abraham, and Isaac and Jacob, rising on the right hand of gladness; then, shall we also rise, each over our own tribe, and we shall worship the heavenly king. Then, shall we all be changed, some into glory and some into shame; for the Lord shall judge Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed and then shall he judge also the gentiles. In Simeon x. 2, the patriarch says: Then shall I arise; and in Zebulon x. 2, we read: Then shall I arise again in the world. Judah xxv. 1, 3, 4, reads: And after these things shall Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, arise unto life, and I and my brethren shall be the chiefs of the tribes of Israel. . . . and ye shall be the people of the Lord and have one tongue; and there shall be no spirit of deceit, for he shall be cast into the fire for ever and they who have died in grief shall arise in joy and they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall awake.

Of the Messiah, the book says in two places that he will be from Judah, and in six, that he will be from Levi. It says, also, that he will war against Beliar and deliver his captives, that he will be free from sin, will walk in meekness and righteousness and open Paradise to the righteous.

(12) The *Book of Jubilees*, written according to Charles at about 107 B. C., has given up all hope in a resurrection. It mentions by name Mastema and Beliar and speaks of the creation and circumstances of angels, of guardian angels, of angels of the presence, of the duty of angels to instruct mankind, and of angels of wood, clouds, fire, etc.; as also, of their marrying the daughters of men, of their punishment, and of their children. It speaks, also, of the final judgment of the fallen angels and of their sons, and of a great judgment, apparently for all men (xxiii. 11, 30). Of the Messiah,

it speaks in but one ambiguous passage (xxx. 18, 19), where it says to Judah: A prince shalt thou be, thou and one of thy sons, over the sons of Jacob: in thee shall be the help of Jacob and in thee be found the salvation of Israel. This reference to the Messiah is based on Gen. xlix. 10.

(13) The *Sibylline Books* are composed of material of such uncertain date, that it is impossible to determine exactly when the different parts were written. Parts of Book Three are generally supposed to have been written in the latter part of the second century B. C. In line 775 of this book the Messiah is called the son of the great God, and in lines 49, 50, a holy king ruling all the lands of earth. In line 56 the sibyl speaks of the judgment of the great king, the deathless God; and in line 63, of the angel Beliar.

2. In the Jewish Literature of the First Century B. C., we find the following testimony about the four subjects.

a. *Second Maccabees* is silent as to the Messiah and the kingdom. It refers to a good angel sent to save Israel (xi. 6, xv. 21), shows a belief in the resurrection of the righteous (vii. 29) and in a judgment.

b. *Third Maccabees* speaks of two angels, glorious and terrible, who appear to Eleazar the high-priest; it has nothing to say of the other subjects.

c. The writer of *Fourth Maccabees* does not believe in a resurrection of the body, but "in the immortality of all souls." He is silent on the other doctrines.

d. The *Epistle of Jeremiah* mentions an angel in verse 7, but is silent on the other subjects.

e. The *Psalms of Solomon* speak of the Messiah and of the king, the son of David, and God's servant (xviii. 6). They do not mention the other three doctrines.

f. The *Story of Zerubbabel* says nothing about any of these doctrines.

g. The *Song of the Three Children* mentions neither resurrection, judgment, nor Messiah. In verse 26, it speaks of the angel of the Lord as coming into the furnace with

Azariah and his fellows; and in verse 37, calls upon the angel of the Lord to bless him.

h. In the *History of Susanna*, the angel of the Lord is mentioned in verse 45, and the angel of God in 55, 59; but the other subjects are not mentioned.

i. In the story of *Bel and the Dragon*, the angel of the Lord is said to have brought Habbakkuk from Judah to Babylon and to have carried him back again (vss. 36, 39); but no reference is made to the other subjects.

j. In the Third Section of *Enoch*, angels are mentioned in xci. 15, and holy angels in xciii. 2; the righteous judgment in xci. 14, and the eternal judgment in xci. 15. Resurrection and Messiah are not referred to.

k. The Fourth Section of *Enoch* in certain passages, where according to Prof. Charles the redactor tries to bring the subject-matter of this section into harmony with the rest of the book, mentions the son of man, the day of judgment, seven holy ones, and the names of the leaders of the stars, one for each season and one for each of the twelve months. Uriel is named as leader and shows things to Enoch.

l. The Fifth Section of *Enoch*, written between 95 and 64 B. C., mentions clearly all four subjects. There will be a judgment and a resurrection of the righteous dead (c. 5), a final judgment with the destruction of the former heavens and earth and the creation of a new heaven (xc. 14-16), and a Messianic kingdom, where God and his son will be united with the children of the earth forever (cv. 2). The holy angels are spoken of in xci. 2 and the wicked in xci. 15. Angels are said to place the prayers of the righteous for a memorial before the Most High (xcix. 3), and to gather the world for judgment (c. 4) and to be guarding over the righteous (c. 5).

m. The Sixth Section of *Enoch*, written between 94 and 79 B. C., speaks of a resurrection of all Israel (li. 1, lxi. 5) and of a judgment on the righteous and the wicked, on angels and on men (xlvi. 2-4, xlviii. 2). The Messiah is called the

elect one (xlvi. 4, xlviii. 8, xlix. 2, 4, li. 5, 6, lii. 6, 9, liii. 6, lv. 4, lxi. 5, 8, lxii. 1), God's anointed (xlviii. 10), the son of man (xlvi. 2, 3, 4, xlviii. 2), who will possess universal dominion, sit on the throne of his glory, and judge all angels and men, slaying the wicked by the word of his mouth (lxii. 7, 9, 14, lxix. 26, 28, 29). There are righteous angels and the five angels of the presence, Raphael, and Michael among them (xxxix. 5, xl. 9), and the angel of peace who went with Enoch (xliii. 3, lii. 3, liv. 4, lv. 2), and angels of punishment (liii. 3, lvi. 1), and thousands of thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand (xl. 1). Of bad angels, Satan and Azazel are named (liii. 3, 5, 6, lv. 4), and five Satans (lxix. 4), and twenty leaders of the evil angels (lxviii. 2). He speaks, also, of the host of God, of Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, and all the angels of power (lxi. 10).

3. In the Jewish and Judæo-Christian Literature from the year 1 A. D. to the year 135 A. D., or thereabouts, we find the following testimony on these subjects.

a. Apocalyptic and Pseudepigraphical Literature :

(1) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah* mentions several bad angels Sammael, Malchira, Beliar, and Satan; but it is silent with respect to the other three subjects, except that by the beloved of i. 13 the Messiah is probably meant.

(2) The *Assumption of Moses* contains ostensibly a revelation of Moses, which mentions an angel (x. 2), the judgment (x. 3-8), and the kingdom (x. 1); but no resurrection, nor Messiah.

(3) The *Apocalypse of Baruch* speaks of angels as created on the first day (xxi. 6), of the existence of armies of them (xlviii. 10, li. 11, lix. 10), of the fall of them (lvi. 11-13), of the angel of death (xxi. 6), and names one of them Ramiel, who presides over true visions (lv. 3, lxiii. 6).

It speaks in xxx. 1 of the time of the advent of the Messiah "when all who have fallen asleep in hope in him shall rise again"; and in chapters l. and li., the resurrection is described at length. It speaks, also, of the revelation of the Messiah

(xxix. 3), of his correcting the leader of the wicked and all his impieties (xl. 1), and of his summoning all the nations, some of whom he will save and some of whom he will slay (lxxii. 2). The Messiah is called a judge (xlviii. 39) and there will be a day of judgment (lix. 8).

(4) The *Testament of Hesekiah* mentions Sammael, Beliar, and the armies of Beliar, the angels and armies of the beloved one. It speaks of the beloved (iii. 17, 18, iv. 3, 6, 9, 13), and of Jesus the Lord Christ (iv. 13). In iii. 18, the resurrection of the beloved is mentioned and in iv. 18 the judgment.

(5) The *Vision of Isaiah* speaks frequently of angels (vii. 22, 27, 37, ix. 6, 28, 29, 42, viii. 2, 15, 19, x. 19), and of the angels of the glory of this world (vi. 13, vii. 2, viii. 4, 23, 25, ix. 11, 21, 25, 31, 32, 37, 39, x. 6, 18, 28, xi. 1, 34), and of angels about the throne (vii. 14-16, 19, 24, 30, 31, 33, viii. 16), and of the angel of the Holy Spirit (vii. 23, ix. 36, 39, 40, x. 4, xi. 4, 33). It also speaks of an angel who was sent to make him see (vi. 13, vii. 11, 21, 25), of a glorious angel (vii. 2), of an angel of death (ix. 16, x. 14), of an angel of Sheol (x. 8), of angels of the firmament and of Sheol (x. 10), and of angels of the air (x. 30). It names Satan and Sammael (xi. 41, 43), and Sammael and his hosts (vii. 9), and speaks of princes, angels, and gods of the world (x. 12), and of princes and powers of that world (x. 15). The Messiah is named in (vii. 8, 12), and has many titles, such as beloved (vii. 17, 23, ix. 12), his beloved the Christ (viii. 18), his beloved the Son (viii. 25), the Son crucified (ix. 14), the only begotten (vii. 37), the elect one (viii. 7), one (ix. 26, 38), this one (ix. 33), a certain one (ix. 27), Lord (viii. 26), Lord Christ (x. 17, 32), the Lord who will be called Christ (ix. 13). The Lord, the Lord Christ, who will be called Jesus (ix. 5), is said to have ascended from the grave (ix. 1).

The resurrection of the righteous is spoken of in ix. 17, and the judgment in x. 12.

(6) The *Ascension of Isaiah* contains two visions which are said to have been revealed to Isaiah just before he was put to death by Manasseh king of Judah. In form, these visions, especially the one recorded in vii. 1f, are more like those in Daniel than any other thus far noticed, in that they give the details of the history of the times of Jesus in much the same way that Daniel presents the details of the history of the Seleucid kings.

(7) Following for the sake of convenience the divisions suggested by Dr. Box, the book of *Fourth Ezra* will be considered under six sections.

(a) The *Ezra Apocalypse* refers only to Messianic woes and tells of an angel who came to speak with Ezra.

(b) The *Son of Man Vision* calls the Messiah God's Son (xiii. 32, 37), and says that he is to judge and to destroy the nations of the earth (xiii. 37, 49), and to defend the people of Israel (xii-xiii. 49).

(c) The *Ezra-Piece* speaks of Ezra's translation to be with God's Son (xiv. 9).

(d) The *Eagle Vision* tells of the Messiah (xii. 32), who shall spring from the seed of David, who shall make the people alive for judgment and then destroy them.

(e) The *Salathiel Section* mentions armies of angels (vi. 3), and angels who guard the souls of the righteous (vii. 85, 95); also, the angel that was sent unto him (v. 31, vii. 7, x. 29). Jeramiel (iv. 36), and Uriel alone are named. Immortality is spoken of in viii. 54 and the resurrection in v. 37, 45. There is to be a judgment (vii. 102-115, viii. 38, 61, x. 16); and punishment and salvation after death (vii. 66, xiv. 34, 35). No personal Messiah is spoken of; but the Messianic times are referred to in vii. 75.

(f) In the passages which Dr. Box assigns to the redactor, it is said that God's son, the Messiah, shall be revealed (vii. 28), and after his death, the earth shall restore those who sleep in her (vii. 32) and the dust of those that are at rest therein. The Most High shall be revealed upon his throne of

judgment and judge the nations that have been raised (vii. 33-44).

(8) The Book of the *Secrets of Enoch* gives the names of seven individual angels and of at least eight classes of angels. It speaks, also, of the prince of the watchmen and of the ruler of Tartarus. There are elders and rulers of the stellar orders, and terrible angels guarding the snows and clouds and dews. There are angels guarding night and day and sun and paradise and the keys of hell. These angels are myriads in number and will all be brought into judgment. There are at least three archangels, Michael, Gabriel and Praviel (or Vretiel), and Sataniel is called the prince of the watchmen. Men also will be judged. There appears to be no reference to a resurrection or to a Messiah.

(9) The *Zadokite Fragments* mention the angels of destruction, the angel of the Mastema, Belial, and the watchers of heaven. A Messiah is spoken of in ii. 10, ix. 10(B) and a Messiah from Aaron and from Israel in ix. 29 and xv. 4. There is no reference to a resurrection, nor to a judgment to come.

(10) *Philo* discusses angels a number of times,²³ but he does not assign names to them, nor give their number. He gives no hint of a Messiah, nor of a resurrection, though he does imply a judgment (iv. 243).

(11) *Josephus*, in discussing Genesis (vi. 1-6), speaks of the angels. If the passage is genuine, he refers to Jesus as the Christ in *Ant.* xviii. iii. 3. In *Ant.* xviii. 1, 3; and in *The Wars of the Jews*, vi. v. 4, he tells of a prediction that about the time of the fall of Jerusalem "one from their own country should become governor of the habitable earth."

b. The New Testament :

(1) In the New Testament, angels are mentioned in every book, except Philippians, 1 Thes., 2 Tim., Tit., Philemon, James, and 1, 2 and 3 John. They are given names in Mat., Mark, Luke, John, Acts, Jude, Rev., Rom., 1 Cor., 2 Cor.,

²³ See Bohn's Translation, i. 332, ii. 237, 341, 418-420, iv. 252, 334.

1 Thes., 2 Thes., 1 Tim. In Matthew, there are said to be legions of them; and in Hebrews, an innumerable company. Paul denotes their relations to mankind by such words as principalities, authorities, powers, lordships and thrones. They are good or evil. Michael is the archangel of the good and Beelzebub, or Satan, is the prince of this world, of the demons, and of the powers of the air.²⁴

(2) The resurrection is mentioned in all the Gospels and in Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., Eph., Phil., 1 Thes., 2 Tim., Heb., 1 Pet., and Rev.; and described at length in 1 Cor. xv.

(3) The judgment is referred to in all the Gospels and in Acts, Rom., 1 Cor., 1 Tim., 2 Tim., Heb., James, 1 Pet., 2 Pet., 1 John, Jude, and Rev.

(4) The Messiah, or Christ, is named in every book of the New Testament. Since the whole New Testament is concerned with Him, it is impossible and unnecessary to give any particular items of evidence upon this subject.

Princeton.

R. D. WILSON.

²⁴ See further in any concordance of the Bible.

(To be continued)

The Princeton Theological Review

OCTOBER, 1923

IS GOD ALMIGHTY?

III. OMNIPOTENCE AND PHILOSOPHY¹

“God either wishes to take away evils and is not able; or he is able and not willing; or he is neither willing nor able; or he is both willing and able. If he is willing and not able he is feeble, which does not belong to the nature of God. If he is able and not willing he is envious, which is equally foreign to God. If he is neither willing nor able he is both envious and feeble, and so is not God. If he is both willing and able, which alone is suitable to God, whence are the evils? or why does he not take them away?” It is in this way that Epicurus, according to Lactantius, *De Ira Dei*, xiii, formulated the problem of evil. A similar dilemma, stated in more up-to-date fashion by a soldier in the trenches who writes from “Somewhere in Hell,” is thus set forth in a letter to an American preacher in London: “The luck is all on your side; you still believe in things. Good for you. It is topping, if one can do it. But war is such a devil’s nursery. I got knocked over, but I am up and at it again. I’m tough. They started toughening me the first day. My bayonet instructor was an ex-pug, just the man to develop one’s innate chivalry. They hung out the bunting and gave me a big send-off, when we came out here to scatter the Hun’s guts. Forgive me writing so. I know you will forgive me, but who will forgive God? Not I—not I! This war makes me hate God. I don’t know whether he is the God of battle and enjoys the show, as he

¹ Previous articles have discussed the Biblical Data and Omnipotence and Religious Experience. See this REVIEW, October, 1922, and April, 1923.

THE INFLUENCE OF DANIEL

IV. A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF DANIEL'S INFLUENCE

From the survey which has been given²⁵ of the literature of the Jews and Christians from the time of Cyrus to 135 A.D., as far as this literature is concerned with the four subjects (angels, resurrection, judgment and Messiah) mentioned by Dr. Driver as tests of the influence of Daniel on later literature, it is evident that the absence of all apparent reference to these subjects in a given work does not prove that the book of Daniel was not known to any given author of a later book, much less that the book of Daniel did not exist before the time of the composition of the later one.

1. For, first, with regard to the argument from Angels, five points may be considered, covering the statements of the Jewish and Christian writers up to 135 A.D. respecting the existence of angels and their number, classes, ranks, names and duties.

a. As to the existence of angels, no book of the Scriptures denies that there are angels, and most of them, from the earliest to the latest, state expressly that there are angels. Thus, according to J (Gen. xvii) angels appeared to Abraham; and according to E, Jacob saw angels ascending and descending the ladder (Gen. xxviii). According to JE, an angel appeared to Joshua (Josh. v. 15) and according to Judges to Gideon, Manoah and the wife of Manoah (Jud. vi. 11-24, xiii. 3, xiii. 13-21). In 2 Sam. xxiv. 1, it is said that an angel smote Israel with a pest. This evidence is sufficient to show that the idea of the existence of angels was known in Israel long before the time of Cyrus.

b. As to the number of the angels, J speaks of cherubim (Gen. iii. 24) and of sons of God (Gen. vi. 2); and Isaiah vi of seraphim. Michaiah saw the Lord sitting on his throne and all the host of heaven standing by him (1 Kings xxii. 19). It is not necessary to give more examples to prove that Daniel

²⁵ See this REVIEW for July, 1923, pp. 342 ff.

is in agreement with the older Old Testament writers as to the number of the angels.

c. As to the classes, or ranks, of angels, Daniel mentions princes, watchers, and angels. Elsewhere in the Old Testament cherubim and seraphim are spoken of (Gen. iii. 24 and Isa. vi). In Joshua v. 15, the prince of the host of Jehovah addresses Joshua in a JE passage. No writer of the Old Testament, however, had a developed system of ranks and classes such as we find in Enoch. It follows, therefore, that no argument for the date of Daniel can be made on the basis of what he teaches as to the ranks and classes of angels, nor on the ground of the absence of the influence of what little he says upon these subjects upon later literature. If what he says is a reason for putting his book late, we should also put Isaiah and JE late.

d. As to names of angels, Daniel gives only two, Michael and Gabriel, neither of which is found elsewhere in the Old Testament. Satan, however, is found in 1 Chron. xxi. 1 and in Ps. cix. 6, and with the article (*the Satan*) in Job i. 6, ii. 1 and Zech. iii. 1. Cherubim are mentioned in Gen. iii. 28 and Ezek. x; and seraphim in Isa. vi.

(1) *Tobit*, written probably in the fourth century B.C., names Raphael.

(2) Of works from the second century B.C., the *Sibylline Books* name Beliar; the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Beliar and Satan; and the *Book of Jubilees*, Beliar and Mastema. Of all the other literature of this century the *Book of Enoch* alone mentions the name of any of the angels. Thus, the first part, called the *Book of Noah*, gives the names of nineteen angels and five satans who were leaders of the rebellious sons of God and of four others who were leaders of the holy ones, among whom are Gabriel and Michael; and the so-called First Section mentions the bad angel Azazel and seven holy angels, among whom, also, are Gabriel and Michael.

(3) Of the large number of works from the first century B.C. the Sixth Section of *Enoch* alone mentions angels by name.

(4) Of works from the year 1 A.D. up to 135 A.D., the *Apocalypse of Baruch* names Ramiel; the *Testament of Hezekiah* Beliar and Sammael; the *Vision of Isaiah*, Sammael and Satan; and the *Book of Fourth Ezra*, Uriel and Jeramiel.

(5) In the New Testament books, Satan is named in Mat. iv. 10 and Rev. xii. 9; Beelzebub in Mat. ix. 34, xii. 24, Mark iii. 22; Belial in 2 Cor. vi. 15; Abaddon, or Apollyon, in Rev. ix. 11; Gabriel in Luke i. 17, 26; and Michael, in Jude ix, Rev. xii. 7.

e. As to the duties, or functions, of the angels of Daniel, they are three in number, (1) to reveal the will of God; (2) to protect and deliver his people; (3) to preside over the nations.

(1) That it was a function of angels to reveal the will of God is clearly shown in the earliest records of the Old Testament. Angels delivered God's messages to Abraham, Joshua, Gideon, and Manoah; and the angel of Jehovah spake to Moses, Isaiah and Zechariah. In New Testament times, also, angels spake to Zacharias and Mary and to the shepherds at Bethlehem. That the angels of Daniel performed this function is therefore, no indication of date.

(2) That another function of angels was to protect the people is clearly shown, also, throughout all the history of Israel. They kept the way to the tree of life. They destroyed the armies of Sennacherib. They protected Joshua. They delivered Peter. That an angel should have delivered Daniel from the lions is, therefore, no indication of the date of Daniel V.

(3) That each nation has an angelic prince presiding over its destinies is a doctrine peculiar to Daniel and, hence, is no indication of its date. It is barely possible that there is some ground for such a doctrine in Deut. xxxii. 8, where the Greek translation says, that God set the boundaries of the nations according to number of the angels of God.²⁶

²⁶ This translation involves the change of *ישראל* into *שֵׂרָאֵל*. Every student of Hebrew palaeography and textual criticism must admit that the Greek reading may be correct.

The best and closest analogy to this teaching of Daniel is to be found, however, in the view of the Babylonian astrologers, that every nation had a particular star and a particular god presiding over it and representing it in the calculations of the seers. Versed in the literature and customs of the Babylonian wise-men, Daniel has substituted for the stars and gods of their heathen superstition the archangels of the one true God. This affords another proof that Daniel was written at Babylon.

The conclusions which can be drawn from the testimony regarding Angels are as follows:

a. The New Testament recognizes, not merely the existence of angels, but that these angels have names. The only good angels mentioned in the New Testament are designated by the very names used by Daniel. No Christian, therefore, who accepts the authority of the New Testament, can logically deny that these names may have been employed as early as the sixth century B.C. Jude says that an archangel named Michael had contended with the devil for the body of Moses. In his vision of the war in heaven, St. John sees this same Michael casting down the Devil and Satan. Luke states Gabriel to have been the name of the angel who brought messages from heaven to Zacharias and Mary, the mother of our Lord. These New Testament writers, therefore, agree in representing the two angels of Daniel as real persons, and not as merely creatures of the imagination.

If they are real persons with real names, why may the persons and the names not have been made known at 600 B.C. as well as at 200 B.C.?

b. In the Old Testament outside of Daniel, no good angel is ever named. It is doubtful, also, if in the Old Testament any evil spirit, or angel, is ever designated by a proper name.²⁷ The good angels are described simply as spirits, or messen-

²⁷ The Hebrew word *satan*, employed in 1 Chronicles and Psalm cix. 6, is probably to be translated simply as adversary. In Job i. 6, ii. 1, and Zech. iii. 1, 2, where it has the definite article, the rendering "the adversary" should almost certainly be given. In Gen. iii. 1, this ad-

gers of Jehovah, or of God; and the bad as evil spirits or adversaries. How, then, does it come that Daniel alone among biblical writers designates two of the good angels by proper names? The simplest answer to this question is to say that it pleased God to have his messengers reveal their names to Daniel alone of the Old Testament prophets. Another answer might be, that a revelation of the names of angels at an earlier time might have enticed the people to the worship of the messengers. A third answer is that the idea of naming angels was derived from the Persians, who designated the Amashpands, or attributes of the Deity, by the terms that denote them. But, as we have shown elsewhere,²⁸ these names are names of attributes and not of persons and they are never used to designate the messengers of God. If, however, the Jews derived the idea of naming angels from the Persians, how are we to account for the fact that of Old Testament writers Daniel alone gives names to angels? The critics assign about half of the literature of the Old Testament to Persian and Greek times; and of this literature, Daniel alone names angels, though it was written among the very latest of them all. Long after the Persian empire had ceased to exist, after the greatest of Alexander's successors had been crushed at Pydna and Magnesia, when the ashes of Corinth were lifting their gray bosom to the unheeding sun and the Roman legates were dictating peace to the rival monarchs of Syria and Egypt, this Persian idea, like a long lost seed, is supposed to have suddenly sprung up in Palestine, a thousand miles from the place of its birth and four hundred years after the time that Babylon fell before the arms of Cyrus. Believe it who can and will!

The fourth and most probable answer to the question as to why the names of the angels of God were first revealed to Daniel is, that he was the first and only writer of an Old

versary is called the serpent. Hence, in Rev. xii. 9, we are told, that "the great dragon was cast out, that old serpent, called the Devil, and Satan, which deceiveth the whole world."

²⁸ See "The Origin of the Ideas of Daniel" (This REVIEW for April 1923).

Testament book that lived in Babylon and who was conversant with the literature and language of the Babylonians. From the earliest times, the Babylonians had been in the habit of giving names to the messengers of the gods. In the Creation Tablets, Gaga is the messenger of Anshar. In the story of Erishkigal, Nerigal and fourteen others who accompany him are mentioned by name. In Ishtar's Descent to Hades, Namtar is called the messenger of Erishkigal. When, therefore, a messenger came from the true God to a Jew who had been educated in all these old Babylonian legends which assigned names to the messengers of their false gods, it was perfectly natural that his name should be announced. The fact that Daniel names his angels and that the writers who lived in Palestine do not name them is a strong proof of the genuineness of Daniel's book, and that it was really written in Babylon.

c. The main theme of the *Book of Noah* is the fall of the angels, as recorded in Gen. vi. 1-8. In large measure, the fallen angels are the theme, also, of the First Section of *Enoch*. It was natural, therefore, that those writing on such a subject should have given names to the sons of God that they were describing. None of the other five Sections of *Enoch*, however, nor any other of the numerous works whose teaching on angels is cited above, covering a period of nearly seven centuries, gives the names of more than two or three angels; many of them name one only. The Revelation of St. John alone names three, and most of the New Testament books name none. As against twelve different names for good and bad angels together in all the other literature of these seven centuries, the three Sections of *Enoch* give the names of about thirty.

The penchant for naming angels seems, therefore, to have been confined to the writers of the parts of *Enoch* which deal expressly with angels and their history. To argue from such documents as to the usage of books that only mention angels incidentally is, to say the least, a hazardous and inconclusive method of procedure. Judging from the numerous names

of the messengers of the gods and of the evil spirits that are found in the Babylonian legends and magical works the Book of Enoch and Daniel and all the other works naming angels, may have been written at any time after the children of Israel were carried captive and brought into contact with the demon worshippers of Babylon.

We conclude, therefore, that there is nothing in the teachings of Daniel with regard to angels, that necessitates the placing of the composition of the book at a date later than the sixth century B.C.; and that, on the contrary, there is much that indicates Babylon as the place where it was written.

2. With regard to the Resurrection:

a. Daniel makes but one statement. In xii. 2, he says that "many of them that sleep in the dust shall awake, some to everlasting life and some to shame and everlasting contempt." A resurrection is taught, also, in Isaiah xxvi. 19, where we read: "Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead." In Job xix. 25 a belief in a resurrection is expressed by the patriarch in the words: "I know that my Redeemer liveth, and that he shall stand at the latter day upon the earth: and though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh I shall see God." Moreover, the thought of a possible resurrection was present in his mind, when he asked, "If a man die, shall he live again?" (xiv. 14). In Matthew xxii. 31, Jesus seems to assert that the fact of a resurrection was involved in the statement, "I am the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." In Acts ii. 27-32, Peter declares that David had taught the doctrine of the resurrection in Ps. xvi. 10, where he says: "Thou wilt not leave my soul in hell; neither wilt thou suffer thy holy one to see corruption." In 1 Cor. xv. 54, Paul discerns a reference to a resurrection in the words of Isaiah xxv. 8: "He will swallow up death in victory."

b. Further, that the ancient Israelites believed in the possibility at least of a resurrection is shown by the story of the

raising of Samuel by the witch of Endor (1 Sam. xxviii. 11-20), by the story of the man who was revived by touching the bones of Elisha (2 Kings xiii. 21), and by Ezekiel's vision of the dry bones (Ezek. xxxvii. 1-10). Moreover, Elijah and Elisha each raised the dead to life (1 Kings xvii. 17-24, 2 Kings iv. 32-35); and Enoch and Elijah were both translated that they should not see death, thus teaching that the soul and the body could be united in the other world.

c. Of uncanonical works from before the year 100 B.C., the only ones that refer to a resurrection are the First Section of *Enoch* which says in xxv. 3-6 that the righteous and holy shall eat of a tree, whose fragrance shall be in their bones, and they shall live a long life on the earth; and the *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs*, which speak of a resurrection of the wicked as well as of the righteous (Benjamin x. 6-8).

d. Of works from the first century B.C., *Second Maccabees*, the Fourth Section of *Enoch* (c. 5), the Fifth Section of *Enoch* (li. 1, lxi. 5), and the *Psalms of Solomon* (ii. 35, xiv. 2), teach a resurrection of the righteous dead; but not one of them teaches clearly the resurrection of the wicked, though the writer of *4 Enoch* may possibly mean that they shall be raised for judgment.

e. Of non-biblical works from the first century A.D., the *Apocalypse of Baruch* (l. 2) states that all that have fallen asleep in hope in God shall rise again, and that the earth will assuredly restore the dead (xxx. 1, l. 2). In a passage from 4 Ezra, which is said by Dr. Box to have been added about 120 A.D., it is said that those that sleep in the earth shall be restored to life in order to be judged (vii. 52). Josephus, also, affirms his belief in a resurrection. The *Testament of Hezekiah* refers to the resurrection of the beloved (iii. 18), and the *Vision of Isaiah*, to the resurrection of the righteous (ix. 17).

f. All of the New Testament writers, with the exception of James and Jude, who say nothing about it, teach a resurrection of both good and bad.

From this testimony, it is evident, that outside the New Testament, of the vast body of literature cited above only the *XII Patriarchs*, *2 Maccabees*, the Fourth and Fifth and possibly the First Section of *Enoch*, the *Psalms of Solomon*, the *Apocalypse of Baruch*, and *4 Ezra*, and *Josephus*, refer to a resurrection and that of these, the *XII Patriarchs* alone teaches that both righteous and wicked shall be raised. Since the last mentioned work was written, according to Professor Charles, about 107 B.C., it is evident that, even if the author got his idea of a resurrection from Daniel, this will not determine whether Daniel was written in the sixth, or in the second century B.C.

3. As to the Judgment :

a. Daniel says that the judgment was set, the Ancient of Days presiding, and that the books were opened and the beast slain (vii. 10-14, 26) ; and that judgment was given to the saints of the Most High and they possessed the kingdom (vii. 22). There are involved in these statements the following facts :

(1) There will be a judgment. (2) There will be a judge. (3) Certain titles of the judge. (4) Books will be opened. (5) The beast will be slain. (6). Judgment will be given to the saints of the Most High. Taking these facts up one after the other, it will be seen from the testimony that they do not support the view that Daniel was composed in the second century B.C.

(1) The fact of a judgment is mentioned in Isa. xxviii. 17, xlii. 1, Zeph. iii. 8, Hag. ii. 7, 9, 22, 23, Zech. viii-xiv, Mal. iii. Ps. i. 5, lviii. 11, xcvi. 14, xcviii. 9. Most of these texts concern the judgment of the nations, just as those in Daniel do.

(2) In all of the texts cited under (1) the person of the judge is God, just as in Daniel.

(3) The titles of the judge are "the Ancient of Days" and "the Most High." The first of these is found nowhere except in Daniel. The second phrase, the Most High, occurs as early as Num. xxiv. 16 and 2 Sam. xxii. 14.

(4) The idea of a book of life being kept by the Lord appears already in Ex. xxxii. 32, 33 (ascribed by the critics to E), in Isa. iv. 3, and in Ps. lxix. 28. In Ps. xxxii. 8 and Mal. iii. 16, these books are called books of remembrance in which good deeds were recorded, and in Isa. lxv. 6, books where evil deeds are recorded. It is obvious, therefore, that the idea is earlier than the sixth century B.C.

(5) The statement that the beast was slain is merely a detail of the vision of the four beasts. As this whole vision is peculiar to Daniel, so also is this feature of the description of the fourth beast. It is worthy of note, however, in this connection, that no vision of any of the apocalyptic books names the same animals as those mentioned here by Daniel. Daniel mentions the lion (*aryeh*), a word familiar from its use in Judges xiv. 8, 1 Kings xiii. 24, and elsewhere. The word for bear (*dov*) is found in 1 Sam. xvii. 34; the word for leopard (*nemer*) in Hos. xiii. 2, Is. xi. 6—all early passages. It will be noted, also, that Daniel's lion has eagle's wings, like the winged lions of Assyria at Babylonia,—a very appropriate figure in a vision at Babylon in the time of Belshazzar; but scarcely fitting to one seen, or imagined, by a Jew in Palestine in the time of the anti-foreign revival under the Maccabees. This winged lion may be compared to the living creatures of Ezekiel and to the seraphim of Isaiah. The apocalyptic literature of the post-Babylonian times dropped this symbolism of wings as a feature of animals that did not naturally have them. In 4 Ezra x. 1, the wings are wings of eagles.

(6) That the judgment was given to the saints of the Most High is ambiguous, since it is not clear whether it means that the saints were judged, or that they issued judgment. That by saints the holy people is meant seems certain from vii. 2, where it is said, that the kingdom shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High. That God will judge his people is taught in Deut. xxxii. 26, Mal. iii. 5, Ps: 1. 4, cxxxv. 15, and in the *XII Patriarchs* (Benj. x. 8). In the Fifth Section of *Enoch* (xlvii. 2) written about

95 B.C., this idea of Daniel may be referred to when it says that the holy angels pray on behalf of the righteous that judgment may be done unto them. It is clear, then, that according to this interpretation the book of Daniel may have been written either in the sixth, or in the second century B.C.

The other interpretation, which makes the holy people participate in the judgment, is taught by Mat. xix. 28, Luke xxii. 30, and 1 Cor. vi. 3. Since it is not found in the early apocalyptic literature, it can have no bearing upon the date of Daniel.

As far, then, as the teaching of Daniel on the judgment is concerned, there is no reason for supposing that it may not have been written as early as 535 B.C.

4. The teachings of Daniel with regard to the Messiah may be considered under the four heads of the idea of a Messiah, the names and titles of the Messiah, his character, and his functions.

a. As to the Idea of a Messiah :

(1) In the literature of the Old Testament preceding the time of Daniel, it is found expressed with more or less clearness and certainty in the "seed" of Gen. iii. 15 (J), in the "Shilo" of Gen. xlix. 10 (J), in the "star" of Num. xxiv. 17, (JE), in the "prophet" of Deut. xviii. 15 (D), in the "prince of peace" of Is. ix. 6, 7, in the "rod of the stem of Jesse and the branch out of his roots" of Is. xi. 1, in the "righteous branch" of Jer. xxiii. 5, 6, and xxxiii. 11-17, in the "shepherd and prince (*nasi*)" of Ezek. xxxiv. 23-31, and in the "ruler in Israel" of Mi. v. 2. From these passages, it is evident that the idea of a Messiah antedated the time of Cyrus, and hence that the presence of this idea in Daniel does not require us to place its date as late as the second century B.C.

(2) The idea of a Messiah is found, also, in the literature between Cyrus and 200 B.C. Thus, the "branch" is spoken of in Zech. iii. 8, vi. 12, the "king" in ix. 9; while Mal. iii. 1 speaks of the coming of the "messenger of the covenant."

That the idea of a Messiah should be absent from Esther and certain other post-captivity books is no more an argu-

ment against the early date of Daniel than it is an argument against the early date of J, E, D, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. On the contrary, according to the critics' way of arguing, the presence of the idea in Zechariah and Malachi should argue for the earlier date of Daniel.

Again, if the absence of the idea of a Messiah from Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, P, and other alleged post-captivity works proves that Daniel was not known to the authors of these works, by parity of reasoning its absence from the four books of Maccabees, from the additions to Daniel and Esther, from the Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Ascension of Moses, and other late works would prove that their authors, also, knew nothing of Daniel. Besides, since most of them show no knowledge of J, D, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and many other Old Testament books, are we to presume that they, also, were unknown to them? It is absurd to suppose that every writer should express all his ideas on every subject in every book that he writes. No one does do it. No one can do it. No one should be expected to do it. Nor should anyone be accused of ignorance, because he says nothing about a subject concerning which he may have had an opinion, but did not think best to express it. How can Mr. Bevan or Professor Cornill know what the author of Esther knew about the idea of a Messiah? It would be interesting to all historians and searchers after truth, if they would reveal the sources of their information. The author of Esther is dead. He has said not a word about the Messiah, nor about why he said not a word. Neither intellect, nor imagination, can possibly discover what he might have written, had he written, nor why he did not write what he did not write.

b. Nor do the Names and Titles of the Messiah give us information from which we may determine the date of Daniel. We shall demonstrate this by giving these names and titles as they appear in the literature of Jews and Christians up to the year 134 A.D. And here we shall give, not merely those that have been universally acknowledged as designating

the Messiah, but those also that were in later times interpreted as referring to him.

I. NAMES AND TITLES IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

1. The seed of Eve, Gen. iii. 15.
2. The seed of Abraham, Gen. xxii. 18.
3. Shiloh, Gen. xlix. 10 (Targum of Onkelos: Messiah whose is the kingdom).
4. A prophet like Moses, Deut. xviii. 18.
5. A star, Num. xxiv. 17.
6. A sceptre, Num. xxiv. 17 (Onkelos translates by "Messiah").
7. A Son of God, Ps. ii. 7, Isa. ix. 6(?).
8. The prince of peace, Isa. ix. 6 (Targum: Messiah who shall multiply peace, etc.).
9. Wonderful, Isa. ix. 6.
10. Counsellor, Isa. ix. 6.
11. Mighty God, Isa. ix. 6.
12. The everlasting Father, Isa. ix. 6.
13. Jehovah, our righteousness, Jer. xxiii. 6.
14. God's messenger, Isa. xlii. 19.
15. God's servant, Isa. xlix. 3 (Targum to xlii. 1, lii. 13, liii. 10 calls this servant "Messiah.")
16. God's righteous servant, Isa. liii. 11.
17. The man of sorrows, Isa. liii. 3.
18. The shepherd of Israel, Ezek. xxxiv. 23.
19. The rod of Jesse, Isa. xi. 10.
20. A rod out of the stem of Jesse, and a branch (Heb. נֹצֵר Targum מִשְׁרָא) from his roots, Isa. xi. 1.
21. The branch of Jehovah, Isa. iv. 2 (Targum: The Messiah of Jehovah.)
22. The branch of righteousness, Jer. xxxiii. 15 (Targum: A Messiah of righteousness.)
23. The righteous branch, Jer. xiii. 5 (Targum: A Messiah of the righteous.)
24. A plant of renown, Ezek. xxxiv. 29.
25. A great light, Isa. ix. 2.
26. The rock of ages, Isa. xxvi. 4.
27. A stone, Isa. xxviii. 16.
28. A tried stone, Isa. xxviii. 16.
29. A precious corner stone, Isa. xxviii. 16.
30. The head of the corner. Ps. cxviii. 22.
31. A sure foundation. Isa. xxviii. 16.
32. God's elect, Isa. xlii. 1.
33. The redeemer (*goel*), Isa. lix. 20.
34. The witness, Isa. lv. 4.
35. The holy one of Israel, Isa. xlix. 7.
36. A leader (*nagid*), Isa. lv. 4.

37. A commander, Isa. lv. 4, A ruler, Mi. iv. 2.
38. David their king, Jer. xxx. 9 (Targum: Messiah the son of David their king).
39. Messiah, Ps. ii. 2.
40. The man of (Jehovah's) fellowship, Zech. xiii. 7.
41. My (Jehovah's) Shepherd, Zech. xiii. 7.
42. My servant, the branch, Zech. iii. 8 (Targum: My servant, the Messiah).
43. The branch, Zech. vi. 12 (Targum: Messiah).
44. The king, Zech. xiv. 16, Jer. xxx. 9.
45. The King, just and having salvation, Zech. ix. 10.
46. A fountain for sin and for uncleanness, Zech. xiii. 1.
47. The one whom they have pierced, Zech. xii. 10.
48. The angel of the covenant, Mal. iii. 1.
49. The sun of righteousness, Mal., iii. 20.
50. (David's) Lord. Ps. cx. 1.
51. The salvation of Israel, Ps. xiv. 7, liv. 7.

II. NAMES AND TITLES FROM THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL LITERATURE
BEFORE CHRIST

1. King, Sib. Oracles iii. 652, Pss. Sol. xvii. 23.
2. Righteous king, Pss. Sol. xvii. 35.
3. King, son of David. Pss, Sol. xvii. 23.
4. King Christ the Lord. Pss. Sol. xvii. 36.
5. His King is Lord. Pss. Sol. xvii. 38 (?).
6. God's anointed, or Messiah, Enoch xlvi. 10, lii. 4.²⁹
7. The elect one, Enoch xlv. 3, 4, xlix. 2, 4, li. 5bis, lii. 6, 9, lv. 4, lxi. 5, 8, 10, lxii. 1.
8. The elect one of righteousness and faith, Enoch xxxix. 6.
9. The righteous one, Enoch xxxviii. 2.
10. The righteous and elect one, Enoch liii. 6.
11. The son of man, Enoch xlvi. 2, 3, 4, xlvi. 2, lxii. 5, 7, 9, 14, lxiii. 11, lxix. 26, 27, 29, lxx. 1, lxxi. 14, 17.
12. The white bull, xc. 37.
13. God's son, Enoch cv. 2.
14. A prince, Jubilees xxxi. 18.
15. The help of Jacob, Jub. xxxi. 19.
16. The salvation of Israel, Jub. xxxi. 19.
17. God's servant, Pss. Sol. xviii. 6.
18. The king, the son of David, Pss. Sol. xviii. 6.
19. King. The Anointed of the Lord, Pss. Sol. xvii. 6, xviii. 8.
20. His (God's) Anointed, Pss. Sol. xviii. 6.
21. The Messiah, II Bar. xxix. 3, xxx. 1, xxxix. 7, xl. 1, lxxii. 2.

²⁹ This and the following titles up to 11 inclusive are from the Fifth Section, which was written, according to Prof. Charles, between 94 and 64 B.C. In Enoch, the Ethiopic word is *Masih* the exact equivalent of the Hebrew *Mashiah*.

22. The rod of righteousness, XII. Pat. Jud. xxiv. 6.
23. The star of peace, XII. Pat. Jud. xxiv. 1a.
24. The salvation of the Lord, XII. Pat. Dan v. 10.
25. A lamb, XII. Pat. Jos. xix. 8, Enoch xc. 38 (?)

III. NAMES AND TITLES IN THE EXTRA-BIBLICAL LITERATURE FROM 1 TO 135 A.D.

1. The beloved, The Vision of Isaiah vii. 17, 23, ix. 12, Mart. Isa. i. 13, Test. Hez. iii. 17, 18, iv. 3, 6, 9, 13.
2. His beloved the Christ, Vis. Isa. viii, 18.
3. His beloved son, Vis. Is. viii. 25.
4. Jesus, the Lord Christ, Test. Hez. iv. 13.
5. The only begotten, Vis. Isa. vii. 37.
6. The elect one, Vis. Isa. viii. 7.
7. The Lord, Vis. Isa. viii. 26.
8. The Lord God, the Lord Christ, who is called Jesus, Vis. Isa. ix. 5.
9. The Lord who will be called Christ, Vis. Isa. ix. 13.
10. (God's) son, Vis. Isa. ix. 14, 16, *Son of man Vision* xiii. 32, 37, iv. Ezra xiii. 52, xiv. 9.
11. The Lord Christ, Vis. Isa. ix. 5, 17, 32, Test. Hez. iv. 13, Odes. Sol. xvii. 15, xxxix. 10.
12. That one, Vis. Isa. ix. 26, 27, 31, 38.
13. Messiah, Odes Sol. xxiv. 1, xli. 16, *Eagle Vision* xii. 32, Redactor Ezra vii. 28, Zad. Frag. ii. 10, ix. 10b, ix. 29, xv. 4.
14. The loving one, Odes Sol. iii. 8.
15. The pleroma, Odes Sol. vii. 14.
16. The word, Odes Sol. xii. 8, 9, 11, xli. 11.
17. The Son of God, Odes Sol. xxxvi. 3, xlii. 21.
18. The son of the Most High, Odes Sol. xli. 14.
19. Jesus, *Test. Hez.* iv. 13, Vis. Isa. ix. 5, Josephus Antiq. xviii. iii. 3.
20. Christ, Josephus Ant. xviii. iii. 3, Tacitus: Annals. xv. 44, Odes Sol. ix. 2, xxix. 6, xli. 3, Vis. Isa. viii. 18, ix. 13.
21. Jesus who was called Christ, Jos. Ant. xx. ix. 1.
22. (God's) Son the Messiah. iv. Ezra vii. 27, 29.
23. The lion, the Messiah from the seed of David. IV Ezra xii. 32.

IV. NAMES AND TITLES OF THE MESSIAH IN THE DIFFERENT BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

A. NAMES AND TITLES IN MATTHEW

1. Son (i.e., of God, or of the Lord) ii. 15, xi. 27 *ter*, xxvii. 19.
2. Young child, ii. 8, 9, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21.
3. Son of man, 32 times.
4. The son of the carpenter, xiii. 55.
5. Son of God, iv. 3, xiv. 33, xxvii. 40, 43, 54.
6. Jesus, son of God, viii. 29.
7. Christ, son of God, xxvi. 63.
8. Christ, the son of the living God, xvi. 16.
9. Christ, the son of the Highest, xvi. 16.

10. Beloved Son, iii. 17.
11. Son of David, ix. 27, xii. 23, xxi. 9, xxii. 42.
12. Lord, son of David, xv. 22, xx. 30, 31.
13. Jesus, 137 times.
14. Christ 11 times.
15. Jesus Christ, I. 1, 18.
16. Jesus, the Christ, xvi. 20.
17. Jesus which is called Christ, xxvii. 17, 22.
18. Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham, i. 1.
19. Lord (of Christ), 33 times.
20. King, xxi. 5, xxv. 34, 40.
21. King of Israel, xxvii. 42.
22. King of the Jews, ii. 2, xxvii. 11, 37.
23. Great King, v. 35.
24. Governor (*hegoumenos*), ii. 6.
25. Master (*rabbi*), xxiii. 7, 8, xxvi. 25, 49.
26. Master (*didaskalos*), viii. 19, ix. 11, xii. 38, xvii. 34, xix. 16, xxii. 16, 24, 36, xxvii. 18.
27. Master (*kathegetes*), xxiii. 8, 10.
28. Nazarene, ii. 23.
29. Jesus, the Nazarene, xxvi. 71.
30. Jesus, the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee, xxi. 11.
31. One of the prophets, xvi. 14.
32. John the Baptist, xvi. 14.
33. Elijah, xvi. 14.
34. Jeremiah, xvi. 14.
35. He that should come, xi. 3.
36. One greater than the temple, xii. 6.
37. One greater than Jonah, xii. 41.
38. One greater than Solomon, xii. 41.
39. My, i.e., God's servant, xii. 18.
40. My (i.e., God's) beloved, xii. 18.
41. Just (man), xxvii. 19, 24.
42. This (man, or fellow), xii. 24, xxvi. 61.
43. That deceiver, xxvii. 63.
44. Beelzebub, x. 25.
45. Stone, xxi. 42.

B. NAMES AND TITLES IN MARK AND PETER

MARK

1. Son (i.e., of God), xiii. 32.
2. Son of man, 14 times.
3. Son of Mary, vi. 3.
4. Son of God, iii. 11, xv. 39.
5. Beloved Son (i.e., of God), i. 11, ix. 7.
6. Jesus, son of the Most High God, v. 7.
7. Jesus Christ, the son of God, i. 1.
8. Christ, the son of the Blessed, xiv. 61.

9. Son of David, x. 48, xii. 35.
10. Jesus, son of David, x. 47.
11. Jesus, 93 times.
12. Jesus of Nazareth (or the Nazarene), i. 24, xiv. 6.
13. Christ, viii. 29, ix. 41, xii. 21, 35, xiii. 21.
14. Jesus Christ, i. 1.
15. Christ, the king of Israel, xv. 32.
16. Lord (of Christ), 8 times.
17. Lord of the sabbath, ii. 28.
18. Holy One of God, i. 24.
19. The king of the Jews, xv. 2, 9, 12, 18, 26.
20. Master (*rabbi*), ix. 5, xi. 21, xiv. 45 *bis*.
21. Master (*rabboni*), x. 51.
22. Master (*didaskalos*), 12 times.
23. Good master (*didaskalos*), x. 17.
24. A prophet, vi. 15, viii. 28.
25. John, vi. 16.
26. John the Baptist, vi. 14, viii. 28.
27. Elijah, vi. 15, viii. 28.
28. Stone, xii. 10.

FIRST PETER.

1. Christ, 8 times.
2. Christ Jesus, v. 10, 14 (?).
3. Jesus Christ, 8 times.
4. Lord (i.e., of Christ), ii. 3, 13, iii. 12 *bis*.
5. Lord Jesus, iii. 15 (Syr. Pesh: Lord Messiah.)
6. Lord Jesus, Christ, i. 3.
7. Shepherd and bishop of souls, ii. 25.
8. Chief Shepherd, v. 4.
9. Stone, ii. 7.
10. Precious corner stone, ii. 6.

SECOND PETER.

1. Our God and our Savior, Jesus Christ, i. 1.
2. My beloved Son, i. 17.
3. Lord, (i.e., of Christ), ii. 9, 11, iii. 9, 10, 15.
4. Jesus Christ, i. 1.
5. Jesus our Lord, i. 2.
6. Lord Jesus Christ, i. 8, 14, 16.
7. Lord and Savior, iii. 2.
8. Master (*despotes*), ii. 1.

PETER'S SPEECHES IN ACTS.

1. Seed, iii. 25.
2. (God's) son Jesus, iii. 13, 26.
3. Holy child Jesus, iv. 27, 30.
4. Jesus, i. 16, ii. 32, 36.
5. Jesus of Nazareth (or the Nazarene), ii. 22, x. 38.
6. Christ, ii. 29, 30, 36, iii. 18, iv. 26.

7. Jesus Christ, ii. 38, iii. 20, ix. 34, x. 36, 48 (?).
8. Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, iii. 6, iv. 10.
9. Lord, i. 24 (?), ii. 21 (?), 25 (?), 34, 36, iii. 19, iv. 29, x. 48 (?), xii. 11, 17.
10. Lord Jesus, i. 21.
11. Lord of all, x. 36.
12. Lord Jesus Christ, xi. 17, xv. 11.
13. Holy One, ii. 27, iii. 14.
14. The Just, iii. 14.
15. Prince of life, iii. 15.
16. A prophet, iii. 22.

C. NAMES AND TITLES IN LUKE AND ACTS

LUKE

1. Son, x. 22 *ter*.
2. Son of man, 26 times.
3. Son of Joseph, iii. 23, iv. 22 (?).
4. Son of God, i. 35, iv. 3, 9, xxii. 70.
5. Son of the Highest, i. 32.
6. Jesus, son of God Most high, viii. 28.
7. Christ, the son of God, iv. 41.
8. Beloved Son, iii. 22, ix. 35.
9. Son of David, xviii. 39, xx. 41 (?).
10. Jesus, son of David, xviii. 38.
11. Christ, the son of David, xx. 41.
12. Jesus, 98 times.
13. Christ, ii. 15, iv. 41, xxii. 67, xxiii. 2, 30, xxiv. 2, 26, 46.
14. Jesus, Master (*epistates*), ix. 33.
15. Jesus, the Nazarene, iv. 34, xviii. 37, xxiv. 19.
16. Jesus, Lord, xxiii. 42.
17. Lord (*despotes*), xxiii. 42.
18. Lord Jesus, xxiv. 3.
19. Lord's Christ, ii. 26.
20. Christ, the Lord, ii. 11.
21. Christ of God, ix. 20.
22. Holy One of God, iv. 34.
23. Holy thing that shall be born, i. 35.
24. Christ, the chosen of God, xxiii. 35.
25. King, xix. 28.
26. King of the Jews, xxiii. 3, 37, 38.
27. Master (*epistates*), v. 5, viii. 24*bis*, 45, ix. 33, 49, xvii. 13.
28. Master (*didaskalos*), 14 times.
29. Good Master (*didaskalos*), xviii. 18.
30. A prophet, ix. 20.
31. Great prophet, vii. 16.
32. One of the old prophets, ix. 20.
33. He that should come, vii. 19.
34. John the Baptist, ix. 19.

35. Elijah, ix. 19.
36. Christ, a king, xxiii. 2.
37. Salvation, ii. 30.
38. A man eating and drinking, a friend of publicans and sinners, vii. 34.
39. Stone, xx. 17.

ACTS.

1. Son (i.e., of God), xiii. 33.
2. Son of man, vii. 56.
3. Son of God, viii. 37, ix. 20.
4. Lord (*despotes*), iv. 24 (?).
5. Lord Jesus, 12 times.
6. Lord Jesus Christ, 6 times.
7. His (God's) son, Jesus, iii. 13, 26.
8. God's holy child, Jesus. iv. 30.
9. Jesus, 26 times.
10. Christ, iv. 26, xviii. 5 (?).
11. Jesus Christ, 9 times.
12. Christ Jesus, xix. 4 (?).
13. Jesus of Nazareth, or the Nazarene, ii. 22, vi. 14, x. 38, xxii. 8, xxvi. 9.
14. Jesus Christ, the Nazarene, iii. 6, iv. 10.
15. Saviour, Jesus, xiii. 23.
16. Prince and Saviour, v. 31.
17. Servant, iii. 26.
18. Servant, Jesus, iii. 13, iv. 27.
19. His (God's) holy servant, Jesus, iv. 30.
20. Holy One, ii. 27.
21. The holy One and just, iii. 14.
22. Just One, vii. 52, xxii. 14.
23. A prophet, iii. 22, 23, vii. 37.
24. Judge of quick and dead, x. 42.
25. Prince of life, iii. 15.
26. Lord of all, x. 36.
27. Stone, iv. 11.

D. NAMES AND TITLES IN JOHN'S WRITINGS³⁰

1. Son (i.e., of God), 16 times, 1 John, 9 times, 2 John, vs. 9.
2. Son of man, 11 times.
3. Son of God, 7 times, 1 John, 8 times.
4. (God's) son, Jesus Christ, 1 John i. 3, iii. 23, v. 20.
5. Jesus Christ, His Son, 1 John i. 7.
6. Christ, the son of God, xi. 27, xx. 31.
7. Christ, the son of the living God, vi. 69.
8. Only begotten Son, iii. 16, 1 John iv. 9.
9. The only begotten Son which is in the bosom of the Father, i. 18.
10. The only begotten of the Father, i. 14.
11. The only begotten Son of God, iii. 18.

³⁰ Unless specially noted the references will be to the *Gospel of John*.

12. The Son of the Father, 2 John 9.
13. The Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of the Father, 2 John, 3.
14. Jesus, 252 times, 1 John ii. 22, iv. 15 v. 1, 5. Rev. xiv. 12, xvii. 6, xix. 10*bis*, xx. 4, xxii. 16.
15. Jesus, the son of Joseph, vi. 42.
16. Jesus, the Nazarene, xviii. 5, 7.
17. Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph, i. 45.
18. Christ, 14 times, 1 John ii. 22, v. 1, 2 John 9*bis*, Rev. xi. 15, xii. 10, xx. 4, 6.
19. Jesus Christ, i. 17, xvii. 3, 1 John iv. 2, 3, v. 6, 11 John 7, Rev. i. 1, 2, 5, 9*bis*, xii. 17.
20. Jesus Christ, the righteous, 1 John ii. 1.
21. Jesus Christ, the faithful witness, the firstborn from the dead, the ruler of the kings of the earth, Rev. i. 5.
22. Lamb, Rev. 23 times.
23. The lamb of God, i. 29, 36.
24. Lord, 37 times, Rev. 7 times.
25. Lord Jesus, Rev. xxii. 20, 21.
26. Lord Jesus Christ, Rev. xxii. 21.
27. Lord of lords and king of kings, Rev. xvii. 14.
28. Lord God of the spirits of the prophets, Rev. xxii. 6.
29. Lord and God, xx. 28.
30. The Logos, (or Word), i. 1*ter*, 18, 1 John v. 7 (?).
31. The Word of God, Rev. xix. 13.
32. The Word of life, 1 John i. 1.
33. Holy One, 1 John ii. 20 (?).
34. The holy, the true, who has the key of David *et cet.* Rev. iii. 7.
35. Rabbi, i. 38, 49, iii. 2, vi. 25, ix. 2, xi. 8.
36. Rabboni, xx. 16.
37. Master (*didaskalos*), 8 times.
38. Master, or Lord (*dcsportes*), Rev. vi. 10.
39. Sir (*kurios*), 17 times
40. A prophet, vi. 14, ix. 17.
41. The prophet, vii. 40.
42. The door, x. 9.
43. The door of the sheep, x. 7.
44. The vine, xv. 5.
45. The true vine, xv. 1.
46. The bread of life, vi. 35.
47. The light, xii. 46.
48. The light of the world, viii. 12, ix. 5.
49. The comforter, xiv. 16.
50. Messiah, i. 42, iv. 25.
51. King, xii. 15.
52. King of Israel, i. 49, xii. 13.
53. King of the Jews, xviii. 39, xix. 3, 19, 21.
54. Jesus of Nazareth, the king of the Jews, xix. 19.
55. King of saints, Rev. xv. 3.

56. King of kings and Lord of lords, Rev. xix. 16.
57. Saviour of the world, iv. 42.
58. The good shepherd, x. 11, 14.
59. The Amen, the faithful and true witness, the beginning of the creation of God, Rev. iii. 14.
60. Alpha and Omega, Rev. i. 8, 11, xxi. 6, xxii. 13.
61. The beginning and the end. Rev. xxi. 6.
62. The first and the last, Rev. i. 17.
63. The living One, Rev. i. 18.
64. The lion of the tribe of Judah, the root of David, Rev. v. 5.
65. The root and offspring of David, the bright and morning star, Rev. xxii. 16.
66. Faithful and true, Rev. xix. 11.

E. NAMES AND TITLE IN PAUL'S WRITINGS

1. Son (i.e., of God), Rom. v. 10, viii. 3, 29, 32; I Cor. xv. 28, Gal. i. 16, iv. 4; I Thes. i. 10; Acts. xiii. 33 cit.
2. Son of God, Rom. i. 4; Gal. ii. 20; Eph. iv. 13.
3. Son of God, Jesus Christ, 2 Cor. i. 19.
4. His (God's) son, Jesus Christ our Lord. Rom. i. 3; I Cor. i. 9.
5. Jesus, Rom. iii. 26, viii. 11; I Cor. xii. 3*bis*; 2 Cor. iv. 10, 11*bis*, xi. 4; Eph. iv. 21; Phil. ii. 10; I Thes. i. 10, iv. 14*bis*; Acts. xiii. 33, xvi. 32, xxvi. 1, 15, xxviii. 23.
6. (God's) dear son, Col. i. 13.
7. Christ, Romans, 35 times; I Cor. 47; 2 Cor., 38; Gal., 25; Eph., 28; Phil. 18; Col. 19; I Thes., 3; 2 Thes., 2; I Tim., 2; 2 Tim., 1; Philemon, 2; Acts (in Paul's speeches), 3.
8. Christ Jesus, Rom. iii. 24, viii. 1, 2, xv. 5, xvi. 3; Gal. ii. 4, iii. 26, 28, iv. 14, vi. 15; Eph. i. 1, ii. 6, 7, 10, 13, iii. 21; Phil. i. 1, ii. 5, iii. 3, 12, 14, iv. 7, 19, 21; Col. i. 4, 28; I Thes. ii. 14, v. 18; I Tim. i. 14, 15, iii. 13, vi. 13; 2 Tim. i. 1, 9, 13, ii. 2, 10, iii. 12, 15; Philemon i. 6, 9.
9. Christ Jesus, our Lord, Rom. viii. 39; I Cor. xv. 31; II Cor. iv. 5 (?); Eph. iii. 11; Phil. iii. 8; Col. ii. 6; I Tim. i. 12; 2 Tim. i. 2.
10. Christ who is over all, blessed for ever, Rom. ix. 5.
11. Jesus Christ, Rom., 13 times; I Cor., 2; 2 Cor., 4; Gal., 8; Eph., 5; Phil., 7; Col., 1; I Tim., 3; 2 Tim., 3; Ti., 1; Philemon, 9; Acts xvi. 18.
12. Jesus Christ, Lord, Rom. iv. 24; I Cor. i. 2, 9, ix. 1; I Tim. i. 2.
13. Jesus Christ, our Saviour, Titus iii. 6.
14. Lord, Rom. 14 times I Cor. 43; 2 Cor. 21; Gal. 19; Eph. 17; Phil. 9; Col. 9; I Thes. 12; 2 Thes. 9; I Tim. 14; 2 Tim. 14; Philemon 16, 20*bis* (?); Acts xiii. 10, 11, xvi. 32, xx. 19, xxii. 10, 16.
15. Lord Jesus, Rom. x. 9, xiv. 14, xvi. 18; I Cor. v. 4*bis*, 5 (?), vi. 11 (?), xi. 23; 2 Cor. i. 14, iv. 10, 14; Gal. vi. 17; Eph. i. 15; Phil. ii. 19; Col. iii. 17; I Thes. ii. 15, iv. 1, 2; 2 Thes. i. 7; Philemon 5; Acts xx. 24, 35.
16. Lord Christ, Rom. xvi. 18 (?); Col. iii. 24.
17. Lord Jesus Christ, Rom. 9 times; I Cor. 12; 2 Cor. 5; Gal. 3; Eph. 7;

- Phil. 2; Col. 2; 1 Thes. 9; 2 Thes. 11; 1 Tim. 4; 2 Tim. 2; Philemon 2; Acts xvi. 31, xx. 21, xxi. 13, xxviii. 31.
18. Lord Jesus Christ, Saviour, Titus i. 4.
 19. Lord of glory, 1 Cor. ii. 8.
 20. Lord of peace, 2 Thes. iii. 16.
 21. Master (*kurios*), Eph. vi. 9, Col. iv. 1.
 22. Savior, Jesus Christ, 2 Tim. i. 10.
 23. Saviour, Lord Jesus Christ, Phil. iii. 20.
 24. Jesus our deliverer, 1 Thes. i. 10.
 25. The man, Acts. xvii. 31.
 26. This man, Acts xiii. 38.
 27. The second man, the Lord from heaven, 1 Cor. xv. 45.
 28. The man Christ Jesus, 1 Tim. ii. 5.
 29. God (?) manifest in the flesh, 1 Tim. iii. 16.
 30. Great God and our Saviour, Jesus Christ, Titus ii. 13.
 31. Holy One, Acts xiii. 35.
 32. Just one, Acts xxii. 14.
 33. God, Acts xx. 28.
 34. Jesus, the Nazarene, Acts xxii. 8, xxvi. 9.
 35. The light of the gentiles, Acts xiii. 47.
 36. The seed of Abraham, Gal. iii. 16.

F. NAMES AND TITLES IN HEBREWS

1. Son, i. 2, *5bis*, 8, ii. 6, v. 5, 8, vii. 28.
2. Son of God, vi. 6, vii. 3, x. 29.
3. Jesus, the son of God, iv. 14.
4. Only begotten, xi. 7.
5. Jesus, ii. 9, vi. 20, vii. 22, x. 19, xii. 2, 24, 28, xiii. 12.
6. Christ, iii. 6, 14, v. 5, vi. 1, ix. 11, 14, 24, 28, xi. 26.
7. Lord, ii. 3, vii. 14.
8. Jesus Christ, x. 10, xiii. 8, 21.
9. Lord Jesus, xiii. 20.
10. Priest, vii. 17, 21.
11. High Priest, x. 21.
12. Apostle and High Priest of our profession Christ Jesus, iii. 1.
13. Great High Priest, Jesus the Son of God, iii. 14.
14. Mediator, viii. 6, ix. 15.
15. Jesus, the Mediator of the new covenant, xii. 2.
16. Forerunner, vi. 20.
17. Captain of salvation, ii. 10.
18. He that shall come, x. 37.
19. Author and finisher of our faith, x. 2.
20. Lord Jesus Christ, the great shepherd of the sheep, xiii. 20.

G. NAMES AND TITLES IN JAMES

1. Lord, 10 times.
2. Lord Jesus Christ, i. 1, ii. 1.
3. Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of glory, ii. 1.

H. NAMES AND TITLES IN JUDE

1. Jesus Christ, i *2bis*.
2. Lord Jesus Christ, 17, 21.
3. Lord, 5, 9, 14 (?).
4. Our only Lord and Master (*despoten kai kurion*) Jesus Christ, 4.

I. NAMES AND TITLES IN STEPHEN'S SPEECH

1. Son of man, Acts vii. 56.
2. Lord, vii. 60.
3. Lord Jesus, vii. 59.
4. A prophet, vii. 37.
5. Just One, vii. 52.

V. THE TITLES OF THE MESSIAH IN DANIEL

1. The Messiah, ix. 26.
2. Messiah prince (*nagid*), ix. 25.
3. The prince of princes, viii. 25.
4. The stone, ii. 34, 35.
5. One like a son of gods, iii. 25.
6. One like a son of man, vii. 13.

Our conclusions based on the Testimony regarding the Messiah are :

a. It cannot be argued from the titles of the Messiah that Daniel was written in the second century B.C.; for the titles given in Daniel are not significant of that period of time, as will be seen from the evidence collected from the above lists.

(1) Messiah, as a title of the expected redeemer of Israel, occurs already in Ps. ii., which Dr. Driver³¹ admits to be presumably pre-exilic. Then, outside of Dan. ix. 26, it does not occur again till in the Second Section of *Enoch* (xlvi. 10), lii. 4, and the *Pss. of Solomon* (xvii. 6, xviii. 6, 8), both from the first century B.C. In the later literature, outside the New Testament, it is found in the Odes of Solomon, Fourth Ezra, the Vision of Isaiah, the Testament of Hézekiah, the Zadokite Fragments, Josephus, and Tacibus, mostly written under Christian influences; and in the Targums and Talmud.

(2) Messiah the Prince is found only in Daniel ix. 25, and hence, cannot be indicative of date. Besides, the term *nagid* used by Daniel for prince, is found besides as a title of the Messiah only in Is. lv. 4.

(3) The title "Prince of princes" occurs nowhere else as a

³¹ LOT, p. 385.

designation of the Messiah, not even in the New Testament; though *sar*, the word used in Dan. viii. 25 for prince, is found in Is. ix. 6 in the phrase "the prince of peace."

(4) The title "stone" of Dan. ii. 34, 43, is used besides in the Old Testament only in Is. xxviii. 16 and Ps. cxviii. 22, and the phrase "rock of ages" only in Is. xxvi. 4. In the New Testament, this stone is used of Christ in Mat. xxi. 42, Mark xii. 10, 1 Pet. ii. 6, 7; also, in Barnabas vi. 4.

(5) The phrase "one who is like a son of gods" occurs in Dan. iii. 25 alone. "Sons of God"³² is used in Gen. vi. 2 to denote the angels. If the word *bar*³³ in Ps. ii. 12 means son, it must mean the son of God and designate the Messiah of verse 2. The phrase is not met with again till in Enoch cv. 2, according to Charles "a passage of uncertain date and origin."³⁴

(6) Whatever the origin and meaning of the phrase "son of man," it is used outside of Daniel as a title of the Messiah only in the New Testament and in the Fifth Section of Enoch (which was probably written in the early part of the first century B.C.) in the Traditions of Matthias (once), in Justin twice, in Ignatius once, and in Celsus once. "The likeness of a man" in 4 Ezra xiii. 3 probably refers to the same person. We have no right, therefore, to presume that Daniel cannot have been written before 200 B. C. because the designations of the Messiah found in it are absent from the post-captivity literature composed before that date, unless we are prepared, also, to maintain that Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, are later than 200 B.C. For Isaiah's

³² In the later literature outside the New Testament, the phrase occurs only in the *Vision of Isaiah* ix. 14, 16 and in Fourth Ezra xiii. 32, 37. If the plural here means God, it is the only example of the plural of majesty found in Aramaic. Since it is Nebuchadnezzar who employs the phrase, he probably meant by it a godlike person.

³³ The occurrence of the word *bar* on a lately discovered Phœnician document from about 850 B.C. does away with any supposed necessity for ascribing the use of *bar* to Aramaic influence.

³⁴ The one hundred and fifth chapter of the Book of Enoch follows the so-called Fifth Section of Enoch and constitutes a sort of appendix to the whole book. It will probably have been written, therefore, not earlier than about 50 B.C.

designations "stone," "rock of ages," "prince" both *nagid* and *sar*), "prince of peace," "servant," and "righteous servant" are all absent from the literature from 500 to 200 B.C.; so also, are Jeremiah's designations "David the king," "branch," "righteous branch," and "branch of righteousness," and the "king" and "shepherd" of Zechariah and Ezekiel. So that, it is evident that, if this method of reasoning from the silence of one document as to doctrines taught in another is valid, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Zechariah, must also be later than 200 B.C.

b. No argument for the late date of Daniel can be made from the use of its designations of the Messiah in the literature written after 200 B.C., that will not for the same reason make a stronger argument for putting the composition of Isaiah and Zechariah after 200 B.C. For Isaiah's designations, "the elect one," "a child," "servant," and Zechariah's designations, "king" and "one that was pierced" are found in the literature from 200 B.C. to 135 A.D.; whereas, no designation peculiar to Daniel, except possibly the phrase "son of man," occurs in this period. "Son of God" may just as well come from Ps. ii. 12, or Is. ix. 6, as from Nebuchadnezzar's phrase "one like a son of gods" in Dan. iii. 25. Messiah may be due to Ps. ii. 2, as well as to Dan. ix. 26. "The stone" is derived from Isa. xxviii. 16, or Ps. cxviii. 22, rather than from Dan. ii. 34, 35.

c. As to the character of the Messiah, it is said in Daniel that he would be an anointed leader, a prince of princes, and that he would be cut off, but not for himself. The idea of the anointed leader is found in the Second Psalm's anointed king. He is called a leader (*nagid*) in Isa. lv. 4 and with the synonym *nasi* in Ezek. xxxiv. 24. The phrase nearest to "prince of princes" is found in the prince of peace of Isa. ix. 6, *sar* being used for prince in both phrases. The idea that the Messiah should suffer, involved in the cutting off of ix. 26, is expressed most fully in Isa. liiii. and in Ps. xxii, both placed by the critics during, or a little after, the captivity.³⁵

³⁵ LOT, p. 245, 386.

The only one of Daniel's characteristics of the Messiah that is found in the literature of the second century is "prince," which occurs in Jubilees xxxi. 18. Since Jubilees, even if written originally in Hebrew, is now known only in a translation, it is impossible to determine whether its word prince stands for one of the words for prince used in Daniel, or whether it represents some other word, such as the *nasi*' of Ezekiel. The only one of the characteristics found in the literature of the first century B.C. is "anointed," appearing in Enoch lii. 4. It thus appears that the usage of Daniel agrees with that of captivity rather than of Maccabean times, even if we accept the dates assigned by the critics to Isaiah and the Psalms.

d. As to the functions of the Messiah, Daniel states simply that his dominion shall be everlasting and that all nations shall serve him. In order to show that these ideas with regard to the length and extent of the dominion of the Messiah were held by the people of Israel before, or about the sixth century B.C., I shall cite first what Daniel says and next, what we find in other early works.

(1) In Dan. vii. 14, we read that there was given to him who was like a son of man dominion and glory and a kingdom that all peoples, nations, and languages shall serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

(2) In Isa. ix. 6, 7,³⁶ it is said of the prince of peace that "of the increase of his government and peace there shall be no end, upon the throne of David, and upon his kingdom to order it, and to establish it, with judgment and with justice from henceforth even for evermore."

(3) In Ps. lxxii., which Dr. Driver says to be presumably preexilic,³⁷ it is said in vs. 11 that all kings shall fall down before the king whom Solomon typified; and in vs. 17, that his name should endure forever, and all nations shall call him blessed.

³⁶ Dating according to LOT from 735-734 B.C.

³⁷ LOT, p. 385.

The two points of everlastingness and universality of the kingdom of the Messiah are thus shown to have been taught long before the time of Cyrus.

CONCLUSIONS

From the above testimony and discussions it will be seen that the four subjects to which Dr. Driver appeals as evidence of the late date of Daniel are all mentioned in Isaiah as well as in Daniel, that three of them are mentioned in Zechariah, and that not more than one, or at most two of them, are mentioned in that vast mass of canonical literature which the critics assign to post-captivity times. That some works written between 500 and 200 B.C. do not refer to any one of these four subjects, no more proves that Daniel did not exist, or was not known, than it proves that Isaiah and Zechariah did not exist, or were unknown to the authors of these works. Many books written after 150 B.C. do not show any knowledge of any of these doctrines. This does not prove that Isaiah, Daniel and Zechariah were not known before the birth of Christ. The Martyrdom of Isaiah, the Ezra-Apocalypse, and the Ezra-piece, are silent as to all but one of these doctrines. This does not prove that Isaiah, Daniel, and Zechariah, were not composed until after 135 A.D.

In short, this argument from silence has been much over-emphasized by the critics; and besides, it proves too much.

That more indications of the existence of Daniel are not found in post-captivity writers may be accounted for on the ground that it was a sealed book, or that the Palestinian writers were not acquainted with a work that had been composed at Babylon, or that they had not yet admitted its canonicity, or simply on the ground that the subjects of which they were treating gave no opportunity of expressing their views on these doctrines; just as, for similar reasons, many writers after 150 B.C., have failed to mention either him, or his doctrines.

Having seen that the doctrines of Daniel agree more nearly with those of Isaiah and Zechariah than with those of any

other books of the Israelites up to 135 A.D., let us, before closing this chapter, and by way of summarizing the argument for the early date, give in short compass the results gathered from all of our investigations. The critics in their attack on Daniel appeal to the evidence of history, literature, language, and doctrine. We have shown in volume one, that there is no sufficient reason for denying the historical statements of Daniel. Belshazzar was certainly in some sense a king of Babylon; and Darius the Mede may have been a sub-king under Cyrus. In the article on *Apocalypses and the Book of Daniel*³⁸ we have seen that the literary forms of Daniel were known in the sixth century B.C. and that these forms differ from those found in Enoch. In an article in the *Biblical and Theological Studies* by the Faculty of Princeton Seminary I showed that the foreign words in Daniel, especially the Persian, support the traditional view that Daniel was written in the Persian period, which produced, also, the books of Zechariah, Haggai, Esther, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah; for these books are characterized by Persian words and no other books of the Old Testament are. Not one of the numerous psalms assigned by the critics to the post-captivity period has a single Persian word, nor has Ecclesiasticus, Ecclesiastes, the Song of Songs,^{38a} Jonah, Joel, Nahum, the so-called Priestly Document of the Pentateuch, nor any of the parts of Isaiah, Hosea, Amos, Proverbs, nor any other possible excerpts from any other Old Testament composition. In short, Persian words occur where one would expect them to occur,—in works from Persian times—and Daniel is one of these works. Nor, as we shall show in a succeeding chapter, if Daniel were written in the second century B.C., is it easy to account for the absence in it of any mention of elephants and phalanxes, the main strength of the Grecian army of the Seleucids.

Taken, therefore, either separately, or collectively, the

³⁸ In vol. XIX, p. 529 of this REVIEW.

^{38a} The so-called Persian words in the Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs are more probably Hittite.

form, language, and contents, of Daniel point to the sixth century B.C., rather than to the second, as the time of its composition. The only grounds left for impugning the historicity of the book of Daniel are the character of the miracles and predictions recorded in it. On these grounds alone, no Christian, or Theist, can logically or consistently reject the evidence in its favor.

It is assumed by the critics that, had the book of Daniel been written in the sixth century B.C., the biblical literature written after that time would show larger traces of its influence, than it does show.

This assumption has been partly answered in the discussion of the second assumption. It may be said further, that the book of Daniel was composed at Babylon; and, hence, may not have been known in Palestine until after the other books were written. It was sealed. This implies that it was inscribed on clay tablets. These tablets may not have been unsealed until long after Daniel was dead. They may even have been written in Babylonian cuneiform, and perhaps even in the Babylonian language.³⁹

Besides, the book of Daniel was not meant so much for immediate effect as for the time of the end. It is doubtful whether it would have been safe, or prudent, to have published it—full, as it is, of predictions of the fall of Babylon and Persia—while the threatened world-powers were still flourishing. When the Maccabean heroes had smashed the power of the last of these, and when the star of Judah was once more in the ascendent, its contents could be revealed without endangering the people of Israel. The record of the constancy of Daniel and his three companions, and of their extraordinary deliverance from their oppressors, and especially, the marvellous and exact fulfillment of the predictions contained in the book, would then serve to arm the despondent nation against the sea of troubles that seemed about to overwhelm it. The broad view which Daniel held of the pur-

³⁹ The discussion of the original script and language of Daniel cannot be entered upon at present, but must be reserved for another time.

poses of God, that he unfolds for us in his vast panorama of world-history—relegating the Jews to their proper place in the movements of the current of human progress—would naturally make his book unpopular among a people, and particularly among leaders like Zerubbabel, Ezra, and Nehemiah, who were intensely narrow and nationalistic in their conception of God's mercy and of the extent and ultimate purpose of his call of Israel and of his government of the nations.

But, even granting that the book of Daniel was published about 535 B.C., the above assumption cannot be admitted, whether we accept the conservative or radical view of the dates of the other books of the Old Testament.

For, first, according to the opinion of both conservative and radical scholars, Haggai, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles, and the first part of Zechariah, were composed after the return from captivity. Haggai, having been written about 520 B.C., can hardly be expected to show many traces of Daniel's influence. It has only thirty-eight verses, and the subject of his prophesy is the rebuilding of the temple. Mere silence, therefore, about the matters treated of in Daniel proves nothing as to what Haggai's views on these matters may have been.

Zechariah, both in form and subject-matter, shows more likeness to the book of Daniel than can be found in any other work of the Old Testament.

Esther presents few traces of any earlier literature, and as the events narrated by its writer have no connection, historically or doctrinally, with the events and teachings of Daniel, it is hard to see that they are of such a character as that traces of Daniel should certainly be found in them.

Malachi exhibits as many possible traces of Daniel as it does of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the other prophetic works.

Chronicles purports to give the history of Israel down to the captivity alone. It would be an evident anachronism for

its writer to have shown traces of the influence of a book written fifty years after the destruction of Jerusalem.

Ezra and Nehemiah are largely personal memoirs, genealogies, and narratives concerning the building of the wall of Jerusalem and the reestablishment of the Law. They show slight traces of any of the prophets and none of most of them; why then should we expect to find large traces of Daniel in them? None but a critic's eye "in a fine frenzy rolling" could have expected to trace the marks of Daniel's teachings on the great things of the kingdom amid the intricacies of the laws on intermarriage with heathen wives, amid the descriptions of the building of the wall, among the special injunctions for the observance of the Sabbath, or even in the account of the keeping of the feast of Tabernacles and of the renewal of the covenant. The prayer of Nehemiah, recorded in chapter nine of the book named after him, certainly has some resemblances to chapter nine of Daniel; but in the chapters themselves there is no evidence to show which of them copied from the other.

As to the various books and parts of books that the critics assigned to the period from 535 to 165 B.C., such as Joel, Jonah, the Priestly Narrative, Isaiah xxiv-xxviii, the Song of Songs, etc., it may be remarked in general, that here, as frequently, the critics are resorting to the fallacy of attempting to prove one assumption by another equally inadmissible. For, we do not admit that it has been proven, nor that it can be proven, that these assumedly post-captivity productions were really so. But, even granting that some of these works were written in post-captivity times, what reason have we for expecting that they must in that case have exhibited large traces of the influence of Daniel? Take Jonah, for example. Suppose its author had been acquainted with the history of Daniel and his three companions, how can he have been expected to show his acquaintanceship in a narrative about his mission to Nineveh, or in his description of his experiences in the belly of the fish, or under the shadow of the gourd? The same is true of Ruth and of the Song of Songs. Only a

perverted imagination and a literary acumen possessed only by "all eminent scholars" would have looked for traces of the fiery furnace and the lions' den in the field of Boaz or the paradise of Solomon.

It cannot be denied by the critics who date Isa. xxiv-xxviii about 400 B.C. that the doctrine of the resurrection taught in xxvi. 19 may have been derived from Daniel xii. 2, provided the latter was written in the sixth century B.C.

The critics assert that most of the psalms were written in post-captivity times. It is, indeed, surprising that so little is said in them about these four doctrines which are characteristic of Daniel; but is it not even more surprising that still less is said about them in the fifty-seven psalms which are assigned by these same critics to Maccabean times? Does it not seem as if there were a conflict here between the literary critics' doctrine of the *Zeitgeist*, or spirit of the times, and that of the traceability of the influence of ideas in successive stages of literary development? If the *Zeitgeist* theory be appealed to, in order to put Daniel and Enoch in the same age, how about these fifty-seven psalms; and how about Ecclesiastes, Ecclesiasticus, Jubilees, Judith, Wisdom, and First Maccabees, most of which make no reference to any of the doctrines characteristic of Daniel? If large traces of the influence of a document of a pre-existent period must be found in all succeeding literature of the same people, how comes it that the great work of Isaiah (except the historic part occurring in chapters xxxvi-xxxix) is never referred to during all the period from 700 to 200 B.C., nor Ezekiel from 550 to 200 B.C.? Further, if Daniel were written in 164 B.C., why is there no trace of his influence on a large part of the Jewish literature that was composed after that time?

Of course, the obvious and only sensible answer to this last question is, that traces of the influence of the ideas of Daniel upon First Maccabees, the Zadokite Fragments, and other works, can only be expected to be found, where and when the author of the later works were treating of the same subjects as those about which Daniel writes. So also, we have

the right to presume that the sensible way of accounting for the absence of large traces of the influence of Daniel upon Haggai, Ezra, Nehemiah, and the authors of other post-captivity works, is the recognition of the fact that they treated of different subjects from those of which Daniel speaks. Galen, writing about medicine, can not be dated by the traces of the Roman laws and jurisprudence that might possibly be looked for in his works. The code of Justinian would not be expected to say much about medicine. Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles, are long on genealogies and short on angels and the resurrection. Daniel is short on genealogies and long on angels and the doctrines of the Messiah, the resurrection, and the judgment. Do men gather grapes of thorns, or figs of thistles?

While, on account of the reasons just given, I think that we should not expect to find traces of the ideas of Daniel in such works as Haggai, Esther, and Ezra, I cannot see how there should be so few traces of these ideas in the Psalms, if, as the critics assert, nearly all of them were composed for the service of the second temple, and more than fifty of them in Maccabean times. For example, is it not remarkable that angels are so seldom mentioned in the psalms, and that neither Gabriel, nor Michael, is named? Why do so few of these numerous poems refer to the Messiah, and why is the glorious and comforting doctrine of the resurrection scarcely hinted at? The theories of *Zeitgeist* and of traces of influence must not be used by the critics only when they seem to support their assumptions. In the case of the psalms, the theories are both dead against the critics.

It is assumed that the same measure of influence on post-captivity literature would be expected from Daniel, as from other early books, especially such as from Deuteronomy, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and Deutero-Isaiah.

This assumption expresses the opinion and expectation of Prof. Cornill, its author; but we doubt, if many other critics will agree with him. It gives too much honor and relative importance to Daniel in comparison with these four great

masterpieces of Hebrew literature. Since Prof. Cornill gives no reasons for his expectation, it becomes incumbent upon us to state both sides of the questions raised by his assertion.

Suppose we admit that these four great books exerted a larger measure of influence upon post-captivity literature than Daniel did, why should they not have done so? They are larger works. They are earlier works. They were ascribed to four of the greatest and most conspicuous of the prophets. Deuteronomy was universally ascribed to their accredited lawgiver, the supposed founder of their nation. Deutero-Isaiah was accepted as a production of the most prominent and influential of the prophet-counsellors of the kings of Judah and certainly possessed all the brilliancy and convincingness of his "genuine" works. Jeremiah stood in a unique relationship to the Jews of the captivity, as the one who had predicted its beginning and its end; and had thus demonstrated that he was truly a prophet of God in a distinguished degree. Ezekiel was himself one of the captives and lived and prophesied among his fellow exiles; and if the radical view of the origin of the Priestly-code be correct, he was the originator of many of its peculiar ordinances.

Besides, all these works are distinctively nationalistic. They are specifically addressed to the Israelites and speak of the other nations only in their connection with the children of Abraham. Whereas, Daniel is a book full of the history of foreign kings and their Hebrew subjects. It is one of the least nationalistic and one of the most catholic and world-embracing of all the Old Testament books. It supplies not a single Haphtara, or reading lesson, to be read by the Jews on the Sabbath day. It arrived at its proper influence only when the gospel, as the means of salvation for all the world, had been proclaimed.

Again, distinctions in books as well as among individuals are invidious. The question in dispute about Daniel is one of existence and not one of relative influence. A book may exist without having any perceptible influence, or any great number of readers. Some books only can be the best sellers of

the year. Some of Paul's epistles have exerted tenfold the influence that others have and are read ten times as much. Some of Milton's works are read by all pupils in the high schools; others are read by all cultivated people; others are scarcely read at all. That Daniel cannot have existed unless we can show traces of his having influenced his contemporaries and successors as much as Jeremiah and others did is simply an assertion made thoughtlessly, hastily, or in the heat of argument. It is utterly without proof and is beyond the reach of proof. It is unworthy of the learned man that made it. May the day soon be past when the dictum of a professor will be considered to outweigh the evidence of common sense, analogy, and documents. Homer sometimes nods; and so also does the most eminent of scholars.

V. THE APPROXIMATION OF DANIEL AND ENOCH

It is assumed that the ideas of Daniel and those of the first part of Enoch approximate and that, because the ideas approximate, the books must have been written at about the same time. There are here two assertions: first, that the ideas approximate, and second, that this approximation shows that the two works must have been composed at about the same time.⁴⁰

The first of these assertions will have credence only with those who have not read the first section of Enoch; for both in the subjects treated and in the manner of their treatment, the two works differ materially. The First Part of Enoch is concerned with the fall and punishment of the angels who kept not their first estate, but took wives from the daughters of men. It is a kind of commentary, or sermon, on the first part of the sixth chapter of Genesis, and gives numerous details about the fallen sons of God. It tells the number of the angels and the names of the leaders and describes the unpardonable nature of their sin and the kind and place of their judgment. It mentions, also, by name the seven good archangels among whom appear Michael and Gabriel. These two

⁴⁰ See page 340 of this REVIEW for July 1923.

names are the only particular in which this section of Enoch can be said to show any approximate connection with Daniel.

It is probable, however, that Dr. Driver referred to the section of Enoch which is embraced in chapters lxxxiii-xc, which is denominated by Prof. Charles as the Third Section. This section contains two dream-visions, the first on the deluge, and the second on the history of the world from the fall of the angels to the founding of the Messianic kingdom. Chapter xc gives a figurative résumé of the history from Alexander the Great to the coming of the white bull, which may possibly represent the Messiah. In order that our readers may be able to judge for themselves as to the approximation of this chapter to the book of Daniel, I shall cite it, beginning with the preceding context (lxxxix. 68), where it begins to treat of the period following the destruction of Jerusalem.

And the shepherds and their associates delivered over those sheep to all the wild beasts to devour them, and each one of them received in his time a definite number: it was written by the others in a book how many each of them destroyed of them. And each one slew and destroyed many more than was prescribed; and I began to weep and to lament on account of those sheep. And thus in the vision I saw that one who wrote, how he wrote down every one that was destroyed by those shepherds, day by day, and carried up and laid down and showed actually the whole book to the Lord of the sheep—everything that they had done, and all that each one of them had made away with, and all that they had given over to destruction. And the book was read before the Lord of the sheep, and He took the book from his hand and read it and sealed it and laid it down.

And forthwith I saw how the shepherds pastured for twelve hours, and behold, three of those sheep turned back and came and entered and began to build up all that had fallen down of that house; but the wild boars tried to hinder them, but they were not able. And they began again to build as before, and they reared up that tower, and it was named the high tower and they began again to place a table before the tower, but all the bread on it was polluted and not pure. And as touching all this the eyes of those sheep were blinded so that they saw not, and the eyes of their shepherds likewise; and they delivered them in larger numbers to their shepherds for destruction, and they trampled the sheep with their feet and devoured them. And the Lord of the sheep remained unmoved till all the sheep were dis-

persed over the field and mingled with them (*i.e.*, the beasts), and they (*i.e.*, the shepherds) did not save them out of the hands of the beasts. And this one who wrote the book carried it up, and showed it and read it before the Lord of the sheep, and implored him on their account, and besought Him on their account as he showed them all the doings of the shepherds, and gave testimony before Him against all the shepherds. And he took the actual book and laid it down beside Him and departed.

xc. And I saw till that in this manner thirty-five shepherds undertook the pasturing (of the sheep), and they severally completed their periods as did the first; and others received them into their hands, to pasture them for their period, each shepherd in his own period. And after that I saw in my vision all the birds of heaven coming, the eagles, the vultures, the kites, the ravens; but the eagles led all the birds; and they began to devour those sheep, and to pick out their eyes and to devour their flesh. And the sheep cried out because their flesh was being devoured by the birds, and as for me I looked and lamented in my sleep over that shepherd who pastured the sheep. And I saw until those sheep were devoured by the dogs and eagles and kites, and they left neither flesh nor skin nor sinew remaining on them till only their bones stood there: and their bones too fell to the earth and the sheep became few. And I saw until that twenty-three had undertaken the pasturing and completed in their several periods fifty-eight times.

But behold lambs were borne by those white sheep, and they began to open their eyes and to see, and to cry to the sheep. Yea, they cried to them, but they did not hearken to what they said to them, but were exceedingly deaf, and their eyes were exceedingly blind. And I saw in the vision how the ravens fled upon those lambs and took one of those lambs, and dashed the sheep in pieces and devoured them. And I saw till horns grew upon those lambs, and the ravens cast down their horns; and I saw till there sprouted a great horn of one of those sheep, and their eyes were opened. And it looked at them (and their eyes opened), and it cried to the sheep, and the rams saw it and all ran to it. And notwithstanding all this those eagles and vultures and ravens and kites still kept tearing the sheep and swooping down upon them and devouring them: still the sheep remained silent, but the rams lamented and cried out. And those ravens fought and battled with it, and sought to lay low its horn, but they had no power over it.

All the eagles and vultures and ravens and kites were gathered together, and there came with them all the sheep of the field, yea, they all came together, and helped each other to break that horn of the ram. And I saw till a great sword was given the sheep, and the sheep proceeded against all the beasts of the field to slay them, and all the beasts and the birds of the heaven

fled before their face. And I saw that man who wrote that book according to the command of the Lord, till he opened that book concerning the destruction which those twelve last shepherds had wrought, and showed that they had destroyed much more than their predecessors, before the Lord of the sheep. And I saw till the Lord of the sheep came unto them and took in his hand the staff of his wrath, and smote the earth, and the earth clave asunder, and all the beasts and all the birds of the heaven fell from among those sheep, and were swallowed up in the earth and it covered them.⁴¹

And I saw till a throne was erected in the pleasant land, and the Lord of the sheep sat Himself thereon, and the other took the sealed books and opened those books before the Lord of the sheep. And the Lord called those men the seven first white ones, and commanded that they should bring before Him, beginning with the first star which led the way, all the stars whose privy members were like those of horses, and they brought them all before Him. And He said to the man who wrote before Him, being one of those seven white ones, and said unto him: "Take those seventy shepherds to whom I delivered the sheep, and who taking them on their own authority slew more than I commanded them." And, behold, they were all bound, I saw, and they all stood before him. And the judgment was held first over the stars, and they were judged and found guilty, and went to the place of condemnation, and they were cast into an abyss, full of fire and flaming, and full of pillars of fire. And those seventy shepherds were judged and found guilty, and they were cast into that fiery abyss. And I saw at that time how a like abyss was opened in the midst of the earth, full of fire, and they brought those blinded sheep, and they were all judged and found guilty and cast into this fiery abyss, and they burned; now this abyss was to the right of that house. And I saw those sheep burning and their bones burning.⁴²

In this whole passage Professor Charles finds but one verse showing verbal coincidences with Daniel; whereas, he cites five verses using ideas and phrases similar to those found in ten different places in Isaiah, two verses probably referring to three places in Zechariah, two referring to two in Micah, and four verses referring respectively to a passage in Ezekiel, Haggai, Malachi, or Tobit. The verse showing resemblances to Daniel is the twentieth verse in chapter xc. This verse

⁴¹ I have omitted the duplicate verses from 13 to 15 inclusive.

⁴² See *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, vol. ii, 256-260.

speaks of "the pleasant land," of a "throne being erected" upon which "the judge sat," and of "sealed books" that were opened before the judge." Each of these statements is fully paralleled in Daniel; but it does not follow from this, that Daniel and Enoch were composed at about the same time, nor that one of them borrowed from the other. As to the phrase "pleasant land," a closer examination of the original Hebrew seems to show that the English word "pleasant" is the correct translation in Jer. iii. 19, Zech. vii. 14, Ps. cvi. 24; but in Daniel xi. 16, 41, 45, the "glorious land" of the Revised Version is better. Unfortuntaealy, the Hebrew, or Aramaic original of Enoch has utterly disappeared; and not a single fragment of this section is preserved in any version except the Ethiopic. In the Ethiopic, the word rendered by "pleasant" is *charwaz*, derived from a root corresponding to the Hebrew and Arabic *chamad* or *chamada*. In the verses cited above from Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Ps. cvi. a derivative of this verb is rightly rendered by "pleasant" in both Ethiopic and English.^{42a}

Now, it is generally admitted that the Ethiopic version was made from the Greek, though it may afterwards have been revised in parts on the basis of the Hebrew. But, the Greek translators, Theodotion as well as the Seventy give us little light on the meaning of this word as employed in Daniel. In Dan. viii. 9, the Seventy render it north (*βόρραν*) and Theodotion probably by power (*δύναμις*).⁴³

^{42a} The verb *patawa* is commonly used in Ethiopic to render *chamad*, as also *'awah* to desire, or covet. The Ethiopic verb *charwaz* and its derivatives are used to render at least eight different Hebrew words for sweet, or pleasant. The idea of glory, however, is expressed by seven, or more roots, all different from those used to render the idea of pleasant. The distinction between pleasant and glorious is thus closely observed all through the Ethiopic version. Now, it is a singular fact that no one of these fifteen Hebrew roots thus clearly distinguished is the one found in Daniel; but a sixteenth root occurs in the derivative *sebi*.

⁴³ Theodotion renders the last part of the ninth verse by towards the south and towards the power, thus omitting the second direction "towards the east." He has evidently read צבא instead of צב', or else has given the same meaning to the two words; for *dynamis* is the usual rendering

In Dan. xi. 16, 41, and 45, Theodotion transliterates and the Seventy omit except in the forty-fifth verse, where it renders by "wish," having doubtless read *sebu* (צְבוּ) which in Syriac means wish, or will.

The Syriac Peshitto gives us even less light than the Greek versions. In viii. 9, it gives no translation; in xi. 16 and 41, it renders by the phrase "land of Israel"; and in xi. 45, by a form of the verb to be.

Jerome is the only one of the ancient first-hand translators to be consistent and correct in the rendering. In xi. 41, he renders by "gloriosam," and in xi. 16, 45, by "incluta" and "inclutum." In viii. 9, he has probably read *saba* (צָבָא), as Theodotion did, and has rendered by "fortitudinem."

From the evidence just given it appears that the Ethiopic version always distinguishes between the ideas of glorious and pleasant; that the idea of a pleasant land is found in Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Ps. cvi., and may easily have been derived by the author of Enoch from one or another of these places; and that Daniel never speaks of a pleasant land, but always of a glorious one. There is in this phrase, therefore, no evidence that proves that Enoch and Daniel were from the same age, or derived one from the other.

But even if *sebi* meant glory, there would be in this no certain proof that the writer of Enoch derived his idea from Daniel; for Ezekiel uses the same word twice to describe the land of Palestine (xx. 6, 15), once of Moab (xxv. 9), and once of Tyre (xxvi. 20); while Isaiah uses a similar phrase of Babylon (xiii. 19).

As to the second phrase in Enoch xc. 20, saying that "a throne was erected," it is scarcely possible to imagine that any writer of antiquity can have been so ignorant as not to know that gods, kings, and all kinds of judges sat upon thrones when they were hearing cases brought before them. In the Egyptian judgment scenes, Osiris and the other gods

of the former, being employed by the LXX more than one hundred and forty times as the translation of צָבָא.

sit as judges.⁴⁴ Among the Assyrians, the judge was said to have a throne of judgment.⁴⁵ One of the inscriptions of Ashurbanipal⁴⁶ uses the phrase *dinu ishakan*, which is almost identical with the *dina yethib* of Daniel. The third clause of xc. 20, stating that books were opened, is the same as one found in Daniel vii. 10. This does not prove, however, that Daniel derived the idea from Enoch, or Enoch from Daniel. For, that a book of life was kept by the Lord appears already in Ex. xxx. 32, 33 (ascribed by the critics to E), in Is. iv. 3, and Ps. lxxix. 28. In Ps. xxxii. 8 and Mal. iii. 16, these books are called books of remembrance in which good deeds were recorded; and in Is. lxxv. 6, records of evil deeds are said to be written. Among the Egyptians, also, as early as the fourth millenium B.C., Osiris was able to be a just judge, because all the words and deeds of men had been written down carefully by the two scribe-gods, Thoth and Sesheta, and his verdict was according to the evidence written.⁴⁷ Among the Babylonians, we have two documents dictated by Hammurabi in which he tells of cases that had been brought before him which were determined on the evidence of tablets that were examined before him. We know that most of these tablets were covered with an envelope of clay. When wanted to be read in a court, these tablets are said to have been opened.⁴⁸ In Muss-Arnolt (page 850) we find the phrase *sha unqu ipattani* "whosoever opens the seal, or tablet." "Opening a letter" is also a phrase in use. (*id.*) In short, it stands to reason, that tablets which were written, sealed, covered, sealed again, and indorsed, in order to be kept as evidence of certain transactions, would be opened in case of need in order to get at the very evidence on account of which they were written and preserved.

It is noteworthy that the verb *pitu* used in Babylonian for

⁴⁴ See Budge; *Osiris and the Egyptian Resurrection*, vol. i. 318.

⁴⁵ A *kussu daianuti*. See Johns; *Babylonian and Assyrian Laws*, etc., p. 81.

⁴⁶ IV Rawlinson xlviij, 10.

⁴⁷ See Budge; *Osiris* i. 309.

⁴⁸ See King; *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, pp. 23-28.

the opening of tablets, is the same as the verb for the opening of letters found in Dan. vii. 10 and Neh. viii. 5. The word translated "book" in Dan. vii. 10 is the one commonly employed in Hebrew as an equivalent of the various words used for tablets of record in Babylonian for documents of different kinds. Moreover, these books of the Hebrews were sealed "according to law and custom." (Is. xxix. 11, Jer. xxxii. 10), apparently in a way similar to that employed among the Babylonians.⁴⁹

It seems evident, therefore, that from Abraham downwards there were sealed books in the libraries of Babylon that would be opened whenever a case came for adjudication before a judge. It is further evident that the phrases used by Daniel describe accurately what may have been observed every day in the law courts of Babylon, in one of which Daniel himself may have sat as judge. In fact, these phrases afford one of the best undesigned coincidences in favor of the veracity and the Babylonian provenance of Daniel.

Further, an argument for a close connection between Daniel and Enoch might seem to be found in the frequent use in both of the word for horn. Enoch employs it a number of times in xc. 9, 12, 16, 37, and Daniel in the Hebrew of viii. 3, 5, 6, 8, 9, 20, 21, and in the Aramaic of vii. 7, 8, 11, 20, 21, 22. But that there is no real force in this argument may be seen from the fact that horns are mentioned also in Amos vi. 1, Mi. iv. 13, Deut. xxxiii. 7, 1 Sam. ii. 1, 10, 2 Sam. xxi., Jer. xlvi. 25, Ezek. xxix. 21, 34, Lam. ii. 3, 17, Job. xvi. 1, Pss. lxxv. 4, 5, 10, lxxxix. 17, 24, xc. 10, cxxxii. 17, cxlvi. 14. In the symbolic use of the word these passages show that in all ages and kinds of Hebrew literature horn was employed exactly as in Enoch and Daniel.

Nor can the fact that both Daniel and Enoch see animals in their visions prove approximation, imitation, or contemporaneity. For, animals are characteristic of the dreams and visions of Jacob, Pharaoh, and Zechariah.

⁴⁹ See Schorr; *Urkunden des altbabylonischen Zivil- und Prozessrechts*, p. xxxvii.

Nor can the fact that both mention stars prove approximation. For stars are mentioned among other places in the vision of Abraham, Gen. xv. 5, in the dream of Joseph, Gen. xxxvii. 9, and in the prophecy of Balaam, Num. xxiv. 17. Besides, Daniel says that the righteous shall shine like stars; but, Enoch that judgment was held over the stars (xc. 24). Enoch, moreover, employs "star" to denote living beings, but Daniel never.

Nor can the fact that Enoch, like Daniel, is said to have seen in a vision all these things that he records, be interpreted as implying any special approximation to Daniel. For visions had been a common means of the communication of divine thoughts from the time of Abraham onwards. The Egyptians, Assyrians, and Babylonians, also, believed in visions from the earliest times and all through their history.⁵⁰

Again, the visions of Daniel are distinguished from those of Enoch in that they give definite dates, and mention the names of the kings in whose reigns they occurred. In fact, the main objection made to the reality of Daniels visions is that they are too definite and so closely in harmony with what we know from other sources to have happened. It has been argued from this very harmony, that the records of Daniel's visions are historical rather than predictive, and the events narrated in them are actually employed in constructing the history of the period of the successors of Alexander.^{50a}

Contrast with this exactness of description the indefiniteness of Enoch. It gives no dates, mentions no names of kings, and counts the number of the shepherds, or rulers, in verse one as thirty-five, in verse five as fifty-eight, in verse twenty-two as seventy, without giving any clear intimation of whom they mean.⁵¹

The only possible reference to the Messiah found in Enoch is xc. 37, 38, where a white bull is said to have been born

⁵⁰ See Article on *Apocalypses and the Date of Daniel*, P. T. R. XIX, 529 f. ^{50a} *Ibid.*

⁵¹ Professor Charles, indeed, says (p. 257), that this number 35 is found by counting twenty-three kings of Egypt from 330 to 200 B.C. and twelve

which afterwards became a lamb. No angel is mentioned by name in this passage, nor is there any reference to a resurrection. Some interpreters make the "new house" of verse 29 to be the New Jerusalem, but it may, so far as the context indicates, refer to a rebuilding of the temple.

But, even if it could be shown that this ninetieth chapter of Enoch, or any other chapter, or section, approximates in form or content to Daniel, it does not follow that such an approximation would prove that Daniel and Enoch are from the same time. Enoch may be an imitation of Daniel. No one would affirm that the Revelation of St. John is from the same time as Daniel, and yet it resembles Daniel much more closely than Enoch does. Macauley says that he imitated Thucydides. Many a man has attempted to imitate the Latin of Cicero. Robert Louis Stevenson says that he studied to make his style suit the particular subject which he treated. The sonnet which was taken over into English from the Italian of Petrarch was brought to perfection by Shakespeare and Milton. Yet, equal perfection of form and wealth of idea and expression can scarcely be denied to Landor, Wordsworth, and Keats. Do these "approximations" prove that all these poets were from the same age? Such examples convince us that no trustworthy argument as to the time of the composition of a document can be based upon form, or style, or subject alone.

Princeton.

R. D. WILSON.

Seleucid kings from 200 to 130 B.C. If, as he further says on p. 171, this section of Enoch must have been written before the death of Judas Maccabaeus in 161 B.C., it follows that the writer must have been able to predict the exact number of the kings of Syria between 161 and 131 B.C., an exceedingly difficult performance in view of the fact that kings of Syria were rising and falling at that time at the rate of about one every five years. In his endeavor to give to his beloved Enoch the gift of predictive prophecy, Prof. Charles fails to note the inconsistency of denying the same power to Daniel. In fleeing from Daniel's bear he rushes into the jaws of Enoch's lion.