

# The Princeton Theological Review

APRIL, 1923

---

## THE ORIGIN OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

Before entering upon the discussion of the origin of the ideas of Daniel, several fallacies must first be considered.

Thus it is claimed that it is possible to determine the time of a revelation from its ideas in the same manner as we would determine that of a mere human production. But, for those who believe in a thinking God who has made the universe including man it is impossible to deny the possibility of a revelation to His creatures of Himself and of His plans up to the capacity of those creatures to receive such a revelation. How and why He makes such a revelation it may be impossible for the objects of it to determine or to understand: but that He can reveal what He desires to reveal must be admitted.

Further, to all who believe that God has begun to make such a revelation it is clear that no limits as to the time and manner and order and emphasis, extent and subject-matter, of such a revelation can be set by the creatures who receive it. These are matters for the Revealer to determine and not for the persons to whom the revelation is made.

To those who accept these premises (and we take it that all Christians must accept them), all objections against the book of Daniel on the ground of the character of the revelation that it contains may safely be looked upon as beyond the legitimate realm of discussion. Whether God saw fit to reveal these truths in the sixth or in the second century B.C. must be a matter of comparatively little importance. What is of importance for us is, that He has revealed them.

To object to the fact of a certain alleged revelation that it is too detailed, or that it is written in veiled language, or in an unusual rhetorical style, or in a novel literary manner, is

fatuous and unreasonable. At sundry times and in divers manners, God spake unto man through the prophets.

Further, though we admit that there is a development in the fullness and clearness of God's revelation of certain truths to man, there is no reason for contending that no revelation of an entirely new truth should ever be made, nor for attempting to fix the time at which the revelation of the new truth should be made. These points, again, are fixed by the Revealer.

It is to be observed further that the laws of the evolution of ideas which may be justly applied to a purely human production do not necessarily apply to a document which is said to be, or contain, a revelation from God. This may be observed in the case of the idea of a Messiah. In the sense in which this idea is put forth in the Scriptures it is unique and can be, if it be true, naught but a matter of revelation as over against a result of mere human longing and development. Most of what any prophet did, or could, say with regard to such a person would be necessarily dependent upon what God pleased to reveal to him. The time and place at which the lineaments of character and work should be made known to man would be subject to the divine will and pleasure. What Isaiah, Micah, Zechariah, or any prophet said with regard to him, or what any prophet might have said, is not for us to judge, nor for any man to judge.

Sometimes, it is true, it may be possible to determine the date of a document by the ideas that are found to be expressed in it for the first time, especially where we have a vast mass of literature revealing a natural intellectual development for a long period of time, or where the idea has been declared by the author or acknowledged by contemporaries or successors to have originated with him. But where these ideas are religious or philosophical, and above all where they are contained in what claims to be a revelation from God, the time when the ideas are first stated or promulgated depends on the mind of the Thinker and the will of the Revealer rather than upon the general condition of mankind.

This general condition may indeed suggest the thought of the Thinker and may occasion the form of the revelation; but it can not be said to have originated it. For example, there were many times before that of the Maccabees, when the Israelites had been grievously oppressed by foreign foes—by Egyptians, Philistines, Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, and Greeks—and when Israel's heroes had performed deeds of valor in their own defence. It would seem absurd to attempt to determine the date of a psalm or prophecy from a general reference to persecution or destitution or from words of comfort contained in it. It would seem equally absurd to attempt to fix the date of a literary production from the fact that it contains words, or references, which would suit many known or unknown eventualities; as, for example, when a distinguished scholar attempts to place the composition of parts of Nahum in the time of the Maccabees, because in chapter ii. 2 the prophet speaks of him who dashes in pieces (מפיץ). This word might just as well indicate the time of Deborah because she speaks of Jael as having "taken a hammer" and "smote" (תקע and המקבת) the head of Sisera.

Another absurdity is to assert that the fact that a book alleged to have been written by a certain author is not quoted or used by a later author proves either that the apparently earlier one did not exist, or that his work was unknown to the later writer. Take in illustration of this the book of Esther. Here we find no mention of God, nor of the prophets, nor even of the Law. Nor does the writer quote from any of the Psalms, nor from any of the historical books. Does this silence on his part disprove his knowledge of any of these books, or at least that they did not exist? Everyone will say, Certainly not! How then has the failure of the post-captivity authors to mention Daniel, or to cite from him, or to refer to the ideas which he first promulgated, proven that Daniel did not exist at the time when Esther was written?

It is equally absurd to suppose that it is always possible to determine from a comparison of similar, or the same words, phrases, or ideas, occurring in two writings which of them

has borrowed from the other. For in most cases it is obvious that both may have had before them the same original from which they have both cited, or that they may both unconsciously have happened to use the same words or to express the same thought in the same or in like language. Thus the verses in Mic. iv. 1-4 are the same as ii. 2-5 of Isaiah. Does this show that Isaiah borrowed from Micah or that Micah borrowed from Isaiah or that both derived from a common original? Again, Deut. xiv. is almost the same as Lev. xi. Does this show that Deuteronomy is later than P or that P is later than Deuteronomy, or may the same writer have expressed the same thought at different times in slightly different phraseology? The accounts of the Sermon on the Mount as given by Matthew and Luke differ in many particulars from one another. Did one of them derive the discourse from the other, or did they both derive it from the same source, or from different accounts given by hearers of the original discourse?

A multitude of such questions confronts us in the literary study of almost every book of the Bible and of the apocryphal and apocalyptic literature; and as we might expect, we find a number of them awaiting us when we enter upon the literary discussions centering around the book of Daniel. From a comparison of the prayer in Daniel ix. with that in Neh. ix., it has been attempted to prove that Daniel is later than Nehemiah or *vice versa*. In the opinion of the present writer such attempts taken by themselves are almost sure to be in all cases devoid of convincing results; especially when as in this instance, the similar phrases may have been derived from a common source found in the literature of the Jews written long before the time either of Nehemiah or of Daniel, or, where not thus found, may well have been the natural and appropriate language of prayer when made by men situated in like circumstances, reared in the same traditions, experiencing the same needs, and desiring help from the same God. Numerous prayers of the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian kings have in them many words and phrases that are

the same and many more that are similar; but it would be impossible in most cases to determine from these words and phrases the relative dates of the prayers. There are certain phrases that for centuries were the same, that had been stereotyped, so to speak, and that consequently can determine nothing definite as to the date of the document in which they occur.

Lastly, it is ridiculous for a Christian to be always running to heathen sources for the origin of the religious ideas which are contained in the Scriptures, and especially for their confirmation. If Daniel speaking of himself says that there will be a resurrection of those who sleep in the dust, then, it may be an interesting question as to whether he is the first human being that ever put this thought in writing. It would, however, be merely his opinion and no better than any other man's; unless this other could prove by experiment, or scientific proof, that a resurrection will certainly take place. But if Daniel, speaking by revelation from God, says there will be a resurrection, this statement is no longer a man's opinion merely, but the truth of God to which all men must attend.

#### OBJECTIONS OF THE CRITICS

According to Driver: ". . . it is undeniable that the doctrines of the Messiah, of angels, of the resurrection and of a judgment on the world, are taught with greater distinctness, and in a more developed form [in Daniel] than elsewhere in the Old Testament, and with features approximating to (though not identical with) those met with in the earlier part of the Book of Enoch, c. 100 B.C."<sup>1</sup>

Cornell says: "At the present time the view which sees in Daniel a work of the Maccabean period is the all-prevailing one." Among the "objective reasons of the utmost weight, which render the view of its non-genuineness necessary" is the presence in it of "a developed angelology" and of

---

<sup>1</sup> LOT, p. 508.

a "two-fold individual resurrection of the dead to bliss and to damnation."<sup>2</sup>

Prince tells us: "It is now very generally admitted that this doctrine [of the resurrection] originated among the Persians and could only have become engrafted on the Jewish mind after a long period of intercourse with the Zoroastrian religion." "The investigations of Persian scholars, especially of Haug, Spiegel, and Windischmann, show that this is a real Zoroastrian doctrine." "It is clearly impossible, therefore, that the author of passages showing such interpretation could have lived as early as the time of Nebuchadnezzar." The angelology of Daniel, there can be little doubt, "is an indication of prolonged Persian influence."<sup>3</sup>

#### ASSUMPTIONS

I. It is assumed in the above statements that the doctrine of Daniel on the resurrection is shown by comparison with other biblical documents to be too highly developed for the sixth century B.C., and especially that the doctrines of the resurrection and of angels as stated in Daniel originated among the Persians, that they were derived by the Jews from the Zoroastrians, and that, hence, they could not have been known to a Jewish author living as early as the time of Nebuchadnezzar.

II. It is assumed that the features of these doctrines as found in Daniel approximate those met with in parts of Enoch to such an extent as to justify the conclusion that the book of Daniel and these parts of Enoch are from the same time.

#### ANSWERS TO OBJECTIONS

Taking up these assumptions in order we shall endeavor to show that all of the four doctrines mentioned by Dr. Driver as indications of the late date of Daniel may have been treated of in the sixth century B.C. as well as in the

<sup>2</sup> *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament*, pp. 384-386.

<sup>3</sup> *Commentary on Daniel*, p. 21.

second. To one who believes that the Bible contains a revelation or a series of revelations from God to man, the question of the origin of the ideas peculiar to any individual writer of the Old Testament is interesting principally from the standpoint of the Biblical theologian who desires to trace the manner and order of those revelations, or of the historian who would give us an account of the gradual preparation of the world for the coming of Christ. A study of the history of Israel seems to teach that an acknowledgment of a need of light from above upon some question insoluble by unaided human intellect, or the expression of a desire for such light, has usually preceded in point of time the revelation which supplies the light needed and meets the want expressed. Hence, such questions as those that concern the origin of the ideas of angels, resurrection, judgment and a Messiah are proper for us to consider even apart from the fact of whether God has seen fit to give us any light upon this subject and when and how He has given this light. That man has recognized that he is a sinner against God, and has need of redemption is one thing; that God has supplied a redemption to meet the need is another thing. That man is mortal and desires immortality is one thing; that God should declare that he is, or may become, immortal is another thing. So also, that men should think that there are angels and hope or fear that there may be a resurrection, or judgment and a Messiah, is one thing; whereas the questions of whether God has said that angels do exist, and as to whether there will be a resurrection and a judgment and a Messiah are an entirely different thing.

Recognizing, then, these distinctions, it will be understood that in the following pages we are not going to consider whether God could have made revelations with regard to angels, resurrection, judgment and the Messianic kingdom as early as the sixth century B. C.; but merely whether we have any evidence that men had thought about these questions as early as that time and as to what they had thought about them. If we can show that they had already thought about

these things, then the statements of Daniel might be looked upon as the answers which God gave to their natural queries upon these matters for which the human mind could find no solution. If we find that they did not express any thoughts upon these subjects, we may still suppose that they had thought upon them or that possibly there first arose in the great mind of Daniel or Isaiah the questions concerning these important matters affecting the future of humanity to which God saw fit to vouchsafe the answers. In no case will it be necessary to suppose that such questions must have arisen or that the unaided human intellect could have found an answer to such questions more readily in the second century B.C. than in the sixth. Nor, in any case, can it be thought for a moment, that God knew the answers to such questions better in the second than in the sixth century B.C.

#### I. THE ANTIQUITY OF THE IDEAS OF DANIEL

I. First, then, let us consider where and when the idea of a Resurrection is first met.

*a.* According to Prof. Breasted<sup>4</sup> the early Egyptians (about 4000 B.C.) believed in a life hereafter, subject to wants of the same nature as those of the present life. The most obvious explanation of the origin of embalming is that it was expected that the soul which had departed would after a time return again to its former body.<sup>5</sup>

*b.* Among the Babylonians the phrase "giver of life to the dead" (*muballit mituti.*) which is found frequently of Marduk "who loves to make the dead alive" and of others of the gods, certainly shows at least that the Babylonians had a conception of revivification of the dead. The argument seems to be, "Oh Marduk, who can raise the dead to life, restore this sick person to health once more." The sentence in King's *Babylonian Magic* (No. ii. 21) expresses the idea more clearly; for it says: "The body of the man who has been brought

<sup>4</sup> *A History of the Ancient Egyptians*, p. 36.

<sup>5</sup> That the ancient Egyptians of the pyramid dynasties believed in the resurrection of the body is demonstrated from numerous texts by Prof. Erman of Berlin in his *Handbook of Egyptian Religion*, pp. 85-114.



down to Arallu (their place of the dead), thou dost (or canst) bring back" (*ša ana aralli šurudu paġaršu tutira*). These texts show that the Assyrians and Babylonians in the times of Ashurbanipal and Nebuchadnezzar had at least the idea of and the longing for, a restoration or continuation, of life after death and a belief that the gods could, if they would, give life unto the dead and bring back their bodies from the place of the dead.

c. Among the old Iranians the doctrine of the resurrection of the body seems to be clearly taught in the nineteenth, or Zamyâd, Yasht.<sup>6</sup> The three passages in the Yashts are almost exactly the same. In the first, it is said that the creatures of Ahura-Mazda, in the second, that the Amesha-Spentas, in the third, that the victorious Saosyant and his helpers, "shall restore the world, which will (thenceforth) never grow old and never die, never decaying and never rotting, ever living and ever increasing, and master of its wish, when *the dead will rise*, when life and immortality will come, and the world will be restored at its wish," etc.

In the fragment translated by Mills we read, "Let the dead arise unhindered by these foes [*i.e.*, Angra Manyu and the Dævas] and let bodily life be sustained in these lifeless bodies."

This evidence shows us that the Avesta manuscripts teach clearly a resurrection of the dead. The oldest of these manuscripts, however, is dated in the year 1323 A.D.<sup>7</sup> Besides, as expert a critic as de Harlez maintains that this resurrection is spiritual and that the Pahlavi theology first introduced the notion of a *resurrectio carnis*.

After having read the testimony of such experts as Windischmann, Spiegel, Haug, West, Moulton, Jackson, Mills, Geldner, Darmesteter, de Harlez, and Soderblom, and also

<sup>6</sup> §§ 11, 12; 19, 20; 89, 90. See the *Zend-Avesta* in the *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. XXIII, translated by J. Darmesteter, and a fragment translated by L. H. Mills in the *Zend-Avesta*, part 3 in the *Sacred Books of the East*, vol. XXXI, p. 390.

<sup>7</sup> Haug in West's edition of the *Language, Writings and Religion of the Parsis* in the chapter on the "Extant Pahlavi Literature," pp. 93-115.

the testimony of the Greek and other sources of information as to the religion of the ancient Persians,<sup>8</sup> one is driven to accept the opinion that the doctrine of the resurrection spoken of in these passages refers to a literal resurrection of the body and that the sixth Yasht at least was most probably written before the time of Alexander the Great. Professor Moulton suggests that the doctrine itself was probably much older than these records, or even than the time of Zoroaster.<sup>9</sup> While accepting this suggestion, it is fair to say that by analogy it is also probable that the doctrine of the resurrection as propounded by Isaiah, Job, and Daniel, is much older than any one of these books.

Since the latest authorities on the Avesta<sup>10</sup> do not place Yasht xix among the Gathas, it may be well to quote part of what Prof. Moulton says on the *Saosyant*.<sup>11</sup> "The 'Consummation' of the Gathas involves a 'Renovation of the World,' a divine event towards which the whole creation is moving. It is accomplished by the present labours of 'those that will deliver,' the *saosyants*. In the Gathas these are simply Zarathushtra himself and his fellow-workers."<sup>12</sup> *Saosyant* comes from a root *sav* meaning "to benefit."<sup>13</sup> A Persian word corresponding to the Messiah (the anointed) of Daniel is not found in the Avesta, nor is "the Benefactor" called a prince or a prince of princes.

d. In the Old Testament outside of Daniel, a resurrection is referred to:

(1) In Isa. xxvi. 19, which reads: "Thy dead shall live, with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in dust; for thy dew is as the dew in the herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead."

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 3-54.

<sup>9</sup> *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 260.

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, 343 f.

<sup>11</sup> *Ibid.*, 158 f.

<sup>12</sup> Thus in *Yasna* 49.9 the helper (*saosyant*) who was created to bring deliverance is said by Moulton to have been Jamaspa the son-in-law of Vishtaspa.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 145.

(2) Ezek. xxxvii, the idea of a resurrection of the dead is clearly expressed in the vision of the dry bones.

(3) Isa. liii. 10 it is said that when the Lord shall have made the soul of his servant an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days and the pleasure of the Lord shall prosper in his hands.

(4) Job xvi. 13 ff. and xix. 25 the author "rises to the thought and throws out the wish that there may be release from sheol, and later on is assured that his redeemer (*gō'ēl*) lived, and that his flesh will see God. All this implies literal death, and then restoration of life after death, *i.e.*, resurrection in the proper sense of the word."

(5) Finally, the actual raisings to life by Elijah and Elisha recorded in 1 Kings xvii. and 2 Kings iv. express a belief in the possibility, and in these cases in the fact, of a revivification of the dead.<sup>14</sup> The assumptions of Enoch and Elijah show that the Hebrews believed in a future life in a physical body, and the raising of Samuel that some at least thought that there was a life after death and that there could be a resumption of the well known physical body.

2. As to the origin of the idea of a Judgment-to-come, we find that it also was prevalent among the Egyptians and Babylonians as well as among the Persians.

*a.* The Egyptians taught that there would be an "ethical test at the close of life, making life hereafter depend upon the character of the life lived on earth."<sup>15</sup> Erman cites the *Pyramid Texts* as follows: "Around thee stand the gods and call to thee 'rise, stand up' and thou awakest."<sup>15a</sup> This reminds us of Daniel. And, "Thou eatest the food of the gods. He (Re) places thee as the morning star in the midst of the field of Eavv."<sup>16</sup> "Those that failed to pass the judgment must

<sup>14</sup> For any further information as to the O.T. teaching on this subject, see the article by E. R. Bernard in *Hastings' Dictionary*.

<sup>15</sup> Breasted, *History of Egypt*, p. 67 and Budge, *The Book of the Dead I*, xciii-cix.

<sup>15a</sup> *Op. cit. supra*.

<sup>16</sup> See also Naville, *The Old Egyptian Faith*, p. 193-207.

lie hungry and thirsty in their graves and can not behold the sun."<sup>17</sup>

b. According to the Avesta,<sup>18</sup> Ahura Mazda will conduct a judgment after death in which he will be assisted by Zoroaster as advocate for the good.<sup>19</sup>

c. The Babylonians, also, believed in some kind of a judgment after death involving a separation and a determination of death or life to the departed.<sup>20</sup>

d. In the books of the Bible written before 550 B.C., we find frequent references to a judgment.<sup>21</sup>

### 3. Regarding the Angelology:

a. There is no proof that the Hebrews derived their ideas concerning angels from the Persians. The earliest portions of the Avesta, as we have it, were collected and edited in the time of the Sassanians (226 A.D.-637 A.D.). Parts of the collection, called the Gathas, most probably date back to about the year 600 B.C., or possibly even earlier. The word Amashaspand which is said to be equivalent to archangel does not occur in the Gathas, nor indeed in any of the earliest texts.<sup>22</sup> *Vohu Manu* "Good Thought" and other terms which came to be used in later Mazdaism to denote the beings or ideas called Amashaspands are never used in the Gathas to denote persons, though at times they are personified, like the Hebrew wisdom in Proverbs. In the memoric stanza (*Yasna*, 47. 1) the names of all the future Amashaspands are found. The stanza as translated by Moulton<sup>23</sup> reads as follows: "By his Holy Spirit and by Best Thought, and Word, in accordance with Right, Mazda Ahura with Dominion and Piety shall give us Welfare and Immortality." It is absurd to suppose

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 105.

<sup>18</sup> Gatha, *Yasna* 46.

<sup>19</sup> *Early Zoroastrianism*, pp. 166, 374 f. See Tisdall, *Christianity and Other Faiths*, p. 133.

<sup>20</sup> See Zimmern, K A T, p. 637.

<sup>21</sup> See especially Isaiah, chapter two.

<sup>22</sup> It occurs first in the Haptanghaite. See Mills in *Sacred Books of the East*, xxxi. 281; Moulton, in *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 121.

<sup>23</sup> *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 376.

that Daniel's ideas of angels were derived from such abstractions or personifications as the Best Thought, Right, Dominion, Piety, Welfare, and Immortality of this passage. The verse sounds like, "I, Wisdom dwell with Prudence" of Proverbs. In Daniel, Michael, Gabriel, and all the angels are real persons, the messengers of God and mediators between God and man, whereas in the Gathas Prof. Mills says that he can recall no passage in which the so-called angels "are not felt to mean exactly what they signify as words," *i.e.*, Right, Piety, etc.<sup>24</sup>

The *Yashts*, the next oldest portions of the Avesta, (except the small prose portion called *Haptanghaite*) seem to have been composed in their original form about 400 B.C.,<sup>25</sup> or as Mills says, "in the third or fourth century before Christ." Here the attributes of God such as Right, Might, etc., have not merely been personified but are treated as objects of worship, just like the gods Ahura Mazda, Mithra, and Anahita. The only example of any one's being sent is in *Yasht* V. 8. 5, where Ahura Mazda orders Anahita to come down from the stars to earth. Anahita was a god and not an Amashaspand. Zeus in Homer also sends his messengers and in the Babylonian Nabu is called the messenger of Bel. A word for messenger, or angel, never occurs in the Gathas or *Yashts*. Except for the compound word Ahura Mazda, no name compounded with the name for god and hence corresponding to Gabri-El and Micha-El, is found in the early Parsi literature. Daniel's angels are not numbered, nor worshipped, like the Amashaspands of the *Yashts*, *Yasnas*, and other literature of the Parsis. The general charge made by Prof. Prince of the dependence of Daniel's ideas on those of the Persians is so devoid of all direct evidence and even of probable inference, that one is filled with amazement that he could have made it. In support of this amazement,

<sup>24</sup> *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. XXXI, p. xxiv.

<sup>25</sup> *Early Zoroastrianism*, p. 78.

appeal is made to the works of Professors Moulton,<sup>26</sup> and Darmesteter.<sup>27</sup>

b. The Assyrio-Babylonians believed in messengers of the gods and in good and evil spirits. Many of these had names. A man had his guardian angel, dwelling within him or going beside him. In a letter from the time of Hammurabi we find the phrase: "Thy guardian god hold thy head for good." A letter to the mother of Esarhaddon says: "A messenger of grace from Bel and Nebo goes at the side of the king." Nabopolassar says: Marduk "caused a good demon (*šedu damku*) to go at my side; in all that I do he causes my work to prosper." Further, the assembly of the Igigi and Anunnaki was a great council in which the destiny of the earth and of men was determined, as in the host of heaven in the vision of Micah recorded in 1 Ki. xxii. 19 and in the sons of God of Ps. xxix. 1 and elsewhere, and in the council of the holy ones of Ps. liii. 6-8. The evil spirits among the Babylonians have distinctive class names such as *ekimmu*, *šedu* and *lilitu*. Judging from the magical texts, the number of these spirits is incalculable. In the Creation Story (III, 67-71) Gaga is the messenger of his father Ansar; in the story of Nergal and Eriškigal a messenger (*mar šipri*) is sent by the gods to Eriškigal (I. 3). On the Reverse I. 5f the messenger of the gods (Nergal) is accompanied by fourteen others whose names are given. In Ishtar's *Descent to Hell*, Namtar is called the messenger (*sukallu*) of Eriškigal. See other examples in the story of Adapa.<sup>28</sup>

c. With regard to angels, *Daniel* gives the following information:

(1) The ordinary word for angel ( מַלְאָכִים ) occurs only in iii. 28 and vi. 23, both in the Aramaic part.<sup>29</sup> In the former

<sup>26</sup> *Early Zoroastrianism*, especially the translation of the Gathas, pages 343-390.

<sup>27</sup> *The Zend-Avesta*, Part II, in the *Sacred Books of the East*, Vol. xxiii.

<sup>28</sup> K A T. VI. i.

<sup>29</sup> The root of this word does not occur in Hebrew or Aramaic, or Assyrian. It is common in Ethiopic in the sense "to send." It appears to have been used in Arabic also.

passage it is used by Nebuchadnezzar; in the latter, by Daniel.

(2) In the dream of Nebuchadnezzar recorded in chapter iv, he says that he saw "a watchful one and a holy" (vss. 13, 23) coming down from heaven.<sup>30</sup> This messenger from heaven speaks of the decree of the watchful ones and the word of the holy ones" (vs. 17).

(3) In vii. 10, speaking of the judgment by the Ancient of Days, Daniel says that he beheld "a thousand thousand ministering unto him and ten thousand times ten thousand standing before him." Whether these multitudes are angels or men, or angels and men, is not certain. Since, according to verses 1, 2 it was in a dream-vision by night that Daniel saw this judgment scene of the Most High, it may be looked upon as an enlargement of what he was accustomed to see at the court of Nebuchadnezzar, the greatest of earthly potentates. Or he may have been attempting to enumerate "all the host of heaven" of which Micaiah speaks in the vision of Jehovah's judgment recorded in 1 Kings xxii. 19, which even the critics would scarcely put later than the sixth century B.C., and which the writer of Kings places in the ninth.

(4) An angel named Gabriel is commissioned to explain a vision to Daniel while the latter is in a deep sleep (viii. 16, 18). This same angel in the form of a man explains another vision in ix. 21, 22f.

(5) A man clothed in fine linen and certain other nameless angels are mentioned here and there, *e.g.*, x. 5, xii. 6. So, also the saint (קדוש) of viii. 13.

<sup>30</sup> עיר is commonly derived from the verb עור "to be awake," found in Syriac also in this sense. Some would connect it with the Hebrew ציר messenger, thus making it a synonym of מלאך, the usual word in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic for messenger, or angel. Thus in Obad. 1, "a messenger has been sent among the nations," (cf. Jer. xlix. 14). In Isa. xviii. 1, 2, "Ethiopia that sendeth צירים by the sea . . . Go ye swift מלאכים" etc. and in Prov. xiii. 17, the two words are in the parallel sentences. (Compare also Isa. lvii. 9 and Rev. xxv. 13). Philologically, it would be equally possible to connect עיר with the Babylonian *širu* "exalted." Since Nebuchadnezzar is the one using this word, it would be entirely in harmony with Babylonian usage for him to speak of the person seen in his vision as "an exalted and illustrious one," *i.e.*, *širu u kuddušu*.

(6) Michael, "one of the chief princes" is said to have come to help Daniel (x. 13). He is called Michael your (*i.e.* Israel's) prince (x. 21) and "the great prince which standeth for the children of your people" (xii. 1), and it is said that he shall stand up at the time of the end.

*d.* Of the Old Testament as a whole it may be said that the idea of angels pervades the literature from the oldest to the latest. Of evil angels Satan is mentioned as the name of one in Zech. iii. 1, Job i. 6, and 1 Chr. xxi. 1; Lilith is found in Isa. xxxiv. 14 and Shed in Deut. xxxii. 17 and Ps. cvi. 37. Of the good angels Gabriel and Michael alone are mentioned by name and that in Daniel only.<sup>31</sup>

It seems evident from the above facts that the ideas of Daniel about angels can be accounted for *on their human side* by the preceding literature of the Old Testament reinforced by the Babylonian without recourse being had to Persian analogies.

4. With regard to the idea of a Messiah,

*a.* It seems certain that no Egyptian or Babylonian text has as yet revealed any hope or belief that any one of the gods was going to intervene in the affairs of men for their redemption from sin and suffering and death. The only ancient records,—from any nation at least that came into contact with the Jews—which give any such idea are those of the Zoroastrians. It is said in *Yasht* xix §§ 88, 89 that the prophet Saosyant the Victorious and his assistant will make a new world and that at his will the dead will rise again and immortal life will come.<sup>32</sup>

*b.* The Old Testament, however, is full of the idea of redemption from sin and its consequences. Daniel and Psalm ii. are the only parts in which the agent in this redemption is called Messiah and Daniel the only one in which he is called the Prince; but the idea of a redeemer from sin and of God's

<sup>31</sup> These angels are mentioned by name in the New Testament also, Michael in Jude 9 and again in Rev. xii. 7, and Gabriel in Luke i. 26. See Article "Angel" in Hastings' *Dictionary* by A. B. Davidson and the chapter on "Angels and Demons" in *The Religion of Israel* by Barton.

<sup>32</sup> Tisdall p. 110. See above under "Resurrection" (p. 169).



appearing at the end of the world for judgment and to establish a kingdom is found all through the Old Testament.

## II. DANIEL AND ENOCH

The assumption is groundless, that Daniel and the earlier part of Enoch approximate so closely in their treatment of the four subjects under discussion as to make certain the conclusion that they are from the same time. This will appear from a comparison of the teachings of Daniel on angels, resurrection, judgment, and the Messiah with what we find in other Old Testament works, in Enoch and in the other works of the second and first centuries B.C. and in the New Testament and other works of the first century A.D. In making these comparisons we shall follow the divisions and dates of the book of Enoch as given by Prof. R. H. Charles.<sup>33</sup> We shall give the teachings on these four subjects of (a) Daniel, (b) the rest of the Old Testament, (c) Enoch and other extra-canonical works of the second and first centuries B.C., and (d) the New Testament and other works of the first century A.D.

### 1. As to the Resurrection.

*a. Daniel* refers to the resurrection but once, that is, in xii. 2: "And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt."

*b. Of the rest of the Old Testament*, the fifty-seven psalms which Reuss, Cheyne, or other critics assign to the second century B.C., do not once mention a resurrection, nor does Ecclesiastes, nor the Song, nor any other portion of Scripture which is placed in this period by the critics. The references to the resurrection have been discussed above (p. 170 f.).

*c. The Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) Of the four parts of the Book of Enoch thought to have been written in the second century B.C.:

(a) The *Book of Noah*, containing all or parts of sixteen chapters, says nothing about a resurrection.

(b) The only reference to a resurrection in the First Sec-

<sup>33</sup> In the *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* II. 170.

tion of *Enoch* is in the passage (xxv), where it is said that the fruit of a fragrant tree shall after the great judgment be given to the righteous and holy elect and they shall live a long life on earth.

(c) The Second Section of *Enoch* (lxxxiii-xc) contains only a "veiled reference to the resurrection." In xc. 33, it is said that all that had been destroyed and dispersed assembled in the Lord's house, and that the Lord rejoiced because they were all good.

(d) The Third Section of *Enoch* (lxxii-lxxxii) does not mention a resurrection.

(2) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* (written, according to Charles, between 137 and 107 B.C.) speaks of the resurrection oftener than any other pre-Christian book. Thus in Benjamin x. 6-8, we read: "Ye shall see Enoch, Noah, and Shem, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, rising on the right hand in 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." In Simeon x. 2, the patriarch says: "Then shall I arise." In Zebulun x. 2, he says: "Then shall I arise again in the world." In Judah xxv. 1, 4 we read: "And after these things, shall Abraham and Isaac and Jacob arise unto life" and "those who have died in grief shall arise in joy and they who are put to death for the Lord's sake shall arise."

(3) The *Book of Jubilees* has given up all hope of a resurrection. According to Charles this book was written between 153 and 105 B.C.

(4) The parts of the *Sibylline Oracles* supposed to have been written in the second century B.C., do not mention a resurrection.

(5) The so-called *Addenda to the Book of Esther*, the *Book of Baruch*, the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, the *Story of Zerubabel*, the *Additions to the Book of Daniel*, *Tobit*, *Judith* and *1 Maccabees* make no reference to a resurrection.

(6) The *Wisdom of Solomon* may make a negative reference to it in ii. 1, where it represents the ungodly as reason-

ing within themselves but not rightly: "Our life is short and tedious, and in the death of a man there is no remedy; neither was there any man known to have returned from the grave."

(7) *Ecclesiasticus* makes no reference to a general resurrection.

(8) *Second Maccabees* shows a highly developed view of a resurrection. Thus in vii. 9 the second of the seven brethren who were slain by Antiochus for not eating swine's flesh says at his last gasp: "The king of the world shall raise us up, who have died for his laws, unto everlasting life." In verse 14, the third brother says: "It is good, being put to death by men, to look for help from God to be raised up again by him; as for thee [meaning king Antiochus], thou shalt have no resurrection to life." In vs. 23, the mother exhorts her last child saying: "Doubtless the Creator of the world will give you breath and life again." In xii. 43-45 Judas is said to have been mindful of the resurrection, "for if he had not hoped that they that were slain should have risen again, it had been superfluous and vain to pray for the dead." And also, "he perceived that there was great favor laid up for those that did godly." Lastly, in xiv. 46 Razis "plucked out his bowels, calling upon the Lord of life and spirit to restore them to him again."

(9) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* says merely that "the righteous sleep a long sleep and have nought to fear" (c. 5.).

(10) The Sixth Section of *Enoch* says in li. 1 that "the earth shall give back that which has been entrusted to it"; and in lxi. 5 that the righteous and the elect "shall return and stay themselves on the day of the Elect One."

(11) The Third and Fourth Books of *Maccabees*, the Fourth Section of *Enoch*, and the *Psalms of Solomon*, do not mention the resurrection.

d. The Literature from the First Century A.D.

(1) At least seventeen of the *New Testament* books speak of a resurrection. Two of them, 1 Cor. xv. and Rev. xx., enlarge upon the nature of it.

(2) The *Testimony of Hezekiah* (iii. 18) speaks of the resurrection of the beloved.

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions the resurrection of the righteous, ix. 17.

(4) The *Salathiel Section of Fourth Ezra* (v. 37, 45), written about 100 A.D., implies a resurrection.

(5) The *Zadokite Fragments* (written about 40 A.D.), the *Ezra Apocalypse*, the *Son of Man Vision*, the *Ezra Piece*, the *Eagle Vision*, the *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, the *Assumption of Moses* and apparently *Fourth Maccabees* do not refer to a resurrection.

2. As to the Judgment.

a. *Daniel* speaks of a judgment only in vii. 10, 22, 26. In verse 10 we read: "The judgment was set and the books were opened"; in vs. 22, "The Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High," and in vs. 26, "the judgment shall sit, etc."

b. The only references to a judgment in the other parts of the *Old Testament* are:

(1) Isa. xlii. 1-4 where it is said that Jehovah's servant "shall bring forth judgment to the gentiles," "shall bring forth judgment unto truth," and "shall set judgment on the earth."

(2) Ps. x. 7, 8 where we read that Jehovah "hath prepared his throne for judgment and he shall judge the world in righteousness, he shall minister judgment to the people in uprightness."

(3) Ps. i. 5, "the wicked shall not stand in the judgment."

(4) Joel iii. 9-17, Ps. lxxvi. 9, lxxviii. 13, speak of a judgment on the nations.

(5) Of the fifty-seven psalms assigned by one or another critic to the second century B.C., only Ps. lxxvi. 10 refers to a judgment.

(6) Ecclesiastes (iii. 17) refers to it in the words, "I had said in my heart that God will judge the righteous and the wicked; and in xii. 14, that he will bring every work into judgment and every secret thing whether it be good or

whether it be evil. In iii. 20 he says that men shall return to dust and in xii. 7 that the dust shall return to the earth as it was and the spirit to God who gave it.

c. The *Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) In the *Book of Noah* (x. 6) we read of "the day of the great judgment" when Azazel "shall be cast into the fire"; and in x. 11, 12 that Semjaza and his associate angels are to be bound fast till the day of their judgment, the judgment that is for ever and ever.

(2) In the First Section of *Enoch* (xvi. 1) it is said that the giants shall destroy until the day of the consummation, the great judgment over the Watchers and the godless; in xxv. 4, that no mortal is permitted to touch the fragrant tree of life until the great judgment, when the Holy Great One, the Lord of Glory, the Eternal King shall sit on his throne and take vengeance on all and bring everything to its consummation for ever; and in xxvii. 2, there is mention of an accursed valley which shall be the place of judgment (or habitation).

(3) In Section Two of *Enoch* (xc. 20-27) we are told that "a throne was erected in the pleasant land and the Lord of the sheep sat himself thereon and one took all the sealed books and opened those books before the Lord of the sheep." "And the judgment was held first over the stars and they were judged and found guilty and likewise the seventy shepherds to whom the sheep had been delivered were judged and found guilty and last of all the blinded sheep were judged and found guilty and all were cast into a fiery abyss and burned."

(4) The Third Section of *Enoch* does not mention the judgment.

(5) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* mention the judgment three times. Benjamin x. 8, 9 reads: "For the Lord judges Israel first for the unrighteousness which they have committed and then so shall he judge all the gentiles"; and Levi. iii, 3 says that "in the second (or third?) heaven are the hosts of the armies which are ordained for the day of judgment," and in iv. 1 it is said that "the Lord shall execute judgment upon the sons of men."

(6) The *Book of Jubilees* (xxiii. 11) speaks of "the day of the great judgment"; and apparently it is on this day that the righteous "shall see all their judgments and all their curses on their enemies," xxiii. 30.

(7) The *Sibylline Books* (iii. 56) speak of "the judgment of the great king, the deathless God."

(8) The *Addenda to Esther*, the *Book of Baruch*, the *Epistle of Jeremiah*, the *Story of Zerubbabel*, the *Additions to the Book of Daniel*, *Tobit* and *1 Maccabees* do not refer to the judgment.

(9) *Judith* (xvi. 17) says: "Woe to the nations that rise up against my kindred! The Lord Almighty will take vengeance of them in the day of judgment."

(10) The *Wisdom of Solomon* (iv. 8) says that the souls of the righteous "shall judge the nations."

(11) *Second Maccabees* (vii. 35, 36) mentions a judgment, but it is doubtful whether the passage refers to a judgment in the present life or hereafter.

(12) The Fourth Section of *Enoch* (lxxxii. 4) speaks of the day of judgment.

(13) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* speaks of a final judgment with the destruction of the present heavens and earth and the creation of new ones (xcii. 14-16).

(14) The Sixth Section of *Enoch* says there will be a judgment of the righteous and the wicked, on angels and on men. (xcvi. 2-4, xlviii. 2).

(15) *Third* and *Fourth Maccabees* are silent on the subject. *d. In the Literature of the First Century, A.D.*

(1) All of the *Gospels*, the *Acts*, the *Revelation*, and most of the *Epistles* speak of a judgment.

(2) The *Testament of Hezekiah* speaks of the judgment once in iv. 18.

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions it in x. 12.

(4) The *Assumption of Moses* (x. 3-10) describes how the Heavenly One will arise from his royal throne and amid the disturbance of earth and sea and sun and stars will punish the gentiles and Israel shall be exalted.

(5) The *Son of Man Vision* tells how God's Son is to judge and to destroy the nations of the earth and to defend the people of Israel (xiii. 37, 49).

(6) *The Eagle Vision* speaks of the Messiah's making the kings of Rome alive for judgment and then destroying them (xii. 12).

(7) The *Salathiel Section* speaks of the judgment and of punishment and salvation after death (vii. 67, 70, 73, 102-105, viii. 38, 61, x. 16).

(8) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, the *Ezra Apocalypse*, and the *Ezra Piece*, do not mention a judgment.

(9) In *Second Baruch*, there is a long and detailed account of the judgment extending from xxiv. 1 to xxx. 1.

(10) In the *Zadokite Fragments* the judgment is probably referred to in ii. 4, where it says that with God are "power and might and great fury with flames of fire wherein are all the angels of destruction." (Compare i. 2 and ix. 12.)

(11) *Philo* and *Josephus* are silent on the subject.

3. As to a Messiah.

a. *Daniel* ix. 25, 26 is one of the two Old Testament passages where the expected Saviour of Israel is called *Messiah*. The verses read: "Know therefore and understand that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be cut off, but not for himself or . . ." In viii. 25 the king of fierce countenance is represented as standing up "against the Prince of princes." In ii. 34, 45, the deliverer is likened to a stone cut out without hands that smote and broke in pieces the image of iron and clay. In iii. 25, he may possibly be the Son of God thus spoken of. In vii. 13, he is likened to a son of man and comes to the Ancient of days and is given dominion and glory and a kingdom which shall not pass away. It is possible, also, that Michael the prince of x. 21 and the Michael of xii. 1 is none other than the Messiah himself.

*b. The Rest of the Old Testament.*

1. Ps. ii. (which Driver thinks to be pre-exilic and which neither Reuss, Cheyne nor W. Robertson Smith places as late as the Maccabean times) agrees with Daniel in calling the Son of God the *Messiah*.

(2) Already in the seed of the woman of Gen. iii. 15 and in the Shiloh of xlix. 10 we have intimations of the coming king who should bruise the head of the serpent. These passages are both assigned to J.

(3) In Num. xx., which is assigned to JE, the Messiah is prefigured in the star which was to come out of Jacob, and the sceptre which should arise out of Israel.

(4) The Prince of Peace of Isa. ix. 6, 7 and the root that should come forth out of the stem of Jesse and the branch out of his roots of Isa. xi. 1, also refer to him. Both of these passages are assigned by the critics to the genuine Isaiah.

(5) The ruler in Israel who, according to Mi. v. 2, should come forth from Bethlehem of Judah must refer to the Messiah, as must also the "Lord" of Ps. cx. 1.

(6) Of the writers contemporary with Daniel, the Branch of Jer. xxiii. 5, 6 and xxxiii. 15-17 and the Shepherd of Ezek. xxxiv. 23-31 clearly indicate the Saviour to come.

(7) Zechariah, who wrote but a few years after the time of Daniel, speaks of him as the Branch (iii. 8, vi. 12), the Shepherd (xi. 16, xiii. 7), the fountain opened for sin (xiii. 1), the one from the house of David who was to be pierced (xii. 10) and the King who was to come to Zion (ix. 9) and the one whose price was thirty pieces of silver (xi. 12).

(8) Of the fifty-seven psalms assigned by one or more of the critics to the Maccabean period only cx. 1, and cxviii. 22 refer to a Messiah. Dr. Driver<sup>34</sup> thought that Ps. cx. "may be presumed to be pre-exilic." Reuss, Cheyne and W. Robertson Smith class Ps. cxviii. as Maccabean, to which date Cheyne assigns Ps. cx. also. The verse "The LORD said unto my Lord," etc. is attributed expressly by the New Testament

<sup>34</sup> LOT, p. 384.



writers and by the Lord himself to David. See Matt. xxii. 49, Mk. xii. 36, Lk. xx. 42, Acts ii. 34.

c. The *Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) The *Book of Noah* and the First and Third Sections of the *Book of Enoch* are silent as to a Messiah.

(2) The Second Section of *Enoch* (xc. 37) speaks of a white bull with large horns whom all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air feared and to whom they made petitions all the time.

(3) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* says in Judah xxiv. 5, 6: "Then shall the sceptre of my kingdom shine forth, and from your root shall arise a stem, and from it shall grow a rod of righteousness to the gentiles, to judge and save all that call upon the Lord." In Judah xxiv. 1-3, we read: "And after these things shall a star arise to you from Jacob in peace and a man shall arise like the sun of righteousness, walking with the sons of men in meekness and righteousness and no sin shall be found in him," etc. In Levi viii. 14 we read that "a king shall arise in Judah and shall be beloved as a prophet of the Most High," etc. Dan., v. 10, says that the salvation of the Lord shall arise from Levi. Joseph xix. 11 says: "Honor Levi and Judah, for from them shall arise unto you one who saveth Israel." Zebulun ix. 8 reads: "After these things shall arise unto you the Lord Himself, the light of righteousness." In Levi xviii. 1-14 there is a long and beautiful description of the new priest to whom all the words of the Lord shall be revealed.

(4) One place only in *Jubilees* refers to the Messiah. In xxxi. 18, 19, in a passage recording an alleged blessing of Levi and Judah by Isaac, it is said of Judah in evident imitation of Gen. xlix. 10 that one of his sons should be a prince over the sons of Jacob and that in him should be the help of Jacob and the salvation of Israel.

(5) The *Sibylline Books* have a long passage (Book III. 652-818) containing an account of a king sent by God from the sunrise who shall give every land relief from the bane of war in obedience to the good ordinances of the mighty God.

(6) *Ecclesiasticus*, *Wisdom*, *Tobit*, *Judith*, and *1 Maccabees*, do not mention a Messiah.

(7) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* speaks of a kingdom where God and his Son will be united for ever with the children of earth (cv. 2).

(8) In the Sixth Section of *Enoch* the Messiah is called :

(a) The Son of Man, xlvi. 2-4, xlviii. 2, 9, xlix. 2, 4, li. 5, 6, lii. 6, 9, liii. 6, lv. 4, lxi. 5, 8, lxii. 1.

(b) God's Anointed, xlviii. 10.

(c) The Elect One, xlv. 4.

(d) He will have universal dominion, sit on the throne of his glory, and judge angels and men.

(9) The *Psalms of Solomon* call the Messiah, the king, the son of David and the servant of God, Ps. xviii. 6.

(10) The Second, Third, and Fourth Books of *Maccabees* and the Fourth Section of *Enoch* are silent on this subject.

d. The Literature of the First Century A.D.

(1) The Messiah is mentioned in every book of the *New Testament*.

(2) The *Testament of Hezekiah* speaks of "Jesus the Lord" (x. 4, 13) and of the "Beloved" (iii. 17, 18, iv. 3, 6, 9, 13).

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions "the Messiah" (vii. 8, 12), "the Beloved" (vii. 17, 23), "His Beloved the Christ" (viii. 18), "His Beloved the Son" (viii. 15), "the Only Begotten" (vii. 37), "the Elect One" (viii. 7), "Lord God the Lord Christ who will be called Jesus" (ix. 5), "Lord who will be called Christ" (ix. 13), "Lord Christ" (ix. 17, 32), "That One" (ix. 26, 38), "This One" (ix. 31), "a Certain One" (ix. 27).

(4) The *Son of Man Vision* of Fourth Ezra calls the Messiah "God's Son" (xiii. 32, 37) and says he is to judge and to destroy the earth (xiii. 37, 49) and to defend the people of Israel (xiii. 49).

(5) The *Ezra Piece* speaks of Ezra's translation to be with God's Son, but otherwise does not refer to the Son.

(6) The *Eagle Vision* mentions a Messiah who is to spring from the seed of David and make the kings of Rome alive for judgment and destruction (xii. 32).

(7) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah*, the *Assumption of Moses*, the *Ezra Apocalypse*, and the *Salathiel Section* do not mention a personal Messiah.

(8) The *Zadokite Fragments* (ii. 10) say that God through his Messiah will make known his Holy Spirit. Also, in Text B, ix. 3 quotes Zech. xiii. 7 where the shepherd refers to the Messiah; and in ix. 8 the sceptre of Gen. 49, 10 "appears to denote the Messiah." In ix. 10 (B), 29 (B), the sword of the Messiah is spoken of.

4. As to Angels.

a. The *Book of Daniel*.

(1) In iii. 25, Nebuchadnezzar says that he saw four *men* in the midst of the fire and that the form of the fourth was like to a "son of gods" (*cp.* Gen. vi. 3). In iii. 22, this fourth man is called an angel.

(2) In iv. 17 we read of "the decree of the watchers and the demand by the word of the holy ones"; and in iv. 23 it speaks of "a watcher and a holy one coming down from heaven" and announcing the decree.

(3) In vi. 22 God is said to have "sent his angel who shut the mouths of the lions."

(4) In vii. 10, "a thousand thousands minister unto the Ancient of days and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before Him."

(5) In x. 5, Daniel saw "one man" clothed in linen, etc. So, also, xii. 6, 7.

(6) In x. 16, one like the similitude of the sons of a man (Adam) touched his lips, etc.

(7) In x. 18, one like the appearance of a man (Adam) came and strengthened him.

(8) In viii. 13, Daniel heard "one holy one" speaking to another holy one.

(9) In viii. 16, Gabriel is mentioned. In ix. 21, he is called the *man* Gabriel (*cp.* Gen. xxxii. 24).

(10) In x. 13, 21, xiii. 1, Michael the prince or "the great prince" or "one of the chief princes" is mentioned.

b. In the other Books of the *Old Testament* we find:

(1) The angel of Jehovah, Gen. xvi. 7, 9, 10, 11, xxii. 11, 15, Ex. iii. 2, Num. xxii. 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 31, 32, 34, 35, Jud. ii. 1, 4, v. 23, vi. 11, 12, 21<sup>2</sup>, 22<sup>2</sup>, xiii. 3, 13, 15, 16,<sup>2</sup> 17, 18, 20, 21,<sup>2</sup> 2 Sam. xxiv. 16, 1 Ki. xix. 7, 2 Ki. i. 3, 15, xix. 35, 1 Chr. xxi. 12, 15, 16, 18, 30, Ps. xxxiv. 8, xxxv. 5, 6, Isa. xxxvii. 36, Zech. i. 11, 12, iii. 1, 5, 6, xii. 8, Mal. ii. 7.

(2) The angel of God, Gen. xxi. 17, xxxi. 11, Ex. xiv. 19, Jud. vi. 12, xiii. 9, 1 Sam. xxi. 9, 2 Sam. xiv. 17, 20, xix. 23.

(3) The angels of God, Gen. xxxii. 2.

(4) Angel (alone), Gen. xxiv. 7, 40, xlvi. 16, Ex. xxiii. 20, 23, xxxii. 34, xxxiii. 2, Nu. xx. 16, 2 Sam. xxiv. 16<sup>2</sup>, 17, 1 Ki. xiii. 18, xix. 5, 1 Chr. xxi. 15<sup>2</sup>, 20, 27, 2 Chr. xxxii. 21, Zech. i. 13, 14, ii. 2, 7, iii. 3, 6, iv. 1, 4, 5, v. 5, 10, vi. 4, 5, Mal. iii. 1.

(5) Angels of God, Gen. xxxii. 2.

(6) Angels (alone), Ps. xci. 11, ciii. 20, civ. 4, xclviii. 2.

(7) Evil angels, Ps. lxxviii. 49.

(8) Angel of his presence, Isa. lxiii. 9.

(9) Angel of the Covenant, Mal. iii. 1.

(10) Angel of the Lord of hosts, Mal. ii. 7.

(11) Cherubim, Gen. iii. 24, Ps. xviii. 10, Ez. ix. 3, x. 1, (*et passim*), xi. 22, xxviii. 14, 16.

(12) Seraphim, Isa. vi. 2, 6.

(13) A man clothed with linen, Ez. ix. 2, 3, 11, x. 2, 6, 7.

(14) Sons of God, Gen. vi. 3 (?), Deut. xxxii. 19, Job i. 6, ii. 1.

(15) Gods, Ps. viii. 6.

(16) Twenty thousand thousands of angels (אֲנִיִּים), Ps. lxxviii. 18.

(17) Mighty (angels?), Ps. lxxviii. 25, Joel iii. 11.

(18) Holy Ones, Deut. xxxiii. 3 (?), Job v. 1, xv. 15, Zech. xiv. 5, Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8.

(19) Sons of the Mighty, Ps. xxix. 1, lxxxix. 6.

(20) Watchmen, Isa. lxii. 6.

- (21) The host of the high ones, Isa. xxiv. 21.  
 (22) Morning Stars, Job xxxviii. 7.  
 (23) Members of God's council, Job i., Ps. lxxxix. 7, I Ki. xxii.  
 (24) Guardian Angels, Ps. xxxiv. 8, xci. 11.  
 (25) Intercessors, Job. v. 1.  
 (26) Punishers of the wicked, Ps. lxxxviii. 49.  
 (27) (The) Satan, Zech. iii. 1, 2<sup>2</sup>, Job, i-ii (*passim*), Ps. cix. 6, I Chr. xxi. 1.  
 (28) Demons "*shedim*," Ps. cvi. 37.  
 (29) Satyr (? *sa'ir*), Isa. xxxiv. 14.  
 (30) Night Monster (*Lilith*), Isa. xxxiv. 14.  
 (31) Deep (? *Tehom*) Deut. xxxiii. 13, Ps. cxlviii. 7.  
 (32) Rahab, Isa. li. 9, Ps. lxxxix. 10, Job ix. 13, xxvi. 12, 13.  
 (33) Leviathan, Job iii. 8, Ps. lxxiv. 14.  
 (34) Azazel, Lev. xvi. 8, 10<sup>2</sup>, 26.  
 (35) Princes of God, LXX version of Deut. xxxii.  
 (36) Ecclesiastes and the Song of Songs do not speak of angels and in all the fifty-seven psalms assigned by one or more critics to the second century, B.C., we find angels referred to only in Psalm cxlviii. 2.

c. The *Book of Enoch*, etc.

(1) The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* mention Satan and Beliar by name. They speak, also, of the angel of God, of angels of the presence, of watchers, and archangels.

(2) The *Book of Jubilees* mentions by name Mastema (Satan) and Beliar. It speaks, also, of angels of the presence, and of guardian angels and of angels of the wood, fire, clouds, etc. It describes the creation and circumstances of the fallen angels, their marrying the daughters of men, their judgment and punishment.

(3) The *Sibylline Books* mention the angel Beliar.

(4) The *Book of Noah* is almost entirely an imaginative explanation of the "sons of God" of Gen. vi. 2, giving their names, duties, teachings, sins, judgment, and punishment.

(a) vi. 7, 8 gives the names of the eighteen chiefs of

tens, and lxix. 2, 3, the names of twenty-one chiefs over hundreds and over fifties and over tens. In alphabetical order the eighteen are Ananel, Armaros, Arakiba, Asael, Baraqijal, Batarel, Danel, Ezeqeel, Jomjael, Kokabiel, Rameel, Samiazaz, Samsapeel, Sariel, Satarel, Tamiel, Turel, Zaqiel. Over all these Semjaza was chief. In lxvi. 2, 3 the names are given as, Armaros, Armen, Artaqifa, Azazel (two of this name), Baraqiel, Batarjal, Busasejal, Danjal, Hananel, Jetrel, Kokabel, Neqael, Rumael, Rumjal, Samjaza, Simapesiel, Tumael, Turael, Turel (two of this name). To these are added in verses 4-12 the names Asbeel, Gadreel, Jeqon, Kasdja, and Penemue. Allowing for differences of spelling we have here the names of thirty-seven fallen angels.

(b) In ix. 1 four good angels are named (Michael, Raphael, Uriel, and Gabriel), who are called "holy ones" (ix. 3, lx. 4). These intercede with the Lord of the Ages for the souls of men (ix. 3, 4). Another good angel, Phanuel, is named in liv. 6.

(c) The "angel of peace," liv. 4, lx. 24.

(d) An "angel of punishment," lxvi. 1.

(e) An angel (without name), lx. 4, 9, 11, lxviii. 5.

(f) Spirits of the hoar-frost, hail, and snow are called angels, lx. 17; also, spirits of the mist, the rain, and the dew, 18-21.

(g) Angels (without names), x. 7, cvi. 6, lxvii. 4, 7, 11, 12, lxviii. 2.

(h) Watchers, x. 7, 9, 15.

(i) "Angels, children of the heaven," vi. 2. These are said to have been two hundred in number (vi. 6).

(j) The angels are a thousand thousands and a thousand times ten thousand, lx. 1.

(k) "Satans" are mentioned in lxv. 6 where they seem to be distinguished from the angels.

(l) The duties, or functions, of the bad angels are mentioned at length in viii. 3, and of angels in xx.

(m) The duties of the good angels are mentioned in ix. 1, 4, x. 1, lx. 2, 21, 23, lxvi. 2, lxvii. 2, lxix. 4f.

(5) In the First Section of the *Book of Enoch*.

(a) Of the evil angels, Azazel only is mentioned, xiii. 1.

(b) There are some holy angels "who watch" (xx. 2-8), and whose names are Michael, Raphael, Uriel, and Raguel, Saraqiel, Gabriel and Remiel. See also xxiv. 6, xx. 3, 6, xxxii. 6, xix. 1, xxiii. 4, xxxiii. 4, xxvii. 2, xxi. 5, 9.

(c) Watchers are mentioned (xvi. 1), who are called holy (xv. 9), eternal (xiv. 1), heavenly (xii. 4), children of heaven (xiv. 3, xii. 2, 3, 4, 10, 15<sup>2</sup>).

(d) Holy one (xiv. 25), the most holy ones (xiv. 23), seven holy angels (xx. 2-8).

(e) Seven stars of heaven, xxi. 6.

(f) Angels (alone), xxxvi. 4, prisons of angels, xxi. 10, xiv. 21.

(g) Giants (= evil spirits), xv. 8.

(h) "Ten thousand times ten thousand" angels, xxi. 24.

(6) The Second Section of *Enoch* calls Azazel a star (lxxxvi. 1), speaks of the angels of heaven (lxxxiv. 4) and calls the angels "white men" (lxxxvii. 2). Probably, also, the "seventy shepherds" of lxxxix. 59 are angels.

(7) In the Third Section of *Enoch* angels are mentioned once (xci. 15) and holy angels once (xciii. 2).

(8) The *Song of the Three Children* speaks twice of the angel of the Lord, vss. 26, 37.

(9) *Susannah* mentions the angel of the Lord (vs. 45) and the angel of God (vss. 55, 59).

(10) *Bel and the Dragon* mentions the angel of the Lord in vss. 36, 39.

(11) *Tobit* mentions:

(a) Raphael by name, iii. 17, xii. 15.

(b) Guardian angels, v. 17, 22.

(c) Holy angels, xi. 14.

(d) Seven angels, xii. 15.

(e) Asmodeus, an evil demon, iii. 8, and elsewhere.

(12) *Ecclesiasticus* refers to angels in xxxix. 28, xli. 2, 45, xlvi. 1, but only in passages cited from the canonical books of the Old Testament.

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

(14) The *Epistle of Jeremiah* mentions an angel in vs. 7.

(15) The *Book of Baruch* mentions devils, iv. 7.

(16) The *Book of Wisdom* mentions the devil, ii. 24, and speaks of angels' food, xvi. 20.

(17) *Judith*, *I Maccabees*, the *Prayer of Manasseh*, and the *Story of Zerubbabel* are silent as to angels.

(18) The Sixth Section of *Enoch* (xxxvii-lxxi) speaks of:

(a) A righteous angel, xxxix. 5.

(b) Four angels of the presence (Michael, Raphael, Sahiel, and Phanuel), xl. 9.

(c) Thousands of thousands and ten thousand times ten thousand, xl. 1.

(d) The angel of peace, xliii. 3, lii. 3, liv. 4.

(e) Angels of punishment, liii. 3, lvi. 1.

(f) Satan, liii. 3, 6.

(g) Azazel, liii. 5, lv. 4.

(h) The host of God, Cherubim, Seraphim, and Ophanim, lxi. 10.

(i) The holy ones, lxi. 10.

(19) *Third and Fourth Maccabees*, and the *Psalms of Solomon* are silent on the subject of angels.

(20) In *Second Maccabees* "the terrible rider" and the two men notable in strength who smote at and scourged Heliodorus were probably angels (iii. 25, 26), as were also "the five comely men upon horses" of x. 29, and "the one in white clothing" of xi. 8. Judas, in xv. 22 refers to the angel who smote the host of Sennacherib and prays for God to "send a good angel" to go before the Jewish army.

(21) *Third Maccabees* speaks of two angels glorious and terrible who appeared to Eleazar the high priest.

(22) The Fourth Section of *Enoch* speaks of seven holy ones (lxxxix. 5) and gives the names of the four leaders who divide the four parts of the year and their three followers.



These seven are named Milkiel, Hel'emmelek, Mel'ejal, Narel, Adnar'el, Ijasusa'el, 'Elome'el. The leaders under them are called Birka'el, Zelebs'el, Hilujaseph, Gida'yal, Ke'el, He'el, and Asfa'el (lxxx. 13-20). Uriel also is mentioned in lxxiv. 2, lxxv. 3, 4, and is the one who shows things to Enoch.

(23) The Fifth Section of *Enoch* (xci-civ) mentions the holy angels (xci. 2) and the wicked (xci. 15). Angels are said to place the prayers of the righteous for a memorial before the Most High (xcix. 3, c. 1) to gather the works for judgment (c. 4) and to be guardians over the righteous (c. 5).

d. The Literature of the First Century A.D.

(1) The *Martyrdom of Isaiah* speaks of the angel Sammael, i. 11, ii. 1, Sammael Malchira, i. 8, Beliar, i. 8, 9, ii. 4, iii. 11, 51, and Satan, ii. 2, 7, and of Satan's angels, ii. 2.

(2) The *Testament of Hezekiah* mentions Sammael, iii. 13, Beliar, iii. 13, iv. 2, 16, Beliar and his armies, iv. 14, and the angels and armies of the holy ones, iv. 14.

(3) The *Vision of Isaiah* mentions:

(a) By name, Sammael, vii. 9, and Satan, xi. 43, vii. 9.

(b) An angel who was sent to make the prophet see, vi. 3, vii. 11, 21, 25.

(c) A glorious angel, vii. 2.

(d) Angel of death, ix. 16, x. 14.

(e) Angels about the throne, vii. 14-16, 19.

(f) Angels of fire and Sheol, x. 10.

(g) Angels of the air, x. 30.

(h) Angels of Satan, vii. 9.

(i) Sammael and his hosts, vii. 9.

(j) Angel of the Holy Spirit, vii. 23, ix. 36, 39, 40, x. 4, xi. 4, 33.

(k) Princes, angels, and powers of the world, x. 12.

(l) Princes and powers of this world, x. 15.

(m) Angels (alone), vii. 22, 27, 37, ix. 6, 28, 29, 42, viii. 2, 15, 19, x. 19.

(4) The *Zadokite Fragments* mention the angels of de-

struction, ii. 4.<sup>35</sup> Belial, also, is named in vi. 9, 10, vii. 19, ix. 12.

(5) The *Assumption of Moses* mentions Satan and an angel, x. 2.

(6) The *Ezra Apocalypse* mentions only the angel who came to speak to him.

(7) The *Son of Man Vision*, the *Ezra Piece*, and the *Eagle Vision* and the parts added by the Redactor do not mention angels.

(8) The *Salathiel Section* mentions:

(a) The angel who had been sent unto him, v. 31, vii. 10, 29.

(b) Armies of angels, vi. 3.

(c) Angels who guard the souls of the righteous, vii. 85, 95.

(d) By name Jeramiel, iv. 36, and Uriel, v. 20, x. 28.

(9) The *Apocalypse of Baruch* speaks of the creation of the angels, xxi. 6, of their fall, lvi. 11-13, of armies of them, xlviii. 10, li. 11, lix. 10, of the angel of death, xxi. 6, and names Ramiel, lv. 3, lxiii. 6.

(10) The *New Testament* books mention Michael, Gabriel, Satan, and Beelzebub.<sup>36</sup>

#### SPECIAL CONCLUSIONS

In view of the evidence given above it will be obvious to the attentive reader who makes a résumé and a comparison of the documents.

1. That of the books put by the critics themselves in the second century B.C., only three out of the seventy-nine<sup>37</sup> make any kind of reference to a *resurrection*.

a. The *Testaments of the XII Patriarchs* is the only one which distinctly mentions a resurrection. It has four such references, of which only that in Benjamin x. 6-8 refers to

<sup>35</sup> Said by Charles to be an interpolation.

<sup>36</sup> For further information, see Bernard in *Hastings' Dictionary*.

<sup>37</sup> In this total the 57 O. T. Psalms assigned by the critics to this period and the three additions to Daniel, *Susannah*, *Bel and the Dragon*, and the *Prayer of the Three Children* each count as one.

the resurrection of some to shame. Since the critics place the composition of this work between 137 and 105 B.C., it cannot have influenced the author of *Daniel*, even if he wrote as late as 164 B.C. On the other hand, the author of the *Testaments* may have been influenced by *Daniel*, whether the latter was written in 164 or 535 B.C.

b. As to the testimony to a resurrection of the parts of *Enoch*, assigned by Prof. Charles to the second century B.C., it will be observed that the Third Section contains only a veiled reference to it, and that the First Section says of it only that the righteous shall after the judgment live a long life on earth, the implication being that they shall live this life in the resurrected body.

c. That the statement of *Daniel* is nearest in form and sense to that of Isa. xxvi. 19, which even the critics do not place later than the fourth century B.C.

2. That *Daniel* and *Enoch* are not the only books which refer to the *judgment*, and that their statements are not identical.

a. That there will be a judgment is stated not merely in *Daniel* and the *Book of Enoch* but also, Isa. xlii. 1-4, Joel iii. 9-17, and in Pss. x. 7, 8, i. 5, lxxvi. 9, and lxviii. 13.

b. That it will be set is stated not merely in *Daniel* and *Enoch* but also in Isa. xlii. 4 and Ps. x. 7.

c. That the books will be opened is stated only in *Daniel* and in Section Two of *Enoch* which is assigned to the first century B.C.

d. That the Ancient of days will come is stated in *Daniel*, but not in *Enoch*.

e. That judgment will be given to the saints of the Most High is stated in *Daniel*, but not in *Enoch*.

f. In *Daniel* the kings and nations of earth will be condemned, whereas in *Enoch* it is the evil angels and the godless.

3. That, with regard to the *Messiah* the ideas of Daniel are distinctive :

a. The name "Messiah" as applied to the future redeemer

of Israel, is found in the literature up to the year 100 B.C., only in *Daniel* and Ps. ii. 2.

b. The phrase "Messiah the Prince" is found nowhere except in *Daniel*.

c. The phrase "Prince of princes" is found nowhere else, though Prince of Peace occurs in Isa. ix. 6. The prince of Ezekiel xxxiv. 24 renders a Hebrew word differing from that found in *Daniel*.

d. The title "stone" is found outside of *Daniel* only in Isa. xxviii. 16 and Ps. cxviii. 22.

e. The title "son of gods" occurs nowhere else, but the Messiah is called God's son in Ps. ii. 7, Isa. ix. 6.

f. "Son of man" as a title of the Messiah does not occur outside of *Daniel* till the first century B.C. In Ezekiel it is appropriated to the prophet himself.

g. If Michael the prince be the Messiah, he is so named elsewhere only in the Revelation of St. John.

h. That Messiah was to be "cut off" is stated also in Isa. liii. 8, but nowhere else except in Mk. ix. 12, Lk. xxiv. 26.

i. The statement and figure of the breaking of the image is found nowhere except in *Daniel*.

j. The glory and the kingdom find their best analogy in Zech. ix. 10.

Of the early parts of *Enoch*, the fragments of the Book of Adam, and the First and Third Sections are absolutely silent with regard to a Messiah. The Second Section (from the first century B.C.) refers to him but once and that under the figure of a *white bull* whom all the beasts of the field and all the birds of the air feared and to whom they made petitions all the time! This is the only "approximation" of *Enoch* to *Daniel* concerning the doctrine of the Messiah. It will be seen that *Daniel* approximates to Isaiah four times, to Zechariah once, and to the Second Psalm twice. The other phrases and titles used of the Messiah by *Daniel* are all peculiar to himself.

4. With regard to *Angels* it will be noted:

a. In the books of the Old Testament outside *Daniel*,

(1) They are mentioned in Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus (?), Numbers, Deuteronomy, Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Chronicles, Isaiah, Joel, Zechariah, Malachi, Psalms and Job.

(2) That, if we take demons, or evil spirits, to be angels we have Lilith, Sa'ir, and Rahab mentioned by name in Isaiah; Shedub in Deut. and Ps. cxlviii; Leviathan in Job and Ps. lxxiv; Rahab in Isa., Ps. lxxxix., and Job; Azazel in Leviticus (H); Satan in 1 Chron., Zech., Job, Ps. cix.

(3) That classes of angels seem to be denoted by the Seraphim, Cherubim, Shedim and by the Princes of God.

(4) That angels are distinguished as holy, guardian, mighty, watchers, intercessors, sons of God, punishers of the wicked, members of God's council, and as evil and tempters of mankind, and that they are practically innumerable, being a host and thousands of thousands.

b. That the *New Testament* agrees with *Daniel* in almost every particular. It speaks of the angels as mighty and strong, as guardians, as mediators, as punishers of the wicked, as surrounding the throne of God, of evil angels, of the Devil as a tempter, of ten thousand times ten thousand, and thousands of thousands, and it names Michael, Gabriel, Satan or Diabolos, Beelzebub and Abaddon or Apollyon.

c. That the treatment of angels differs in the four sections of the *Book of Enoch* and that in no one of the sections can it be fairly said that there is an "approximation" of the treatment of angels with that of *Daniel*. Thus,

(1) In the Third Section of *Enoch* the angels are mentioned but twice, once with the epithet "holy."

(2) In the Second Section of *Enoch*, angels are mentioned only three times certainly and possibly four times. They are called "angels of heaven," "white men," one of them "Azazel," and "seventy shepherds" are spoken of. Not one of these phrases, nor the name Azazel, occurs in *Daniel*.

(3) The First Section of *Enoch* and the *Book of Noah* both agree with *Daniel* and other books of the *Old Testament*,

- (a) In expressing a belief in angels.
- (b) In giving names to some of them.
- (c) In arranging them in classes, or ranks.
- (d) In mentioning "watchers." This designation of angels is found also in Isa, lxii. 6.

(e) Further, *Daniel* agrees with the *Book of Noah* alone, in speaking of angels as a thousand thousand and ten thousand times ten thousand. A similar phrase is found also in Rev. v. ii. The First Section of *Enoch* has the latter part of this phrase "ten thousand times ten thousand" (*cp.* Ps. lxxviii. 18).

(f) *Daniel* agrees with the First Section alone of *Enoch* in designating angels as "holy." This designation is found, also, in Job v. 1, xv. 15, Zech. xiv. 5, Ps. lxxxix. 6, 8, and Deut. xxxiii. 3 (?).

(4) The First Section of *Enoch* and the *Book of Noah* disagree with *Daniel* in the following particulars:

(a) *Daniel* introduces angels merely incidentally, whether as messengers to communicate the will of God or as agents for the deliverance or strengthening of His servants; whereas in both the *Book of Noah* and the First Section of *Enoch*, the angels are the subject of the discourse and the whole narration is taken up with the story of the "sons of God" of Gen. vi. 2, 3.

(b) *Daniel* mentions good angels only, whereas the *Book of Noah* and the First Section of *Enoch* are concerned almost entirely with the angels who fell.

(c) *Daniel* names two good angels alone, whereas the *Book of Noah* mentions four good angels and thirty-seven wicked angels, and the First Section of *Enoch* mentions by name one bad angel and seven holy ones.

(d) The *Book of Noah* speaks of two hundred "angels, children of heaven," of spirits of hoar-frost, hail, snow, mist, rain and dew, of an angel of peace and of an angel of punishment, and of Satans. *Daniel* never refers to any of these.

(e) The First Section of *Enoch* calls angels "stars" and "giants." *Daniel* never does this.

(f) The duties, or functions, of the angels both good and bad are given at length and specifically both in the *Book of Noah* and the First Section of *Enoch*. Daniel never refers to their duties as such and leaves us to infer them from the words which they spake and the actions they performed.

#### GENERAL CONCLUSIONS

The following general conclusions may be drawn from the above discussion and special conclusions.

1. That of the four doctrines cited by Dr. Driver it cannot be fairly said that the teachings of Daniel approximate to those of the early parts of the book of Enoch, seeing that no one of these parts expressly mentions all of the doctrines.

2. That on the doctrine of the resurrection, Daniel approximates most nearly the teachings of Isa. xxvi.; on that of the judgment, he makes a slight advance on the teachings of Joel, Isaiah and certain of the psalms, but agrees in only one particular with any one of the Sections of Enoch alone; that on the matter of the Messiah, his closest approximations are to Isaiah, Zechariah and certain of the psalms; and that on the doctrine of angels he is unique as far as the pre-Christian literature is concerned and is approximated only by the Book of the Revelation of St. John.

3. It is asserted by Dr. Driver that whether or not, in one or two instances, the development of the four doctrines of the resurrection, judgment, Messiah, and angels "may have been partially moulded by foreign influences, they undoubtedly mark a later phase of revelation than that which is set before us in [most of] the other books of the Old Testament."<sup>38</sup>

If by "revelation," Dr. Driver had meant what the New Testament and the Christian Church have always meant by it (that is, a making known to man by God of certain ideas in accordance with his good pleasure), we cannot see why God could not have revealed the ideas of Daniel in the sixth century B.C., as well as in the second. If the old view

<sup>38</sup> LOT, p. 508.

of the dates of the books is taken, Daniel would still represent a comparatively late view of these four doctrines. Moreover there is no doubt that the doctrine of angels is more fully developed in Daniel than in any other book of the Old Testament, the nearest approximation being in Zechariah, another prophecy of the sixth century. As to the resurrection, Isaiah xxvi. 29, and, as to the judgment, Joel iii. are as fully developed as Daniel; and as to the Messiah, the teachings of the other books of the Old Testament such as Isaiah, Zechariah, and certain of the psalms, though different in some respects from Daniel, are in the view of the New Testament writers, (and we think of any fair minded critic) more explicit, and just as important and highly developed as anything in Daniel. Dr. Driver, and those who agree with him, think and say that God *must* have revealed his ideas in a certain order of time and in the midst of certain circumstances and temporal conditions. Having assumed this order and these conditions, it seems "undoubtedly" true, that this or that prophecy must have been written or spoken at a certain place and time. "Undoubtedly," if the doctrines could all be proven to be late, the books containing them would be late. "Undoubtedly," if the books, or parts of books, containing the doctrines could be proven to be late, the doctrines also would be late. But *undoubtedly*, also, it is not fair to say without positive proof that the doctrines are late because they are in certain books or parts of books, and that the books or parts of books are late because they contain the doctrines. This, however, is exactly what the critics do. One of their principal reasons for putting Isa. xxiv.-xxvi. and Job late is the fact that the doctrine of the resurrection is taught in them. Joel is said to be late because of its prophecy on the judgment and the kingdom.

Lastly, might I be pardoned for asking a question to which I would like to have an answer? If the absence of any reference to these doctrines is a proof that the earlier prophets and psalmists did not know anything about them, how about the fifty-seven psalms, Ecclesiastes, and other parts of



the Old Testament which the critics put in the time of the Greek domination and many of them as late even as the Maccabean times? Why is First Maccabees altogether silent on all of them and Ecclesiasticus substantially so? If the absence of all reference to a resurrection in Zechariah, Haggai, Malachi and Chronicles proves that Daniel was written later than they were, why does the silence of the Third and Fourth Sections of the Book of Enoch, of Jubilees, of the Sibylline Oracles, of the Addenda to Esther and Daniel, of Tobit, Judith, First, Third and Fourth Maccabees, the Book of Baruch, the Book of Wisdom, and the Psalms of Solomon not show that Daniel was not written till after they were? Finally, since Haggai, Malachi, Chronicles, and Ezra-Nehe-miah, are absolutely silent on most, or all, of these four doctrines, how do the critics know what were the views of the authors of these books upon these doctrines? Or, if we hold that the doctrines as expounded in Daniel are not his own opinions on these doctrines, but are really revelations from God, do the critics mean to insinuate that God could not have revealed them to the authors of these books, if He had thought it well so to do? Is it necessary to suppose that every author of a book must have told all he knew on every subject, or that God must have given the same message to every writer of the same period, no matter what may have been the purpose of his writing, or the work he had to do?

*Princeton.*

R. D. WILSON.