

The Princeton Theological Review

JULY, 1916

THE DIVINE MESSIAH IN THE OLD TESTAMENT

The question whether the Old Testament has any testimony to give as to the Deity of our Lord, when strictly taken, resolves itself into the question whether the Old Testament holds out the promise of a Divine Messiah. To gather the intimations of a multiplicity in the Divine unity which may be thought to be discoverable in the Old Testament,¹ has an important indeed, but, in the first instance at least,² only an indirect bearing on this precise question. It may render, it is true, the primary service of removing any antecedent presumption against the witness of the Old Testament to the Deity of the Messiah, which may be supposed to arise from the strict monadism of Old Testament monotheism. It is quite conceivable, however, that the Messiah might be thought to be Divine, and yet God not be conceived pluralistically. And certainly there is no reason why, in the delivery of doctrine, the Deity of the Messiah might not be taught before the multiplicity in the unity of the Godhead had been revealed. In the history of Christian

¹ As H. P. Liddon does in the former portion of the lecture in which he deals with the "Anticipations of Christ's Divinity in the Old Testament" (*The Divinity of our Lord and Saviour, Jesus Christ*. Bampton Lectures for 1866. Ed. 4, 1869, pp. 44 ff.). Similarly E. W. Hengstenberg gives by far the greater part of his essay on "The Divinity of the Messiah in the Old Testament" (*Christology of the Old Testament*, 1829, E. T. of ed. 2, 1865, pp. 282-331),—namely from p. 284 on—to a discussion of the Angel of Jehovah.

² For such questions remain as, for example, whether the Angel of Jehovah be not identified in the Old Testament itself with the Messiah (Daniel, Malachi). So G. F. Oehler (art. "Messias" in Herzog's *Realencyc.*, p. 41; *Theol. des A. T.*, ii, pp. 144, 265; *The Theology of the Old Testament*, E. T. American ed., pp. 446, 528), A. Hilgenfeld, *Die jüdische Apokolyptik*, pp. 47 ff. Cf. E. Riehm, *Messianic Prophecy*, E. T. pp. 195, 282, who cites these references in order to oppose them.

THE SILENCE OF ECCLESIASTICUS CONCERNING DANIEL

If we can believe the newspaper reports of the answers of Madame Caillaux, wife of the late Finance Minister of the French Republic, to the interrogatories of the magistrate conducting the preliminary examinations into the reasons why she assassinated M. Calmette, the editor of *Figaro*, it was a difficult matter for her to determine why she fired the fatal shot. It is, in fact, a difficult matter for any of us to analyze the various motives which have conduced to any given course of action, or that have converged toward the production of a certain line of thought. Much more difficult is it to unfold the manifold complexities involved in our critical conclusions and in our literary judgments.

Yet, in spite of this recognized difficulty in discovering our own motives, how many there are who think that they can perform the much more difficult task of discovering the motives of a man who lived two thousand, or more, years ago. This is especially true, when we come to consider the reasons why an author is silent with respect to some person, or event, of his own or preceding times. This silence may have resulted from ignorance; but it may just as well have resulted from prejudice, misjudgment, neglect, or contempt. In no case, however, would the silence prove that the person never existed, or that the event did not occur.

For example, it is found that Jesus ben Sira makes no mention of Daniel, nor any reference to the book bearing his name. The motive, or reason, for this silence is utterly unknown to us. Nevertheless, this silence has been assumed to be a proof that at the time of Ben Sira the book of Daniel had not been written, and even, that at that time the Jews were in ignorance of the fact that such a man as Daniel had ever existed. This assumption is made, notwithstanding that there is good reason for supposing that

Ben Sira intentionally omitted all reference to Daniel, or his book. For the works of Ben Sira show that he was a man of pronounced prejudices and opinions. His views might be characterized as Sadducean and nationalistic. When he gives an account of the great men of his nation, he selects for his encomiums those who had most distinguished themselves according to his ideas of what constituted greatness. We, doubtless, would have added some names that he has omitted from his list. We might have omitted some that he has selected. We certainly would have given more space to the praise of some than he has given, and less to the praise of others. But after all has been said, we will have to admit that there must be granted to him the right and the liberty to praise as he pleases the men whom he wishes to praise. That he has passed by some whom we most highly esteem does not show that he was not aware of their existence. It simply shows that he had reasons of his own, that seemed satisfactory to him, for rejecting them from his list of worthies.

This brief exordium is by way of introduction to the objections made to the early date of the book of Daniel on the ground that it cannot have existed before Ecclesiasticus was written, because neither Daniel nor his book is mentioned, nor apparently even referred to, by Ben Sira. The objections are stated as follows.

OBJECTIONS

“Jesus son of Sirach (writing c. 200 B.C.), in his enumeration of Israelitish worthies, c. 44-50, though he mentions Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and (collectively) the Twelve Minor Prophets, is silent as to Daniel”.¹

“The silence of Jesus Sirach (Ecclesiasticus) concerning Daniel seems to show that the prophet was unknown to that late writer who, in his list of celebrated men (C. XLIX), makes no mention of Daniel, but passes from Jeremiah to Ezekiel and then to the twelve Minor Prophets and

¹ Driver : *Literature of the Old Testament*, p. 498.

Zerubbabel. If Daniel had been known to Jesus Sirach, we would certainly expect to find his name in this list, probably between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Again, the only explanation seems to be that the Book of Daniel was not known to Sirach who lived and wrote between 200 and 180 B.C. Had so celebrated a person as Daniel been known, he could hardly have escaped mention in such a complete list of Israel's leading spirits. Hengstenberg remarked that Ezra and Mordecai were also left unmentioned, but the case is not parallel. Daniel is represented in the work attributed to him as a great prophet, while Ezra appears in the Book bearing his name as nothing more than a rather prominent priest and scholar".²

That Ben Sira knew nothing about Daniel is said to be supported by his statement in chapter xlix. 17, that "no man was born upon earth like unto Joseph, whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinctions he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph".³

ASSUMPTIONS

The assumptions involved in the above objections are as follows:

1. That Ezra and Mordecai did not deserve mention by Ben Sira as well as Daniel did.
2. That the mention of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the Twelve, by Ben Sira, while he is silent as to Daniel, proves that Daniel was unknown to him.
3. That the passing from his mention of the Twelve directly to Zerubbabel, implies that Daniel was not known to Ben Sira.
4. That the silence of Ecclesiasticus concerning Daniel, shows that the prophet and his book were unknown to Ben Sira.

² *Prince; Commentary on Daniel*, p. 16f.

³ *Driver: Daniel*, pages 17 and 64.

5. That the statement of Ben Sira, that there was no man like Joseph, shows an ignorance on his part of the existence of the man Daniel.

DISCUSSION OF THE ASSUMPTIONS

I. The assumption that the omission of the names of Ezra and Mordecai from the list of Ben Sira's worthies is easily to be accounted for on the ground of their relative inferiority to Daniel is a matter of opinion merely. Prince thinks that "Daniel is represented in the work attributed to him as a great prophet, while Ezra appears in the Book bearing his name as nothing more than a rather prominent priest and scholar". As to the part of this statement which refers to Daniel, I would be the last man to deny it; although as I have shown elsewhere, I believe that Daniel's greatness as a prophet was not recognized until after so many of his predictions had been so accurately fulfilled in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. But even if he had been recognized as a great prophet, we must remember that he had said and done nothing to exalt or save the law, the temple, the city of Jerusalem, or the land or people of Israel. Ezra, however, was the greatest protagonist of the Law since the days of Moses and Joshua. The whole critical hypothesis of the formation of the Canon and of the fixation of the vast fabric of the Jewish ceremonies of the Second Temple, is based on the theory that Ezra collected and edited and induced the people to accept formally the so-called first part of the three-fold Canon of the Old Testament Scriptures. In his own time he was the determiner and the champion of orthodoxy, and in all succeeding ages he has been recognized as the organizer of the Temple service and the first of the ready scribes in the Law of Moses.

Now, as to Ezra, Dr. Driver says, that "the second section of the book, c. 7-10, dealing with Ezra's own age, there is no reason to doubt, is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him" (LOT, 549); and Kusters and Cheyne in the *Ency. Bibl.*, 1473 say, that of

his "memoirs, written by himself, some portions unaltered and others considerably modified, have come down to us in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah". If the failure of Ben Sira to mention Ezra is no evidence against the existence, the works, and the writings of Ezra, or against Ben Sira's knowledge of the same; so, in like manner, his failure to mention Daniel is no evidence against the existence, the work and the writings of Daniel, or against Ben Sira's knowledge of them.

As to Mordecai's being in the same class of great men as Daniel, I am inclined to agree with Professor Prince that he was not. But unfortunately for Professor Prince's argument, neither his opinion nor mine is the determining factor in this discussion, but that of the Jews of the time of Ben Sira; and as to this I am not so certain as Professor Prince seems to be that in their estimation Mordecai may not have been "parallel" to Daniel but even have outranked him in importance. For to them Daniel was a minister of foreign kings and the interpreter of their dreams, the great seer of the fortunes of world empires, and the least nationalistic,—perhaps we might even say the least patriotic—of all the prophets; whereas Mordecai was the upholder of the narrowest form of racial exclusiveness, the deliverer of his people from extermination, and the founder of the great national festival of Purim, the only festival which in the belief of the Jews had been decreed between the time of Moses and that of Ben Sira. By all critics, therefore, who like Dr. Driver put the book of Esther as early as the 3rd century B.C. (LOT, 484), this omission of the name of Mordecai from a list of Israel's heroes must be acknowledged as parallel to that of Daniel. So that it seems impossible to escape the conclusion that Ben Sira's failure to mention Daniel, Ezra, and Mordecai, is no argument against the existence of the works and writings of the persons bearing their names, nor of Ben Sira's knowledge of the same.

II. As to the assumption that because Ben Sira mentions

Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve, without mentioning Daniel, he did not know of Daniel, several remarks may be made.

1. Ben Sira does not propose to mention all the prophets of the Old Testament. As a matter of fact, he names only Moses, Samuel, Nathan, Elijah, Elisha, Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel. All of these were prominent in the political and religious history of the land and people; whereas, Daniel left his land while a boy, and spent his life among the kings and wise men of Babylon.

2. Ben Sira does not propose to mention the books of the Old Testament; nor does he mention a single one of them, nor cite specifically by name from any one of them.

3. In Ben Sira's time, Daniel may have been counted as one of the Twelve, just as Ruth was, then and as late as the time of Josephus and later, counted as part of Judges; and just as Lamentations was often counted as part of Jeremiah. In the time of Ben Sira, Jonah may have been a part of the book of Kings; for as Dr. Driver says: "Both in form and contents, the Book of Jonah resembles the biographical narrative of Elijah and Elisha" (LOT 322). It must be remembered that Ben Sira does not name anyone of the Twelve Minor Prophets and that all that he says of them is: "Let their bones be flourishing" (c. XLIX. 10 b) and, if XLIX. 10 c. d. refer to them and not Daniel, that "they comforted Jacob and saved him with the hope of truth".

III. The next assumption is that the Book of Daniel was not known to Ben Sira because he passes from Jeremiah to Ezekiel and then to the Twelve Minor Prophets and Zerubbabel without mentioning Daniel. This assumption is based on two false assumptions. First, that Ben Sira is naming the books of the Old Testament; and secondly, that he is naming all of his heroes in a chronological order. In the former case, one might ask where he finds the books of Phinehas and Zerubbabel. In the latter case, attention need only be called to the facts, that the account of Josiah is in-

serted between the mention of Isaiah and that of Jeremiah, and the description of Job between that of Ezekiel and that of the Twelve and that of Joseph between that of Nehemiah and that of Simon.

Again, it is remarkable that just as Nathan is connected with David so Isaiah and Jeremiah are mentioned in connection with Hezekiah and Josiah. Each of the three kings of Israel had a good prophet to support him. Each of the three good prophets had a worthy Israelitish king to support.⁴ But of what good king of Israel was Daniel the prophet? Of Nebuchadnezzar, forsooth?

Furthermore, Professor Prince fails to notice two other points which are at least as surprising as Ben Sira's omission to mention Daniel and Ezra and Mordecai. The first is that Ben Sira should have placed Zerubbabel among the great men he has mentioned. Certainly, most men in making a list of twenty of the worthies of Israel would not have included him among them. The same might be said of Phinehas and Caleb and Nathan and Adam, and Seth and Shem and perhaps even of Enoch and Noah and Job.

The second is that he should have given eleven verses to Elijah and only two to Jeremiah and one to Ezekiel; three verses to Phinehas and none to Ezra; two to Caleb and only eight verses to Samuel and only one to all the Minor Prophets; and seventeen verses to Aaron and twenty-one to Simon (a non-biblical hero) while giving only five to Moses, one to Nehemiah, and none to Ezra.

The third is that he mentions such men as Caleb and Seth and Shem, while never mentioning by name Gideon and Deborah and Jephthah and Samson; nor Jehoshaphat, Jehoiada, Esther and Ezra; nor any of the twelve Minor Prophets.

Ben Sira certainly did not estimate the Israelitish worthies as Professor Prince does, not as any one of us would

⁴For as Ben Sira says in xlix. 4: Aside from David, Hezekiah, and Josiah, all of the kings had acted corruptly.

do. But what are we going to do about it? Call him an *ignoramus*? or admit his right of private judgment?

IV. The fourth assumption is that the silence of Ben Sira concerning Daniel shows that the prophet and his book were unknown to him.

This is admittedly true of the LXX and Peshitto versions of Ecclesiasticus, but it is not certain when we look at the original Hebrew text, which has been discovered since Bleek put forth this objection to the early date of Daniel. In chapter xlix. 10 we read: And I will mention "also the Twelve Prophets; let their bones sprout beneath them". Verse 11 is as follows: **אשר החלימו את יעקב וישעוהו**. If we take the first three letters as the relative the sense of the verse will be: "who comforted Jacob and saved him". But if we point the letters as in an a class *segholate*, the verse would read: "Blessed be they who comforted Jacob and saved him" *etc.* As the Greek has *παρακαλε* in the singular, we could read: "Blessed be he who comforted Jacob" *etc.*

The sense of "comfort" for the *hiphil* of **חלם** is supported by Isaiah xxxviii. 16, and by the use of the Aramaic and late Hebrew. Further, as the *hiphil* of this verb may mean "to cause to dream" (Jer. xxix. 8), or, after the analogy of **הזה**, "to show or explain visions" (Is. xxx. 10; Sam. ii. 14), we might translate: "Blessed be he who explained dreams to Jacob" *etc.*⁵ As to the construction and use of **אשר** in the construct before the verbal sentence in the genitive, compare Ecclus. xlvi. 11: "Blessed be he who saw Thee and died". Compare also Psalm lxxv. 5, where **אשרי** is employed in like manner.

If this verse be taken in the above sense, it would most naturally refer to Daniel.

But let us waive this conjecture, granting for the sake of argument either that Sira did not mention Daniel or that he shows no acquaintance with the book of Daniel, what then? There are three possibilities. First he may have

⁵ Compare New Hebrew **חלם** *Traumdeuter.*

known the book of Daniel, but not have seen fit to use it; secondly, he may have known about the man Daniel, while not being acquainted with the book; and thirdly, both the book and the man may have been unknown to Ben Sira.

A. Taking these three possibilities in order, let us suppose that Sira was acquainted with the book of Daniel, but did not please to use it. Is there any reasonable way of accounting for such a fact?

This is purely a psychological question having to do with the opinions, feelings, and judgment of Ben Sira himself. He may have been of the opinion that Daniel did not measure up to the standard of the "fathers of the aeon" whose praises he was celebrating. For we must remember that what made the book of Daniel of such supreme importance to the Jews and Christians of later times are its manifest references to Maccabean and New Testament times. To a Jew living at 200 B.C., its message must have been largely closed and sealed. It is hard to see why he should have been specifically mentioned, in view of the failure of Sira to name Samson, Gideon, or Jonah. Besides, with the deliverance from the fiery furnace, the most extraordinary of the miracles mentioned in his book, Daniel personally had nothing to do. As to the failure of the lions to eat him, when cast into their den, the pages of Herodotus, Livy, and of many other ancient authors, are full of just as astounding statements. As to his ability to explain dreams, the Egyptian, Assyrian, and Babylonian kings, Croesus, Xerxes, and Alexander, and indeed, one might say, almost all men of all classes, believed in the significance of dreams and in the power of correct interpretation; so that Sira may have thought that there was no special reason for mentioning Daniel on this account. The equivocal position in which Daniel stood in the Babylonian court may not have been thought by Sira to entitle him to be inscribed in the catalogue of the fathers of his people. He was after all but a slave dancing attendance on a tyrant's will. Besides, so far as is recorded, he never did anything for the

Jews in general, but only accomplished the promotion of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. Many other Jews must have been known to Sira who had risen high in the courts of heathen kings, and who had done much more for their contemporary Israelites: such for example, as Ezra, Mordecai, Athanaeus, and Joseph the son of Tobias, the last a contemporary of Ben Sira himself. Why should Daniel have been signalized and these not?

Again, a close study of Sira's encomiums on the celebrated men of his nation reveals some noteworthy facts, to wit:

1. From the time preceding Abraham, he names Enoch (perhaps twice), Noah, and apparently Adam, Seth, Enosh, and Shem.

2. From Abraham to Joshua, he names Abraham, Isaac, Israel, Moses, Aaron, Phinehas, Caleb, Joshua, and, as it were as an afterthought, Joseph.

3. From the times succeeding Joshua, he names only Samuel, David, Nathan, Solomon, Elijah, Elisha, Hezekiah, Isaiah, Josiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Nehemiah, and Job; and possibly refers to Ezra.

4. From post-biblical times, he names Simon the High Priest, who served about 280 B.C.

5. He refers to the twelve patriarchs, the judges, and the twelve Minor Prophets without mentioning any one of them by name, except Samuel.

6. If his estimate of the relative importance of the great men he mentions can be derived from the number of verses written about them, they will stand in the following order: the High-priest Simon 21 verses, Aaron 17, Solomon 12, Elijah 11, David 10, Hezekiah 9, Samuel 8, Moses 5, Josiah 4, Abraham 3, Phinehas 3, Elisha 3, Noah 2, Jeremiah 2, Joseph 1 or two, and Isaac, Israel, Nathan, Ezekiel, Zerubbabel, Jeshua, and Nehemiah, one each. The twelve Minor Prophets are honored in but one verse, or less; Shem, Seth and Adam, in one verse altogether.⁶

⁶ Enoch, also, is certainly mentioned in chapter xlv. 16, which reads,

In xlix. 14, the Greek reads: "But upon the earth was no man created like Enoch; for he was taken from the earth." The Peshitto has simply: "Few were created upon earth like Enoch." The Hebrew text as amended by Smend is: מעט נוצרו על הארץ כחנוך וגם הוא נלקח פנים. Thus read, the translation would be: "Few have been formed upon earth like Enoch; and he, also, was taken away bodily."

But, it is to be noted, that the manuscript gives us כחנוך, and that the last letter of נוצרו appears to have been added (scheint nachgetragen zu sein).⁷ Following the general principle of the original writing of the vowel letters as propounded by Cornill on page 491 of his "Introduction to the Canonical Books of the Old Testament", the text of the first part of the verse might be as follows: כהנך מעט נוצר. The verse would, then, read: "For a little while thy priest was kept upon the earth; and he, also, was taken away bodily". מעט would be used adverbially as in Ruth ii. 7, Psalm xxxvii. 10; and נלקח would have the same sense as in the probable original of the Ezra-Apocalypse viii. 14. Thus rendered, the verse will refer to Ezra, who may justly be looked upon as the greatest of all the priests. For the belief that Ezra was taken away bodily, compare *Fourth Ezra* xiv. 9, 49, and vi. 26, vii. 28, and viii. 19. In xiv. 9, the voice out of the bush says to Ezra: "Thou shalt be taken up from among men". In xiv. 49, it is said: "Then was Ezra caught away and taken up into the place of such as were like him". In viii. 19 is found: "The beginning of the prayer of Ezra, before he was taken up"; and in vi. 26: "The men who have been taken up, who have not tasted death from their birth, shall appear."

In favor, also, of this latter text and rendering are two important circumstances: first, Enoch has already been

according to the Hebrew text: "Enoch walked with God, a sign of knowledge to all generations". The Greek translation reads: "Enoch pleased God and was translated, being an example of repentance to all generations". The Peshitto omits the verse.

⁷ Smend *in loco*.

mentioned by Ben Sira in his proper place in chapter xlv. 16; and secondly, Nehemiah has just been referred to in the preceding verse, and we would naturally expect to have Ezra noticed in connection with his great collaborator.

It has already been shown (page 455) that xlix. 10 may possibly contain a reference to Daniel. Job, also, is mentioned in the Peshitto text of xlix. 9, which reads: "And also concerning Job he said, that all his ways were right." The Greek here has: "For he made mention of the enemies under the figure of a cloud." The Hebrew original has: "And also I will mention Job." The only difference between the two readings is that one has אֵיבִי whereas the other had אֵיבִי.

7. It will be observed, further, that our author gives 21 verses to the High Priest Simon, a non-biblical character, and one who is known elsewhere only in two short notices by Josephus; whereas he gives 17 verses to Aaron and only five to Moses. Samuel is honored with 8 verses, and all the other judges with but two. Phinehas is granted as long a notice as Abraham. Hezekiah receives almost as much attention as David and Solomon combined. Caleb is treated with the same consideration as Jeremiah, and receives twice as much notice as Ezekiel and at least twice as much as all the Minor Prophets together.

8. Many persons notable in the history of Israel are not mentioned at all by Ben Sira. Such are, of priests, Abiathar, Jehoiada, Hilkiyah, Eliashib and Jaddua; of judges, Gideon, Jephthah, and Samson; of kings, Saul, Asa, Jehoshaphat, Jehu, and Jeroboam II; of prophets, Hosea, Jonah, Haggai, and Zechariah. Besides, all the women, without any exception, are passed over in silence,—Sarah, Rachel, Miriam, Deborah, Ruth, and even Esther.

9. Of the 133 verses employed in the encomiums, 42 are given to the priests, 35 to the kings, 32 (or 33, if we count Job as a prophet) to the prophets, 8 or 9 to the patriarchs, 12 to Joshua and the judges, and two to Zerubbabel and Nehemiah.

10. Further, it will be noted that, with the exception of the doubtful case of Job, all of the "famous men" from Moses onward exercised their activities in Palestine, and had to do with the establishment, defense, or renovation, of the laws, institutions, and polity, of the Jews, with the conquest of the land, or with the building, or restoration, of Jerusalem and the temple. In this connection, Jehoiada, Jehoshaphat, Zechariah, Haggai, and Ezra, might have been mentioned; and also, Mordecai, at least had he labored and lived in Palestine. But Daniel, so far as we know, originated no laws, did not assist in any national movement, did not participate in the return from Babylon, nor in the rebuilding of the walls of Jerusalem, nor in the re-establishment of the people and of its laws.

11. No one can maintain that Ben Sira failed to mention Daniel on account of not being acquainted with him, or with his book, without maintaining that he was also ignorant of the existence and labors of Ezra. But Ben Sira's knowledge of Nehemiah would seem to make it certain that he knew also of Ezra.

12. Ben Sira's judgment as to what rendered men famous, is certainly odd and eccentric. For example, of the 21 verses of encomium upon the High Priest Simon, 17 are taken up with a description of the beauty of his person and of the ceremonies connected with the service at the altar, and of the blessing which the congregation received at his hands. In the case of Aaron, also, a large part is taken up with a description of his garments. If we compare the ideas of Ben Sira with those of the book of Daniel, we find very substantial reasons why the former may not have deemed Daniel worthy of a place among the famous men of his nation. The greatest things that Daniel ever did were to interpret the dream of Nebuchadnezzar and to explain the writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace. Now, in the beginning of chapter xxiv, Ben Sira has expressed plainly his opinion of dreams, when he says among other things, that "dreams lift up fools", "whoso regardeth

dreams is like him that catcheth at a shadow and followeth after wind", "divination and soothsaying and dreams are vain", "for dreams have deceived many, and they have failed that put their trust in them".

Again, Daniel expresses his belief in a resurrection, whereas Ben Sira never even hints at such a possibility. The only kind of immortality that he expressly teaches, is the immortality of fame, and of nationality, family, and institutions, such as the covenant and the priesthood. Moreover, Ben Sira never refers to the distinction between clean and unclean foods, or to the praying toward Jerusalem, or to praying three times daily, to fasting, or to a *post mortem* judgment of the world,—all doctrines that distinguish the book of Daniel. With reference to angels, also, Ben Sira never expresses his own belief, merely mentioning them in allusions to the earlier history.

SUMMARY

To sum up, it may be said that while it is probable that Ben Sira does not refer to Daniel, nor show any knowledge of his book, yet this is no indication that he was not acquainted with both. For as a matter of fact, he does not purpose to give, nor does he give, a complete list of Israelitish worthies; the ones he does mention being selected and celebrated after a manner peculiar to himself. After the conquest, he praises especially priests, kings, and prophets, to none of which classes did Daniel officially, at least, belong. After the conquest, moreover, he mentions, with the possible exception of Job, none but those whose activities were passed in Palestine. With the exception of Solomon and Isaiah, the writers of the nation are given scant space and praise. And finally, there are special reasons why Daniel should have been passed by Ben Sira, arising from the fact that the doctrines and practices of Daniel were out of harmony with those approved and taught by Ben Sira.

B. Some writers, while maintaining that the book of Daniel was not written till the time of Antiochus Epiphanes,

maintain that the man Daniel was, in the words of Dr. Driver, "a historical person, one of the Jewish exiles in Babylon, who, with his three companions, was noted for his staunch adherence to the principles of his religion, who attained a position of influence at the court of Babylon, who interpreted Nebuchadnezzar's dream and foretold, as a seer, something of the future fate of the Chaldean and Persian empires. Perhaps, written materials were at the disposal of the author; it is at any rate probable that for the descriptions contained in c. 2-7 he availed himself of some work, or works, dealing with the history of Babylon in the 6th century B.C."⁸

In view of the fact that Ben Sira gives his longest encomium to the High Priest Simon, a non-biblical character, it is hard to see how he can have failed to mention Daniel, this well known and distinguished man, even though the book that bears his name had not yet been written. Objections that Ben Sira may have reasonably made to doctrines of the book of Daniel he can not have made in like measure to the historical character of Daniel ii-vi. If we assert that the book of Daniel was not written before 180 B.C., we can no longer compare the silence of Ben Sira with his mention of the authors of the books of Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve; but we must compare this silence with his mention of the great men who, so far as we know, were not authors, that is, with his mention of Caleb, Phinehas, Elijah, Elisha, Josiah, Zerubabel, and Simon. So that, when we deny the existence of the book of Daniel and admit the knowledge of the man, whether this knowledge had been gained from "written materials", or from oral tradition, we have not escaped the difficulties involved in Ben Sira's silence. We have simply shifted them from the book to the person. For, if this silence disprove the existence of the book, it disproves equally the knowledge of the person. In the opinion of the present writer, the silence of Ben Sira with reference to

⁸ LOT, 510, 511.

Daniel neither proves nor disproves anything with regard to either the existence of the book, or his knowledge of the person of Daniel. His silence may have been intentional, or unintentional. It may have been through ignorance, or design. But the reason for it is to be sought in the mind of Ben Sira, and this mind is beyond our ken.

C. Much more consistent is the view of Professor Prince and others, who hold that the silence of Ben Sira with regard to Daniel shows that both the book and the man were unknown to him. When, however, Professor Prince says that the only explanation of this silence "seems to be that the book of Daniel was not known to Sirach", and "had so celebrated a person as Daniel been known, he could hardly have escaped mention in such a complete list of Israel's leading spirits", Professor Prince is, as has been shown above, going beyond what his premises justify.

1. For, first, let us suppose that the book of Daniel was unknown to Ben Sira. What follows? Not necessarily, as Professor Prince concludes, that there was no such book in existence. Here is a fallacy which few writers on Old Testament introduction seem able to avoid. They confound the time of the writing of an Old Testament book with the time of its assumption into the collection of the canon. The New Testament books were presumably all written before the close of the first century A.D. Their acknowledgment as canonical, and their collection into one book, took place many years afterwards. So, the books of the Old Testament may have been written centuries before they were recognized as canonical, or admitted into the collection of the sacred scriptures. Daniel, for example, may have been written in Babylon in the 6th century B.C., and may not have been received officially into the canon of the Palestinian Jews until after its predictions had been so significantly and accurately fulfilled in the events of the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

To be sure, according to Josephus, the High Priest Judua showed the predictions of the book to Alexander the

Great in 332 B.C. To be sure, also, the author of the First Book of Maccabees represents Mattathias as inciting the Asmoneans to rebellion against Antiochus in 169 B.C., by citing the deliverance of the three children from the flames and of Daniel from the lions' den. But while Jaddua in the fourth century B.C. may have known of the book, and while Mattathias and his hearers may have known about the fiery furnace and the deliverance from the lions in 169 B.C.; it may be possible that Ben Sira, who wrote his work about 180 B.C. was, as Professor Prince and others have brought themselves to believe, entirely ignorant of both the book and the person of Daniel. Jaddua may have known the book. Mattathias and his hearers may have known the person, but for some reason unknown to us Ben Sira may have been unacquainted with either the book or the person of Daniel. But all this does not prove that the book did not exist in the time of Ben Sira, or that the facts recorded in the book of Daniel had not occurred. For the collection of the sacred books to which Ben Sira had access may not have contained the book of Daniel; or, for reasons deemed sufficiently good by him, may not have been acknowledged as canonical. As has been shown above, he may have known the book, but on account of its doctrines, or of the locality in which its deeds were enacted, he may have refused to recognize its authority, or to celebrate its heroes. Or, the book may not have been accessible to him; for it is a mistake to suppose that all of the books recognized as canonical were at that time bound together in a single volume. Dr. Gregory of Leipzig has shown that folios did not come into use till the second century A.D. Before that time, it was the sacred books (*biblia*) that men had, not the holy Bible, or book (*biblion*). The oldest MS of the Hebrew scriptures, whose date is generally accepted, contains only the Prophets. The next oldest has nothing but the Law. Till printing came into vogue, few institutions, or churches, and still fewer individuals, had a complete collection of the books of the Canon. It is not to be

imagined that among the scattered and impoverished Jews of the second century B.C. there were many who were fortunate enough to possess copies of all the Old Testament books. Josephus states that a copy of the Law, which had been laid up in the temple, was carried in the triumphal procession of Titus; but he does not say whether by Law he means only the Pentateuch, or the whole Old Testament. In his *Life*, section 75, he says that he himself received from Titus as a special mark of his favor, the "holy books" indicating clearly that he considered this gift of the Caesar as a noteworthy concession. The Prologue to Ecclesiasticus affirms that Ben Sira the elder had given himself much to the reading of the Law, and of the Prophets, and of the other books of the fathers. What and how many books these were, he does not state. It is altogether possible that he had not access to a copy of the book of Daniel, and that for this reason his language shows no signs of having been influenced by it. If the book of Daniel had been in circulation in Palestine in his time, it is hardly possible, however, to perceive how something of the principal events and persons described in it could have been utterly unknown to Ben Sira. This knowledge must have seemed to him to be of such a character as not to justify him in placing Daniel among his famous men, especially in view of the fact that he thought best to omit from his list so many others that to us seem equally worthy of mention.

2. Secondly, let us suppose that Ben Sira did not even know that a man called Daniel had ever lived. In answer to this supposition, one might content himself with referring to the fact that Ezekiel twice mentions a Daniel as a wise man of equal standing with Noah and Job. Since Ezekiel wrote in the early half of the sixth century B.C., the Daniel to whom he refers must have lived as early, at least, as that time; and there is no other Daniel known to history, except the Daniel of our book, who can by any possibility have been referred to in such a connection. Josephus, also, treats Daniel as an historical character. This he would not have

done, unless it had been the common opinion of the Jews of his time. Moreover, he and his contemporaries had access to many sources of information which have since ceased to exist. These sources covered the period of the Maccabees. But no one of them gives a hint that anyone had ever suspected that Daniel was a fictitious character, or that the account of him given in his book is not historical.

The author of the First Book of Maccabees, also, considered Daniel to be an historical person; for he says that Mattathias, the father of Judas Maccabaeus, exhorted his adherents in the following words: "Call to remembrance what acts our fathers did in their time; so shall you receive great honor and an everlasting name. Was not Abraham found faithful in temptation, and it was imputed unto him for righteousness? Joseph in the time of his distress kept the commandment, and was made lord of Egypt. Phinees our father in being zealous and fervent obtained the covenant of an everlasting priesthood. Jesus for fulfilling the word was made a judge in Israel. Caleb for bearing witness before the congregation received the heritage of the land. David for being merciful possessed the throne of an everlasting kingdom. Elias for being zealous and fervent for the law was taken up into heaven. Ananias, Azarias, and Misael, by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of the lions. And thus consider ye throughout all ages, that none that put their trust in him shall be overcome."

The first book of Maccabees records the history of the Jews from 169 to 135 B.C. and is our principal source of information for the events of which it speaks. The speech of Mattathias was, according to the author of First Maccabees, made in 169 B.C. According to the view of those who deny that there ever was a real Daniel, the book named after him was written about June 164 B.C., about five years after the speech was delivered. Is it possible that a reliable author, such as the writer of First Maccabees certainly was, would have put such statements with regard to Daniel and

his companions into a speech made five years before the work of fiction containing the suppositious history of them was written?

Again, how can we account for the fact that the author of Maccabees, if he himself manufactured the speech, should have placed these fictitious characters in the very climax of his heroic appeal? If he had had a suspicion even that they were not real persons, and that there had been no deliverance from the flame and from the lions, would he have finished this magnificent call to patriotism and faith by descending from the thrilling experiences of Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, David, and Elijah,—all bearing directly upon his attempt to stir up his hearers to their noblest endeavors for God and country—by descending, I say, to such bathos as this? Surely, also, the author of this speech must have known that the enthusiasm of the hearers could not be aroused by appealing to the example of men whose names and deeds were unknown to them. If Mattathias made this speech, it shows that he esteemed the traditions about Daniel as being of equal value with those concerning the others to whom he appeals. If the author of First Maccabees composed the speech, and put it into the mouth of Mattathias, he must have thought, at least, that those for whom he wrote his history would acknowledge that Mattathias might have made such a speech, and that his hearers might have understood it. That it is a good speech for the alleged purpose of it, no one can deny. That it accomplished its purpose is equally undeniable. Finally, the author of First Maccabees writes like one who had first hand information of the facts that he records. He probably lived throughout most, if not all, of the stirring times which Daniel predicts and that he describes. Is it not, then, remarkable that if the book of Daniel were first written in 164 B.C., and had been expressly published with the purpose of exciting the flagging energies of the despondent and faithless Jews, that no mention is made in First Maccabees of any such publication, or even of its author?

But no. The references to Daniel and his companions are made in the same way as to Abraham and David, showing clearly, that the author put the sources of Daniel in the same class as the Law and the Prophets.

That the Jews of the first century A.D., also, considered Daniel to be an historical person is abundantly shown, moreover, in the numerous references which the New Testament writers make to the book. It will not do to say that they would have referred to it in the same way and with the same frequency, if they had looked upon it as fiction; for they do not thus refer to Judith, Tobit, and other works of a fictitious character.

Now, against this consentient testimony of the New Testament writers, Josephus, and the Maccabees, as to the existence of a knowledge of Daniel and of his book before the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, what have those who deny this knowledge to advance? Nothing but two opinions: first, that these writers, whose honesty they will probably admit, did not have the opportunity or the intelligence to judge correctly on such subjects; and secondly, that it is impossible that there can have been predictions of such a character as those to be found in the book of Daniel.

I. (I) As to the first of these opinions, it may be remarked, first, with reference to the New Testament writers, that, inspiration aside, they certainly give us the views prevalent among the Jews of their time. Writers like the apostle Paul must have known the history of the Jewish people from the time of the High Priest Simon the Just onward, much better, at least, than any one can know it today. Hostile readers and critics, such as those to whom the epistle to the Hebrews was directed, render it incredible that an educated author, such as he was who wrote this epistle, could have referred to what he considered to be imaginary events and persons in the clauses "stopped the mouths of lions", and "quenched the violence of fire". Whether Paul, or Apollos, or whoever wrote this epistle, he was certainly acquainted with the history of Israel, and

he undeniably meant to give us a list of the real heroes of faith, in order to stimulate his readers to follow their example. Such a stimulus could not have been derived from the supposititious heroes of romance, any more than it could be today; unless, indeed, both writer and readers believed that they were historical. Let our belief in the truthfulness of the cherry tree incident be dissipated, and it will be vain to cite the veracity of the boy Washington to excite the emulation of the youth of America. Let our belief in the reality of the miracles and privations of the saints be destroyed, and these signal events of their lives will at once cease to be ensamples for our conduct and consolation. Let our belief in the fact of the incarnation, or of the resurrection, and in the correctness of the records of the words and deeds of Jesus once be done away, and our appeal to sinners to accept of Jesus as their Lord and Savior will inevitably loose its conviction and its power. These are psychological facts, which the experience of every one will approve as true.

In like manner, we must agree that the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews would not have appealed to imaginary characters and events to support and strengthen the failing faith of his readers. He must, then, himself have believed that Daniel and his companions lived and acted as the book of Daniel asserts that they did. Living within 250 years of the time when some assume that the book of Daniel was written, and at a time of great literary activity, it is scarcely possible that a writer of such intelligence as is displayed throughout the epistle to the Hebrews should not have known whether the heroes that he cites as examples were real or fictitious characters.

(2) Secondly, as to Josephus, we have in him a witness whose honesty and intelligence no one can dispute. His opportunity to learn the facts can alone be controverted. But we have no evidence with regard to what he says about Daniel, to show that he can be effectually controverted. For he lived only about 250 years after the time of the

Maccabees, and all of the earlier part of his life was passed in Palestine. He had access to all of the religious literature of the Jews and to all of the profane literature of the Gentiles, and was thoroughly acquainted with all the laws, institutions, and traditions of his people. Of all ancient historians, none but Polybius and Pliny cite as many authorities, and no one as many archives, as he. No one so often appeals to the best sources of information on the different matters of which he treats. Nor does anyone so persistently defy all critics, nor so consistently marshal the testimony of the original sources.

Now, Josephus treats the book of Daniel as historical, and gives six whole pages of Whiston's translation, embracing all of the tenth and eleventh chapters of Book X of his *Antiquities of the Jews*, to a narration of the principal events of Daniel's career. In language which cannot be surpassed, he says of him (Book X. XI. 7), "it is fit to give an account of what this man did, which is most admirable to hear; for he was so happy as to have strange revelations made to him, . . ., and now that he is dead, he retains a remembrance that will never fail, for the several books that he wrote and left behind him are still read by us till this time; and from them we believe that Daniel conversed with God. . . . He also wrote and left behind him what made manifest the accuracy and undeniable veracity of his predictions. . . . And indeed, it so came to pass that our nation suffered these things under Antiochus Epiphanes, according to Daniel's vision, and what he wrote many years before they came to pass. In the very same manner, also, Daniel wrote concerning the Roman government, and that our country should be made desolate by them. All these things did this man leave in writing, as God had showed them to him, insomuch that such as read his prophecies and see how they have been fulfilled would wonder at the honor wherewith God honored Daniel, and may thence discover how the Epicureans are in error, who cast providence out of human life, and do not believe that God takes care of

the affairs of the world, nor that the universe is governed and continued in being by that blessed and immortal nature."

From these citations from Josephus it appears clearly that this careful writer, whose great vocation in life it was to defend the institutions and writers of his nation, and to describe the persons and events of its history, never harbored a suspicion that the book of Daniel was other than historical, or was in any wise different, as a trustworthy source of information, from the other books of the Old Testament, whose records, as Josephus says in his first treatise against Apion, section 6, "had been written all along down to his own times with the utmost accuracy". "For we have not", says he, in section 8, "an innumerable number of books among us, disagreeing from and contradicting one another, but only twenty-two books, which contain the records of all the past times. And of them five belong to Moses, which contain his laws, and the traditions of the origin of mankind till his death. But as to the time from the death of Moses till the reign of Artaxerxes king of Persia, who reigned after Xerxes, the prophets who were after Moses, wrote down what was done in their times in thirteen books. The remaining four books contain hymns to God, and precepts for the conduct of human life." From this last statement of Josephus it is apparent that he classed Daniel among the prophets, and deemed his book of equal authority with the rest.

2. As to the second opinion mentioned above (page 468), that it is impossible that there can have been predictions of such a character as those to be found in the book of Daniel, let it suffice to say here that to one who grants the possibility and the fact of a revelation from God it is unreasonable to lay down the limits and to define the character of that revelation. It is at least probable that God would speak in divers manners through the prophets. No man, be he ever so wise, can say to the All Wise: Thus must Thou have spoken, or not at all. The length, the detailed

description, and the literary form of the revelation, may differ as widely as the truth permits; but they do not affect the truth. God alone can be the judge of how, and when, and where, and to whom, He will reveal His thoughts and plans.

V. The fifth assumption of those who assert that Ben Sira knew nothing about Daniel, is based on the allegation that Ben Sira states that there was no man like Joseph, "whereas the narratives respecting Daniel represent him much like unto Joseph in regard to both the high distinction he attained and the faculties he displayed; and further, the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives in Genesis concerning Joseph."⁹

By the method pursued by Dr. Driver in this citation, we could establish, or condemn, almost any proposition ever made. By omitting the qualifying clauses of Ben Sira's statement, he has made him appear to say what he does not say at all. Ben Sira does not make the very questionable assertion that no man like Joseph was ever born; but, that no man was born like Joseph in this respect, that his dead body was mustered (*i.e.*, counted in the muster). In the preceding verse, according to Smend's and Strack's texts of the Hebrew original, he had just said that "few were formed upon earth like Enoch, in that he was taken away bodily". In the 16th verse, he says that no man was born like Joseph in that his body was mustered. The two verses are of the same construction. In each case, the comparison is limited by the second clause of the verse; and the statements of the first clauses, when thus limited, are in both cases perfectly true. At least, it is perfectly true concerning Joseph.¹⁰ For of no other man could it be said that his dead body had been preserved as was that of Joseph in Egypt, and mustered as his was among the embattled hosts of

⁹ See Driver, *Daniel*, pages 17 and 64.

¹⁰ In the case of Enoch it might be doubted whether in view of Elijah's ascension it could be said that he alone of all men had been translated bodily.

Israel. In this particular, Joseph was and will be forever unlike all other men; and it is in this particular that Ben Sira says that Joseph was unlike all other men. He does not say a word, or give a hint, as to his meaning to suggest or insinuate that no one was like Joseph "as to both the high distinction he attained and the faculties he displayed".

Nor will Dr. Driver's assertion derive any support from the Greek version of Ecclesiasticus, which reads: "Neither was there a man born like unto Joseph, a governor of his brethren, a stay of his people, whose bones were regarded of the Lord." Nor will the Syriac Version help him; for it reads: "And no mother has borne a child like Joseph, in that his body was assembled (*i.e.*, gathered to his fathers) in peace."

As to the further part of the citation from Dr. Driver, that "the very wording of the narratives in the first part of Daniel is modelled after that of the narratives of Genesis concerning Joseph", it has absolutely nothing to do with the question of the date of the composition of the book of Daniel. Since, according to Dr. Driver himself, the whole history of Joseph belongs to the so-called Jehovistic and Elohist documents (LOT, 17), and since critics agree that both of these documents were certainly finished before 750 B.C. (LOT, 122), it is perfectly obvious that a writer of the sixth century B.C. may have imitated the account in Genesis as readily as one who lived in the second century B.C.

Moreover, in only three particulars can the life of Daniel be said to resemble that of Joseph. They were both captives at the court of a mighty foreign monarch; they both rose to positions of pre-eminence at these respective courts; and they both rose because of their skill in the interpretation of dreams. In all other respects their lives differ as much as it is possible for human lives, especially of men in somewhat similar circumstances, to differ. But finally and chiefly, it is to be noted that it is not to one of these resemblances, but to one of the differences, between Joseph

and Daniel, that Ben Sira calls our attention; that is, that something was done with the body of Joseph such as never happened in the case of any other man. For when Joseph was about to die, he gave commandment concerning his bones, saying to the children of Israel: God will surely visit you, and ye shall carry up my bones from hence (Genesis 1. 25). In Exodus xiii. 19, we are told that Moses took the bones of Joseph with him, when he went out of the land of Egypt; and in Joshua xxiv. 32, it is said that the children of Israel buried these bones, which they had brought all the way from Egypt, in a parcel of ground in Shechem which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph.

This was the unique, the unparalleled, event in the history of Joseph. It was recognized as such by Ben Sira in his day, and by the writer of the epistle to the Hebrews in his. And it must be recognized by us today. In this one respect there was no one like him among all the children of Israel, nor ever has been, nor ever can be among all the sons of men.

CONCLUSION

Having thus considered fully all of the objections to the early date of the book of Daniel made on the ground of the silence of Ben Sira with respect to it, there seems to be no sufficient reason for doubting the conclusion that notwithstanding this silence the book of Daniel may have been in existence before 180 B.C.

Princeton, New Jersey.

ROBERT DICK WILSON.