

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

PayPal

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

DANIEL IN THE CRITICS' DEN

DANIEL IN THE CRITICS' DEN

A REPLY

TO

DEAN FARRAR'S 'BOOK OF DANIEL

BY

ROBERT ANDERSON, LL.D.

BARRISTER-AT-LAW;

ASSISTANT COMMISSIONER OF POLICE OF THE METROPOLIS

WILLIAM BLACKWOOD AND SONS

EDINBURGH AND LONDON

MDCCCXCV

P R E F A C E.

THE Daniel controversy has hitherto been regarded as the special preserve of the philologist. Who but he is qualified to decide to what epoch any portion of the Hebrew Scriptures should be assigned? The claim, however, is based upon a fallacy. The whole question turns upon a simple issue of fact—"Was the book in existence before the days of Antiochus?" If this be decided in the affirmative, its prophetic character is unquestionable; and this, again, practically involves the admission that it is the work of the Daniel of the Exile.

And an issue of this kind demands an inquiry essentially judicial. An experienced judge with an intelligent jury, accustomed to sift and weigh conflicting testimony, would here be a fitter tribunal than any board of specialists, however eminent. The philologist can supply but a part, and that by no means the most important part, of the necessary evidence. And if a single well-ascertained fact be inconsistent with the theory he advocates, the fact must prevail. But this the specialist is proverbially slow to recognise. Whatever the subject-matter of the inquiry, he is apt to exaggerate the importance of his own testimony, and to betray impatience when evidence of another kind is allowed its legitimate weight. Nowhere, moreover, is this tendency more marked than among the critics.

Here, then, is the author's apology for

this volume. Accustomed to deal with evidence in inquiries quite as difficult and intricate, he has set himself to investigate the question of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel. And he ventures to think no competent judge would arrive at any other conclusion than that here recorded—that the indictment which the Higher Criticism has framed against this portion of the Scripture cannot be sustained. So striking is the apparent completeness of the hostile evidence adduced in support of that indictment, that persons unused to judicial inquiries are ready at once to accept an adverse verdict. But—to pursue the figure—that evidence fails under cross-examination; and when we come to hear the other side, which Higher Criticism ignores, the weight of proof in its favour seems overwhelming.

A word as to the tone and manner of

the reply here offered to the Dean of Canterbury's recent work.¹ The character of the attack has naturally influenced the spirit of the defence. A treatise of another kind — such, for example, as Professor Driver's or Professor Cheyne's, both so conspicuously moderate and fair — would invite discussion in a tone of philosophic calmness. But to maintain such an attitude of mind in dealing with the book here under review would betray deficiency of moral sense.

In respect of some of the defects which mark the present volume, the author can only appeal to the indulgence of the reader. In a life of peculiarly engrossing and anxious work, hours which might fitly be devoted to recreation or rest are scarcely the most

¹ *The Expositor's Bible: The Book of Daniel.* By F. W. Farrar, D.D., F.R.S. (Hodder & Stoughton, 1895.)

suitable for such a task. But the result may perhaps be accepted for the moment, until some worthier pen supplies a want which Dr Farrar's book has brought into prominence.

It only remains to add that these pages are based upon the writer's article in *Blackwood's Magazine* for April 1895.

39 LINDEN GARDENS, W.,
14th October 1895.

DANIEL IN THE CRITICS' DEN.



CHAPTER I.

By "all people of discernment" the "Higher Criticism" is now held in the greatest repute. And discernment is a quality for which the dullest of men are keen to claim credit. It may safely be assumed that not one person in a score of those who eagerly disclaim belief in the visions of Daniel has ever seriously considered the question. The literature upon the subject is but dull reading at best, and the inquiry demands a combination of qualities which is comparatively rare. A newspaper review of some ponderous treat-

ise, or a frothy discourse by some popular preacher, will satisfy most men. The German literature upon the controversy they know nothing of, and the writings of scholars like Professor Driver of Oxford are by no means to their taste, and probably beyond their capacity. Dean Farrar's *Book of Daniel* will therefore supply a much-felt want. Ignored by scholars it certainly will be, and the majority of serious theologians will deplore it; but it will supply "the man in the street" with a reason for the unfaith that is in him. The narrowness with which it emphasises everything that either erudition or ignorance can urge upon one side of a great controversy, to the exclusion of the rest, will relieve him from the irksome task of thinking out the problem for himself; and its pedantry is veiled by rhetoric of a type which will admirably suit him. He cannot fail to be deeply impressed by "the acervation of endless conjectures," and "the unconsciously disingenuous resourcefulness of

traditional harmonics." His acquaintance with the unseen world will be enlarged by discovering that Gabriel, who appeared to the prophet, is "the archangel,"¹ and by learning that "it is only after the Exile that we find angels and demons playing a more prominent part than before, divided into classes, and even marked out by special names."² It is not easy to decide whether this statement is the more astonishing when examined as a specimen of English, or when regarded as a dictum to guide us in the study of Scripture. But all this relates only to the form of the book. When we come to consider its substance, the spirit which pervades it, and the results to which it leads, a sense of distress and shame will commingle with our amazement.

What the dissecting-room is to the physician the Higher Criticism is to the theologian. In its proper sphere its value is immense, and it has made large additions to our knowledge

¹ P. 275.

² P. 191.

of the Bible. But it demands not only skill and care, but reverence; and if these be wanting, it cannot fail to be mischievous. A man of the baser sort may become so degraded by the use of the surgeon's knife that he loses all respect for the body of his patient, and the sick-room is to him but the antechamber to the mortuary. And can we with impunity forget the reverence that is due to "the living and eternally abiding Word of God"?

It behoves us to distinguish between the Higher Criticism as a means to clear away from that Word corruptions and excrescences, and to gain a more intelligent appreciation of its mysteries, and the Higher Criticism as a rationalistic and anti-christian crusade, whose end and aim is to eliminate God from the Bible. Regarded in this aspect, it was the impure growth of the scepticism which well-nigh swamped the religious life of Germany in the eighteenth century.

Eichhorn set himself to account for the

miracles of Scripture. The poetic warmth of oriental thought and language sufficed, in his judgment, to explain them. The writers wrote as they were accustomed to think, leaving out of view all second causes, and attributing results immediately to God. This theory had its day. It obtained enthusiastic acceptance for a time. But rival hypotheses were put forward to dispute its sway, and at last it was discarded in favour of the system with which the name of De Wette is prominently associated. The sacred writers were honest and true, but their teaching was based, not upon personal knowledge, still less upon divine inspiration, but upon ancient authorities by which they were misled. Their errors were due to the excessive literalness with which they accepted as facts the legends of earlier days. De Wette, like Eichhorn, honestly desired to rescue the Bible from the reproach which had fallen upon it. Upon them at least the halo of departed truth still rested. But

others were restrained by no such influence. "With the ignorance of Pagans and the animus of apostates" they perverted the Scriptures and tore them to pieces.

One of the old psalms,¹ in lamenting with exquisite sadness the ruin brought by the heathen upon the holy city and land, declares that fame was apportioned according to zeal and success in the work of destruction. A like spirit has animated the host of the critics. It is a distressing and baneful ordeal to find oneself in the company of those who have no belief in the virtue of women. The mind thus poisoned learns to regard with suspicion the purest inmates of a pure home. And a too close familiarity with the vile literature of the sceptics leads to a kindred distrust of all that is true and holy in our most true and holy faith. Every chapter of this book gives proof to what an extent its author has suffered this moral and spiritual deterioration; and no one can

¹ Ps. lxxiv.

accept its teaching without sinking, imperceptibly it may be, but surely and inevitably, to the same level. Kuenen, one of the worst of the foreign sceptics, is Dean Farrar's master and guide in the interpretation of Daniel. And the result is that he revels in puerilities and extravagances of exegesis and criticism which the best of our British contemporary scholars are careful to repudiate.

The Book of Daniel is not "the work of a prophet in the Exile" (if indeed such a personage as Daniel ever really existed), "but of some faithful *Chasid* in the days of the Seleucid tyrant."¹ Its pretended miracles are but moral fables. Its history is but idle legend, abounding in "violent errors" of the grossest kind.² Its so-called predictions alone are accurate, because they were but the record of recent or contemporary events. But Dr Farrar will not tolerate a word of blame upon "the holy and

¹ P. 118.

² P. 45.

gifted Jew”¹ who wrote it. No thought of deceiving any one ever crossed his mind.² The reproach which has been heaped upon him has been wholly owing to Jewish arrogance and Christian stupidity in misreading his charming and elevating romance. For it is not only fiction, but “*avowed* fiction,”³ and was never meant to be regarded in any other light. In a word, the book is nothing more than a religious novel, differing from other kindred works only in its venerable antiquity and the multiplicity of its blunders.

Accepting these results, then, what action shall we take upon them? In proportion surely to our appreciation of the preciousness of Holy Scripture, shall be our resoluteness in tearing the Book of Daniel from its place in the sacred canon and relegating it to the same shelf with *Bel and the Dragon* and *The Story of Susanna*. By no means. Dr Farrar will stay our hand by the assurance that

¹ P. 119.

² Pp. 43, 85.

³ P. 43.

“Those results . . . are in no way derogatory to the preciousness of this Old Testament Apocalypse.” “No words of mine,” he declares, “can exaggerate the value which I attach to this part of our Canonical Scriptures. . . . Its right to a place in the Canon is undisputed and indisputable, and there is scarcely a single book of the Old Testament which can be made more richly ‘profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, completely furnished unto every good work.’”¹

Christian writers who find reason to reject one portion of the sacred canon or another are eager to insist that in doing so they increase the authority and enhance the value

¹ P. 4. Again and again throughout this volume the author uses like words in praise of the Book of Daniel. Here are a few of them: “It is indeed a noble book, full of glorious lessons” (p. 36). “Its high worth and canonical authority” (p. 37). “So far from undervaluing its teaching, I have always been strongly drawn to this book of Scripture” (p. 37). “We acknowledge the canonicity of the book, its high value when rightly apprehended, and its rightful acceptance as a sacred book” (p. 90). And most wonderful of all, at p. 118 the author declares that, in exposing it as a work of fiction, “We add to its real value”!

of the rest. It has remained for the Dean of Canterbury, in impugning the Book of Daniel, to insult and degrade the Bible as a whole. An expert examines for me the contents of my purse. I spread out nine-and-thirty sovereigns upon the table, and after close inspection he marks out one as a counterfeit. As I console myself for the loss by the deepened confidence I feel that all the rest are sterling coin, he checks me by the assurance that there is scarcely a single one of them which is any better. The Book of Daniel is nothing more than a religious novel, and it teems with errors on every page, and yet we are gravely told that of all the thirty-nine books of the Old Testament there is *scarcely a single book* which is of any higher worth! The expert's estimate of the value of my coins is clear. No less obvious is Dr Farrar's estimate of the value of the books of the Bible.

It is precisely this element which renders this volume so pernicious. The apostle

declares that "Every Scripture *inspired of God* is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work;" and in profanely applying these words to a romance of doubtful repute, Dr Farrar denies inspiration altogether.

But "What is inspiration?" some one may demand. In another connection the inquiry might be apt; here it is the merest quibble. Plain men brush aside all the intricacies of the controversy which the answer involves, and seize upon the fact that the Bible is a divine revelation. But no one can yield to the spirit which pervades this book without coming to raise the question, "Have we a revelation at all?" The Higher Criticism, as a rationalistic crusade, has set itself to account for the Bible on natural principles; and this is the spirit which animates the Dean of Canterbury's treatise.

CHAPTER II.

“THE historical errors” of the Book of Daniel are the first ground of the critic’s attack upon its authenticity. Of these he enumerates the following:—

(1.) “There was no deportation in the third year of Jehoiakim.”

(2.) “There was no King Belshazzar.”

(3.) “There was no Darius the Mede.”

(4.) “It is not true that there were only two Babylonian kings—there were five.”

(5.) “Nor were there only four Persian kings—there were twelve.”

(6.) Xerxes seems to be confounded with the last king of Persia.

(7.) And “All correct accounts of the

reign of Antiochus Epiphanes seem to end about B.C. 164."

Such is the indictment under this head. Two other points are included, but these have nothing to do with *history*; first, that the decrees of Nebuchadnezzar are extraordinary—which may at once be conceded—and secondly, that "the notion that a faithful Jew could become president of the Chaldean magi is impossible"—a statement which only exemplifies the thoughtless dogmatism of the writer, for, according to his own scheme, it was a "*holy and gifted Jew*," brought up under the severe ritual of post-exilic days, who assigned this position to Daniel. A like remark applies to his criticism upon Dan. ii. 46—with this addition, that that criticism betokens either carelessness or malice on the part of the critics, for the passage in no way justifies the assertion that the prophet accepted either the worship or the sacrifice offered him.

So far as the other points are concerned, we may at once dismiss (4), (5), and (6), for the errors here ascribed to Daniel will be sought for in vain. They are "read into" the book by the perverseness or ignorance of the rationalists.¹ And as for (7), where was the account of the reign of Antiochus to end, if not in the year of his death?

¹ As regards (5) and (6), the way "kisses and kicks" alternate in Dr Farrar's treatment of his mythical "Chasid" is amusing. At one moment he is praised for his genius and erudition; the next he is denounced as an ignoramus or a fool! Considering how inseparably the history of Judah had been connected with the history of Persia, the suggestion that a cultured Jew of Maccabean days could have made the gross blunder here attributed to him is quite unworthy of notice.

And may I explain for the enlightenment of the critic that Dan. xi. 2 is a prophecy relating to the prophecy which precedes it? It is a consecutive prediction of events *within the period of the seventy weeks*. There were to be "yet" (*i.e.*, after the rebuilding of Jerusalem) "three kings in Persia." These were Darius Nothus, Artaxerxes Mnemon, and Ochus; the brief and merely nominal reigns of Xerxes II., Sogdianus, and Arogus being ignored—two of them, indeed, being omitted from the canon of Ptolemy. "The fourth" (and last) king was Darius Codomanus, whose fabulous wealth attracted the cupidity of the Greeks.

The statement is one of numerous instances of slipshod carelessness in this extraordinary addition to our theological literature.

The Bible states that there was a deportation in the reign of Jehoiakim: the critic asserts there was none; and the Christian must decide between them. Nothing can be clearer than the language of Chronicles,¹ and, even regarding the book as a purely secular record, it is simply preposterous to reject without a shadow of reason the Chronicler's statement on a matter of such immense interest and importance in the national history. But, it is objected, Kings and Jeremiah are silent upon the subject. If this were true, which it is not, it would be an additional reason for turning to Chronicles to supply the omission. But Kings gives clear corroboration of Chronicles. Speaking of Jehoiakim, it says: "In his days Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, came up, and Jehoiakim became his servant

¹ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 6.

three years; then he turned and rebelled against him.”¹ Daniel² tells us this was in his *third* year, and that Jerusalem was besieged upon the occasion. This difficulty again springs from the habit of “reading into” Scripture more than it says. There is not a word about a taking by storm. The king was a mere puppet, and presumably he made his submission as soon as the city was invested. Nebuchadnezzar took him prisoner, but afterwards relented, and left him in Jerusalem as his vassal, a position he had till then held under the King of Egypt.

But Dr Farrar’s statements here are worthy of fuller notice, so thoroughly typical are they of his style and methods. For three years Jehoiakim was Nebuchadnezzar’s vassal. This is admitted, and Scripture accounts for it by recording a Babylonian invasion in his third year. But says the critic—

“It was not till the following year, when Ne-

¹ 2 Kings xxiv. 1.

² C. i. 1.

buchadrezzar, acting as his father's general, had defeated Egypt at the battle of Carchemish, that any siege of Jerusalem would have been possible. Nor did Nebuchadrezzar advance against the Holy City even after the battle of Carchemish, but dashed home across the desert to secure the crown of Babylon on hearing the news of his father's death."

The idea of dashing across the desert from Carchemish to Babylon is worthy of a board-school essay! The critic is here adopting the record of the Babylonian historian Berosus, in complete unconsciousness of the significance of his testimony. We learn from Berosus that it was as Prince-royal of Babylon, at the head of his father's army, that Nebuchadnezzar invaded Palestine. And, after recording how in the course of that expedition Nebuchadnezzar heard of his father's death, the historian goes on to relate that he "committed *the captives he had taken from the Jews,*" &c., to the charge of others, "while he went in haste over the desert to Babylon."¹ Could corroboration of

¹ Josephus, *Contra Apion*, i. 19.

Scripture be more complete and emphatic? The fact that he had Jewish captives is evidence that he had invaded Judea. Proof of it is afforded by the further fact that the desert lay between him and Babylon. Carchemish was in the far north by the Euphrates, and the road thence to the Chaldean capital lay clear of the desert altogether. Moreover, the battle of Carchemish was fought in Jehoiakim's *fourth* year, and therefore after Nebuchadnezzar's accession; whereas the invasion of Judea was during Nabopolassar's lifetime, and therefore in Jehoiakim's *third* year, precisely as the Book of Daniel avers.¹

It only remains to add that Scripture nowhere speaks of a *general* "deportation" in the third year of Jehoiakim. Here, as

¹ The question of course arises how this battle should have been fought *after* the successful campaign of the preceding year. There are plausible explanations of this, but I offer none. Scripture has suffered grievously from the eagerness of its defenders to put forward hypotheses to explain seeming difficulties.

elsewhere, the critic attributes his own errors to the Bible, and then proceeds to refute them. The narrative is explicit that on this occasion Nebuchadnezzar returned with no captives save a few cadets of the royal house and of the noble families. But Dr Farrar writes: "*Among the captives* were certain of the king's seed and of the princes." Nor is this all: he goes on to say, "They are called 'children,' and the word, together with the context, seems to imply that they were boys of the age of from twelve to fourteen." What Daniel says is that these, *the only captives*, were "skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding science." What prodigies those Jewish boys must have been! The word translated "children" in the A.V. is more correctly rendered "youths" in the R.V. Its scope may be inferred from the use of it in 1 Kings xii. 8, which tells us that Rehoboam "forsook the counsel of the old men, and took counsel with the *young men* that

were grown up with him." This last point is material mainly as showing the animus of the critic.¹

But the Scripture speaks of *King* Nebuchadnezzar in the third year of Jehoiakim, whereas it was not till his fourth year that Nabopolassar died. No doubt. And a writer of Maccabean days, with the history of Berosus before him, would probably have noticed the point. But the so-called inaccuracy is precisely one of the incidental proofs that the Book of Daniel was the work of a contemporary of Nebuchadnezzar. The historian of the future will never assert that Queen Victoria lived at one time in Kensington Palace, though the statement will be found in the newspapers which recorded

¹ The only reason for representing Daniel as a mere boy of twelve or fourteen is that thereby discredit is cast upon the statement that three years later he was placed at the head of "the wise men" of Babylon. It is with a real sense of distress and pain that I find myself compelled to use such language. But it would need a volume to expose the errors, misstatements, and perversions of which the above are typical instances. They occur in every chapter of Dr Farrar's book.

the unveiling of her statue in Kensington Gardens.

The references to Jeremiah raise the question whether the book records the utterances of an inspired prophet, or whether, as Dr Farrar's criticisms assume, the author of the book wrote merely as a religious teacher.¹ This question, however, is too large to treat of here, and the discussion of it is wholly unnecessary, for the careful student will find in Jeremiah the clearest proof that Scripture is right and the critics wrong. The objection depends on confounding the seventy years of the "Servitude to Babylon" with the seventy years of "the Desolations of Jerusalem"—another of the numerous blunders which discredit the work under review.² "The Captivity," which is confounded with both, was not an era of seventy years at all. The prophecy of the twenty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah was a warning addressed to the

¹ The careful reader of Dr Farrar's book will not fail to see that his references to the prophets generally imply a denial of the truth of **II** Pet. i. 20, 21.

² P. 289.

people who remained in the land after the servitude had begun, that if they continued impenitent and rebellious, God would bring upon them a further judgment—the terrible scourge of “the Desolations.” The prophecy of the twenty-ninth chapter was a message of hope to the Jews of the Captivity. And what was that message? That “after seventy years be accomplished for Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you, in causing you to return to this place.”¹ And that promise was faithfully fulfilled. The servitude began in the third year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 606-605). It ended in B.C. 536, when Cyrus issued his decree for the return of the exiles. By the test of chronology, therefore—the severest test which can be applied to historical statements—the absolute accuracy of these Scriptures is established.

¹ Jer. xxix. 10, R.V. The word is “*for* [not *at*] Babylon.” This seventy years dated not from their deportation to Babylon as captives, but from their subjection to the suzerainty of Babylon.

CHAPTER III.

THE careful student in search of what sober and serious scholarship has to urge against the authenticity of Daniel will turn to such a work as Professor Driver's *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*. And he will there learn that "it may be admitted as probable that Belsharuzar held command for his father in Babylon while the latter took the field against Cyrus." And further, that "there remains the possibility that Nabunahid may have sought to strengthen his position by marrying a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, in which case the latter might be spoken of as Belshazzar's father (= grandfather, by Hebrew usage)." So also the

author of the *Ancient Monarchies*, our best historical authority here, tells us that Nabonidus (Nabunahid) "had associated with him in the government his son Belshazzar or Bel-shar-uzur, the grandson of the great Nebuchadnezzar," and "in his father's absence Belshazzar took the direction of affairs within the city."¹ The only question, therefore, is whether Belshazzar being thus left as regent at Babylon, when his father was absent at Borsippa in command of the army, he would be addressed as *king*. But Dr Farrar settles the matter by asserting that "there was no King Belshazzar," and that Belshazzar was "conquered in Borsippa."² This last statement is a mere blunder.

The accuracy of Daniel in this matter is confirmed in a manner which is all the more striking because it is wholly incidental. Why did Belshazzar purpose to make Daniel the *third* ruler in the kingdom? The natural explanation is, that he himself was but *second*.

¹ Rawlinson's *Ancient Mon.*, vol. iii. p. 70.

² P. 54.

“Unhappily for their very precarious hypothesis,” Dr Farrar remarks, “the translation ‘third ruler’ appears to be *entirely untenable*. It means ‘one of a board of three.’”¹ As a test of the author’s erudition and candour, this deserves particular notice. Every scholar, of course, is aware that there is not a word about a “board of three” in the text. This is exegesis, not translation. But is it correct exegesis?

Under the Persian rule there was a cabinet of three, as the sixth chapter tells us; but there is no authority whatever for supposing such a body existed under the empire which it supplanted. As regards chapter v., it will satisfy most people to know that the rendering which Dr Farrar declares to be “entirely untenable” has been adopted by the Old Testament company of revisers. And I have been at the pains to ascertain that the passage was carefully considered, that they had no difficulty in deciding in favour of the read-

¹ P. 57.

ing of the A.V., and that it was not until their final revision that the alternative rendering "one of three" was admitted into the margin. In the distinguished Professor Kautzsch's recent work on the Old Testament,¹ representing the latest and best German scholarship, he adheres to the rendering "third ruler in the kingdom," and his note is, "either as one of three over the whole kingdom, or as third by the side of the king and the king's mother." Behrmann, too, in his recent commentary, adopts the same reading—"as third he was to have authority in the kingdom"—and adds a note referring to the king and his mother as first and second.²

¹ *Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments.*

² In reply to an inquiry I have addressed to him, the Chief Rabbi writes to me as follows: "I have carefully considered the question you laid before me at our pleasant meeting on Sunday relative to the correct interpretation of the passages in Daniel, chapter v., verses 7 and 16. I cannot absolutely find fault with Archdeacon Farrar for translating the words 'the third part of the kingdom,' as he follows herein two of our Hebrew commentators of great repute, Rashi and Ibn Ezra. On the other hand, others of our commentators, such as Saadia, Jachja, &c., translate this passage as 'he shall be

This surely will suffice to silence the critic's objection, and to cast suspicion upon his fairness as a controversialist.

But, we are told, the archæological discoveries of the last few years dispose of the whole question, and compel us entirely to reconstruct the traditional history of the Persian conquest of Babylon. "We now possess the actual records of Nabonidos and Cyrus," Professor Sayce tells us; and he adds, "They are records the truth of which cannot be doubted."¹ What "simple child-like faith" these good men have in ancient records, Holy Scripture only excepted! The principal record here in question is "the

the third ruler in the kingdom.' This rendering seems to be more strictly in accord with the literal meaning of the words, as shown by Dr Winer in his *Grammatik des Chaldaismus*. It also receives confirmation from Sir Henry Rawlinson's remarkable discovery, according to which Belshazzar was the eldest son of King Nabonidus, and associated with him in the government, so that the person next in honour would be the third."

¹ *The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, p. 498.

Annalistic tablet of Cyrus," an inscription of which the transparent design is to represent his conquest of Babylon as the fulfilment of a divine mission, and the realisation of the wishes of the conquered. And any document of the kind, whether dated in the sixth century B.C. or the nineteenth century A.D., is open to grave suspicion, and should be received with caution. Even kings may pervert the truth, and State papers may falsify facts! But even assuming its accuracy, it in no way supports the conclusions which are based upon it. No advance will be made towards a solution of these questions until our Christian scholars shake themselves free from the baneful influence of the sceptics, whose blind hostility to Holy Scripture unfits them for dealing with any controversy of the kind. The following is a typical instance of the effect of the influence I deprecate :—

"But Belshazzar never became king in his father's place. No mention of him is made at

the end of the Annalistic tablet, and it would therefore appear that he was no longer in command of the Babylonian army when the invasion of Cyrus took place. Owing to the unfortunate lacuna in the middle of the tablet we have no account of what became of him, but since we are told not only of the fate of Nabonidos, but also of the death of his wife, it seems probable that Belshazzar was dead. At any rate, when Cyrus entered Babylonia he had already disappeared from history. Here, then, the account given by the Book of Daniel is at variance with the testimony of the Inscriptions. But the contradictions do not end here. The Biblical story implies that Babylon was taken by storm; at all events it expressly states that 'the king of the Chaldeans was slain.' Nabonidos, the Babylonian king, however, was not slain, and Cyrus entered Babylon 'in peace.' Nor was Belshazzar the son of Nebuchadnezzar, as we are repeatedly told in the fifth chapter of Daniel." ¹

¹ *The Higher Crit. and the Mon.*, pp. 525, 526. This last point is typical of the inaccuracy and pertinacity of the critics. We are nowhere told in Daniel that Belshazzar was the son of Nebuchadnezzar. We are told that *he was so addressed* at the Court of Babylon, which is a wholly different matter. He was probably a descendant of the great king, but it is certain that if, rightly or wrongly, he claimed re-

May I criticise the critic? Daniel nowhere avers that Belshazzar became king in his father's place. On the contrary, it clearly implies that he reigned as his father's viceroy. Daniel nowhere suggests that he was in command of the Babylonian army. The Annalistic tablet, on the other hand, tells us that *Nabonidus* was at the head of the army, and that he was at Sippara when the Persian invasion took place, and fled when that town opened its gates to the invaders. To the fact that more than half of the inscription is lost Professor Sayce attributes the absence of all mention of Belshazzar. And yet he goes on to assume, without a shadow of evi-

lationship with him, no one at his Court would dispute the claim. In a table of Babylonian kings I find mention of a daughter of Nebuchadnezzar who married the father of Nabonidus (*Trans. Vict. Inst.*, vol. xviii. p. 99). This of course would dispose of the whole difficulty. She, perhaps, was "the king's mother," whose death eight years before was followed by national mourning (*Annal. Tablet*). To trade on the word "son" is a mere quibble, *ad captandum vulgus*, which has been exposed again and again. (See Pusey's *Daniel*, p. 405, and Rawlinson's *Egypt and Babylon*, p. 155.)

dence, that he had died before the date of the expedition; and upon this utterly baseless conjecture he finds the equally baseless assertion that "Daniel is at variance with the testimony of the Inscriptions"! As a matter of fact, however, the tablet is not silent about Belshazzar. On the contrary, it expressly refers to him, and records his death.

But to resume. Daniel nowhere avers that "Babylon was taken by storm." Neither is it said, "the king of the Chaldeans was slain"; the words are explicit that "*Belshazzar*, the Chaldean king, was slain." How his death was brought about we are not told. He may have fallen in repelling an assault upon the palace, or his death may have been caused in furtherance of the priestly conspiracy in favour of Cyrus, or the "wise men" may have compassed it in revenge for the preferment of Daniel.

All this is mere conjecture. Scripture merely tells us that he was slain, and that

Darius the Mede, aged about sixty-two, "*received* the kingdom." The same word occurs again in ii. 6 ("Ye shall *receive* of me gifts," &c.), and in vii. 18 ("The saints of the Most High shall *receive* the kingdom"). No word could more fitly describe the enthronement of a vassal king or viceroy. No language could be more apt to record a peaceful change of dynasty, such as, according to some of the students of the inscriptions, took place when Nabonidus lost the throne.

But this is not all; and the sequel may well excite the reader's astonishment. Not only are we asked to draw inferences from the silence of this document, though we possess but mutilated fragments of it, and, for aught we know, the lost portions may have contained matter to refute these very inferences. But further, accepting the contents of the fragments which remain, the allegation that they contradict the Book of Daniel has no better foundation than Professor Sayce's

more than doubtful reading of them; and if we appeal to a more trustworthy guide, we shall find that, so far from being inconsistent with the sacred narrative, they afford striking confirmation of its truth.

According to this tablet, "Sippara was taken without fighting, and Nabonidus fled." This was on the 14th day of Tammuz (June—July); and on the 16th, "Gobryas and the soldiers of Cyrus entered Babylon without fighting." On the 3d day of Marchesvan (October—November) Cyrus himself arrived. Following this comes the significant statement that "*the son of the king died.*" Then follows the mention of the national mourning which lasted for a week, beginning the 27th day of Adar (February—March), and of the State burial conducted by Cambyses, the son of Cyrus, in person. But instead of "the *son* of the king," Professor Sayce here reads "the *wife* of the king," and upon this gloss rests the entire superstructure of his attack upon the accuracy of Daniel. This reading,

however, is declared upon high authority to be wholly mistaken.¹

Nor is this all. The main statements in the tablet may reasonably be accepted. We may assume that the Persian troops entered Sippara on the 14th Tammuz, and reached Babylon on the 16th. But the assertion that in both cases the entry was peaceful will of course be received with reserve. Professor Sayce, however, would have us believe it all implicitly; and he goes on to assert that Cyrus was King of Babylon from the 14th Tammuz, and therefore that Daniel's mention of the death of Belshazzar and the accession of Darius the Mede is purely mythical. He dismisses to a footnote the awkward fact that we have commercial tablets dated in the reign of Nabonidus throughout the year, and even after the arrival of Cyrus himself; and his gloss upon this fact is that it gives further proof that the change of dynasty was a peaceful one!

¹ See Appendix, Note III.

It gives proof clear and conclusive that during this period Nabonidus was still recognised as king, and therefore that Cyrus was not yet master of the city. As a matter of fact we have not a single "Cyrus" tablet in this year dated from Babylon. All, with one exception, the source of which is not known, were made in Sippara.¹

But who was this personage whose death was the occasion of a great national mourning and a State funeral? The context shows clearly that "the king" referred to was not Cyrus. It can have been no other than Nabonidus; and as "the king's son" so frequently mentioned in the earlier fragments of the inscription and in the contract tablets is admittedly Belshazzar,² there is no reason whatever to doubt that he it is whose death and obsequies are here recorded.

What, then, does all this lead us to? The careful and impartial historian, repudiating

¹ See Appendix, Note III.

² Sayce, p. 525.

the iconoclastic zeal of the controversialist, will set himself to consider how these facts can be harmonised with other records sacred and profane, and the task will not prove a difficult one. Accepting the fact that at the time of the Persian invasion Nabonidus was absent from Babylon, he will be prepared to find that "the king's son" held command in the capital as viceroy. Accepting the fact that the Persian army entered Babylon in the month Tammuz, and that Cyrus arrived four months later, but yet that Nabonidus was still recognised as king, he will explain the seeming paradox by inferring that the invaders were in possession only of a part of the vast city of Nebuchadnezzar, and that Belshazzar, surrounded by his Court and the wealthy classes of the community, still refused to yield. Accepting the fact that Cyrus desired to represent his conquest as a bloodless one, he will be prepared to assume that force was resorted to only after a long delay and when peaceful diplomacy was ex-

hausted. And he will not be surprised to find that when at last, either in an attack upon the palace, or by some act of treachery in furtherance of the cause of the invaders, "Belshazzar, the King of the Chaldeans, was slain," the fact was veiled by the euphemistic announcement that "the king's son died."¹

But while the record is thus shown to be entirely consistent with Daniel, so far as the mention of Belshazzar is concerned, what room does it leave for Darius the Mede? The answer is that the inscription fails us at this precise point. "The rest of the text is destroyed, but the fragments of it which re-

¹ When the fall of the Empire scattered the Secret Service staff of the French Prefecture of Police many strange things came to my knowledge. I then learned that Count D'Orsay's death was caused by a pistol-bullet aimed at the Emperor, with whom he was walking arm-in-arm. But it was publicly announced, and universally believed, that he died of a carbuncle in the back. If even in these days of newspapers facts can be thus disguised for reasons of State, who will pretend that the circumstances of Belshazzar's death may not have been thus concealed in Chaldea twenty-five centuries ago?

main indicate that it described the various attempts made by Cyrus and his son Kambyses, after the overthrow of Nabonidos, to settle the affairs of Babylonia and conciliate the priesthood." Such is Professor Sayce's own testimony.¹ In a word, it is doubtful whether the tablet mentions Darius or not; but it is certain that any such mention would be purely incidental, and wholly outside the purpose with which the inscription was framed. While its mention of him, therefore, would be conclusive, its silence respecting him would prove nothing.

Nor will the omission of his name from the commercial tablets decide the matter either way. If, as Daniel indicates, Darius was but a viceroy or vassal king, his suzerain's name would, in the ordinary course, be used for this purpose, just as the name of Nabonidus was used during the regency of Belshazzar.

¹ P. 503.

But who was this Darius? Various hypotheses are maintained by scholars of eminence. By some he is identified with Gobryas, and this suggestion commends itself on many grounds. Others, again, follow the view adopted by Josephus, according to which Darius was "the son and successor of Astyages"—namely, Cyaxares II. Xenophon is the only authority for the existence of such a king, but his testimony has been rejected too lightly on the plea that his *Cyropædia* is but a romance. The writers of historical romances, however, do not invent kings. Yet another suggestion remains, that Darius was the personal name of "Astyages," the last king of the Medes. "This," says Bishop Westcott, "appears to satisfy all the conditions of the problem."¹

I refuse to commit myself to any one of

¹ Smith's *Bible Dictionary*, 1st ed., art. "Darius." Dr Westcott adds: "The name Astyages was national and not personal, and Ahasuerus represents the name Cyaxares borne by the father of Astyages."

these rival hypotheses. My task is merely to show that the question is still open, and that the grounds on which it is now sought to prove it closed are such as would satisfy no one who is competent to form an opinion upon the evidence. Though Professor Driver here remarks that "there seems to be no room for such a ruler," he is careful to add that the circumstances are not inconsistent with either his existence or his office, "and a cautious criticism will not build too much on the silence of the inscriptions, where many certainly remain yet to be brought to light."¹

The identity of Darius the Mede is one of the most interesting problems in the Daniel controversy, but it is a problem which still awaits solution. The critics do not dispose of it by declaring the Book of Daniel to be a "pseud-epigraph" of Maccabean days.

¹ *The Introduction, &c.*, p. 469. In the *Addenda* note to the 3d ed., Professor Driver seeks to qualify this, misled by Professor Sayce's argument. But see pp. 32-38 *ante*.

Accepting that hypothesis for the sake of argument, the mention of Darius remains to be accounted for. Some writers reject it as "pure fiction"; others denounce it as a "sheer blunder." Though these are wholly inconsistent hypotheses, Dr Farrar, *more suo*, adopts both. Both, however, are alike untenable; and the "*avowed* fiction" theory may be dismissed as unworthy of notice. The writer would have had no possible motive for inventing a "Darius," for the events of Daniel vi. might just as well have been assigned to some other reign, and a figment of the kind would have marred his book. The suggestion is preposterous.

And *ex hypothesi*, the author must have been a man of extraordinary genius and of great erudition. He would have had before him historical records now lost, such as the history of Berosus. He would have had access to the authorities upon which the book of the *Antiquities* is based; for the

student of Josephus cannot fail to see that his history is partly derived from sources other than the Book of Daniel. And besides all this, he would have had the Book of Ezra, which records how Darius the Persian issued an edict to give effect to the decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the Temple, and also the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, which bring this fact into still greater prominence. It may safely be averred, therefore, that no intelligent schoolboy, no devout peasant, in all Judah could have been guilty of a blunder so gross and stupid as that which is attributed to this "holy and gifted Jew," the author of the most famous and successful literary fraud the world has ever seen! The "sheer blunder" theory may be rejected as sheer nonsense.

Accepting, then, for the sake of argument, the pseud-epigraph theory of Daniel, the book gives proof of a definite and well-established historical tradition that when

Cyrus conquered Babylon, "Darius the Mede received the kingdom." How, then, is that tradition to be accounted for? The question demands an answer, but the critics have none to offer.

CHAPTER IV.

“THE philological peculiarities of the book” constitute the next ground of the critic’s attack on Daniel. “The Hebrew” (he declares) “is pronounced by the majority of experts to be of a later character than the time assumed for it.” The Aramaic also is marked by idioms of a later period, familiar to the Palestinian Jews.¹ And not only are Persian words employed in the book, but it contains certain Greek words, which, it is said, could not have been in use in Babylon during the exile.

¹ The opening passage of Daniel, from c. i. 1 to c. ii. 3, is written in the sacred Hebrew, and this is resumed at c. viii. 1 and continued to the end. The intervening portion, from c. ii. 4 to the end of c. vii., is written in Chaldee or Aramaic.

Here is Professor Driver's summary of the argument under this head :—

“The verdict of the language of Daniel is thus clear. The *Persian* words presuppose a period after the Persian Empire had been well established : the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits*, a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (B.C. 332). With our present knowledge, this is as much as the language authorises us definitely to affirm.”¹

Now, the strength of this case depends on the point last stated. Any number of argumentative presumptions may be rebutted by opposing evidence ; but here, it is alleged, we have proof which admits of no answer : the Greek words in Daniel *demand* a date which destroys the authenticity of the book. Will the reader believe it, that the only foundation for this is the presence of *two* words which are alleged to be Greek ! Dr Farrar insists on three, but one of these (*kitharos*) is practically given up.

The story was lately told that at a church

¹ *The Introduction*, p. 476.

bazaar in Lincoln, held under Episcopal patronage, the alarm was given that a thief was at work, and two of the visitors had lost their purses. In the excitement which followed, the stolen purses, emptied of course of their contents, were found in the bishop's pocket. The higher criticism would have handed him over to the police! Do the critics understand the very rudiments of the science of weighing evidence? The presence of the stolen purses did not "demand" the conviction of the bishop. Neither should the presence of the Greek words decide the fate of Daniel. There was no doubt, moreover, as to the identity of the purses, while Dr Pusey and others dispute the derivation of the words. But in the one case as in the other the question would remain, How did they come to be where they were found?

The Talmud declares that, in common with some other parts of the canon, Daniel was edited by the men of the Great Synagogue—a college which is supposed to have

been founded by Nehemiah, and which continued until it gave place to the Great Sanhedrim. May not this be the explanation of all these philological difficulties? This is not to have recourse to a baseless conjecture in order to evade well-founded objections: it is merely to give due weight to an authoritative tradition, the very existence of which is *prima facie* proof of its truth. The attempt to explain in this way difficulties of another kind is to force the hypothesis unduly. But assuming—what there is no reason whatever to doubt—that such a revision took place, surely we should expect to find that familiar idioms would be substituted for others that were deemed archaic, that familiar words would be substituted for terms which then seemed strange or uncouth to the Jews of Palestine, and that names like Nebuchadrezzar¹ would be altered to suit the then

¹ As regards this name, it is hard to repress a feeling of indignation against the dishonesty of the critics. They plainly imply that the spelling “Nebuchad~~nezzar~~” is peculiar to Daniel. The fact is that the name occurs in nine of

received orthography. And the "immense anachronism," if such it were, of using the word "Chaldeans" as synonymous with the caste of wise men is thus simply and fully explained.

It may be added that in view of recent discoveries no competent scholar would now reproduce without reserve the argument based on the presence of foreign words in the book. The fact is, the evolution theory has thrown its shadow across this controversy. The extraordinary conceit which marks our much-vaunted age has hitherto led us to assume that, in what has been regarded as a prehistoric period, men were slowly emerging from barbarism, that written records were wanting, and that there was no interchange among nations in the

the books of the Old Testament, and in all of them, with the single exception of Ezekiel, it appears in this form. In Jeremiah it is spelt in both ways, proving clearly that the now received orthography was in use when the Book of Daniel was written, or else that the spelling of the name throughout the sacred books is entirely a matter of editing.

sphere either of scholarship or of trade. It is now known, however, that at even a far earlier period the nations bordering upon the Mediterranean possessed a literature and enjoyed a civilisation of no mean excellence. Merchants and philosophers travelled freely from land to land,¹ carrying with them their wares and their learning; and to appeal to the Greek words in Daniel as proof that the book was written after the date of Alexander's conquests, no longer savours of scholarship. According to Professor Sayce, "there were Greek colonies on the coast of Palestine in the time of Hezekiah"—a century before Daniel was born; "and they

¹ May not all that is truest and best in Buddhism be thus traced to the great prophet-prince of the exile? Gautama was a contemporary of Daniel. And when he set out upon his long pilgrimage in search of truth and light, may he not have found his way to Babylon, then the most famous centre both of civilisation and of religion? And visiting the broad-walled city, he could not fail to come under the influence of Daniel. Daniel was born about B.C. 624; and, according to Sir E. Arnold (*Light of Asia*, Preface), Gautama was born about B.C. 620.

already enjoyed so much power there that a Greek usurper was made King of Ashdod. The Tel el-Amarna tablets have enabled us to carry back a contract between Greece and Canaan to a still earlier period.”¹ Indeed he goes on to indicate the possibility “that there was intercourse and contact between the Canaanites or Hebrews in Palestine and the Greeks of the Ægean as far back as the age of Moses.”

The Persian words are of still less account. That the Persian language was unknown among the cultured classes in Babylon is incredible. That it was widely known is suggested by the ease with which the Persian rule was accepted. The position which Daniel attained under that rule renders it probable in the extreme that he himself was a Persian scholar. And the date of his closing vision makes it certain that his book was compiled after that rule was established.

But, it will be answered, the philological

¹ *The Higher Criticism and the Monuments*, pp. 494, 495.

argument does not rest upon points like these; its strength lies in the general character of the language in which the book is written. The question here raised, as Dr Farrar justly says, "involves delicate problems on which an independent and a valuable opinion can only be offered" by scholars of a certain class and very few in number.¹

But the student will find that their decision is by no means unanimous or clear. And of course their *dicta* must be considered in connection with evidence of other kinds which it is beyond their province to deal with. Dr Pusey's magnificent work, in which the whole subject is handled with the greatest erudition and care, is not dismissed by others with the contempt which Dr Farrar evinces for a man who is fired by the enthusiasm of faith in the Bible. In his judgment

¹ Dr Farrar's words are, "by the merest handful of living scholars" (p. 17). How many scholars make a "handful" he does not tell us, and of the two he proceeds to appeal to, one is not living but dead!

the Hebrew of Daniel is "just what one should expect at the age at which he lived."¹ And one of the highest living authorities, who has been quoted in this controversy as favouring a late date for the Book of Daniel, writes in reply to an inquiry I have addressed to him: "I am now of opinion that it is a very difficult task to settle the age of any portion of that book from its language. I do not think, therefore, that my name should be quoted any more in the contest." It is Professor Cheyne's opinion, also, that "from the Hebrew of the Book of Daniel no important inference as to its date can be safely drawn."²

And, lastly, appeal may be made to Dr Farrar himself, who remarks with signal fairness, but with strange inconsistency, that "Perhaps nothing certain can be inferred from the philological examination either of the Hebrew or of the Chaldee portions of the book."³ And again, still more definitely

¹ Pusey, p. 578.

² *Ency. Brit.*, art. "Daniel," p. 804.

³ P. 17.

he declares : " The character of the language proves nothing." ¹ This testimony, carrying as it does the exceptional weight which attaches to the admissions of a prejudiced and hostile witness, might be accepted as decisive of the whole question. And the fact being what is here stated, the stress laid on grounds thus admitted to be faulty and inconclusive is proof only of a determination by fair means or foul to discredit the Book of Daniel.

It may be well, however, to appeal to evidence of a more general character upon this subject. The witness shall be one whose competency Dr Farrar acknowledges, and none will question. And his words have an interest and value far beyond the present controversy, and deserve most careful consideration by all who have been stumbled or misled by the arrogant dogmatism of the so-called Higher Critics. The following quotation is from *An Essay on the*

¹ P. 89.

place of Ecclesiasticus in Semitic Literature,
by Professor Margoliouth of Oxford :¹—

“My lamented colleague, Dr Edersheim, and I, misled by the very late date assigned by eminent scholars to the books of the Bible, had worked under the tacit assumption that the language of Ben-Sira was the language of the Prophets; whereas in reality he wrote the language of the Rabbis” (p. 6).

It should be explained that the Proverbs of Jesus the son of Sirach have come down to us only in a Greek translation, but the character of that translation is such that the reconstruction of the original Hebrew text is a task within the capacity of competent scholarship, and a preface to that translation fixes the date of the book as not later than about B.C. 200. But to resume :—

“If by 200 B.C. the whole Rabbinic farrago, with its terms and phrases and idioms and particles, was developed, . . . then between Ben-Sira and the books of the Old Testament there must lie centuries, nay, there must lie, in most cases, the

¹ *Clarendon Press*, 1890.

deep waters of the captivity, the grave of the old-Hebrew and the old-Israel, and the womb of the new-Hebrew and the new-Israel. If Hebrew, like any other language, has a history, then Isaiah (first or second) must be separated from Ecclesiastes by a gulf; but a yet greater gulf must yawn between Ecclesiastes and Ecclesiasticus, for in the interval a whole dictionary has been invented of philosophical terms such as we traced above, of logical phrases, . . . legal expressions, . . . nor have the structure and grammar of the language experienced less serious alteration. . . . It may be, if ever Ben-Sira is properly restored, . . . that while some students are engaged in bringing down the date of every chapter in the Bible so late as to leave no room for prophecy and revelation, others will endeavour to find out how early the professedly post-exilian books can be put back, so as to account for the divergence between their awkward middle-Hebrew and the rich and eloquent new-Hebrew of Ben-Sira. However this may be, hypotheses which place any portion of the classical or old-Hebrew Scriptures between the middle-Hebrew of Nehemiah and the new-Hebrew of Ben-Sira will surely require some reconsideration, or at least have to be harmonised in some way with the history of the language, before they can be unconditionally accepted" (p. 21, 22).

CHAPTER V.

“THE existence of violent errors as to matters with which a contemporary must have been familiar, at once refutes all pretence of historic authenticity in a book professing to have been written by an author in the days and country which he describes.”¹ “By no possibility could the book have been written in the days of the Babylonian exile.”² Thus it is that Dean Farrar disposes of the Book of Daniel. Such dogmatism, while it will surprise and distress the thoughtful and the well-informed, will no doubt overwhelm the simple folk whom this volume of the *Expositor's Bible* is presumably intended to en-

¹ Dr Farrar, p. 45.

² *Ib.*, p. 110.

lighten. Indeed, the writer betrays throughout his belief that, from Bacon to Pusey, all who have accepted the Book of Daniel as authentic have been wanting either in honesty or intelligence. And it suggests that he himself is one of a line of scholars who, as the result of independent inquiry, are agreed in rejecting it. The discovery of the hidden records of the court of Babylon cannot be much longer deferred, and when these shall have been brought to light we shall learn, perchance, on which side the folly lies—that of the believers or of the critics. And while an ignorant public is easily imposed upon by a parade of seeming scholarship, no one who is versed in the Daniel controversy can fail to recognise that fair and independent inquiry is absolutely wanting. Porphyry the Pagan it was who set the ball rolling long ago. After resting for centuries it was again put in motion by the rationalists. And now that the fashion has set towards scepticism, and “Higher Criticism” is supposed to denote

higher culture, critic follows critic, like sheep through a gap. Here in this last contribution to the controversy the writer falls into line, wholly unconscious that the "violent errors" he pillories have an existence only in the ignorance of those who denounce them. And we seek in vain for a single page that gives proof of fair and unbiassed inquiry.

But the critic will tell us that the time for inquiry is past, for the question is no longer open. "There is no shadow of doubt on the subject left in the minds of such scholars as Driver, Cheyne, Sanday, Bevan, and Robertson Smith."¹ This list of names is intended as a climax to the pretentious periods which precede it, but this grouping together of the living and the dead makes it savour rather of anti-climax. Do these writers monopolise the scholarship of England? or does the list represent only the authorities hostile to the Book of Daniel? Dean Farrar's words, moreover, are a flagrant misrepre-

¹ P. 118.

sentation of their views. Those of them who have treated of the subject generally, and not of the philological controversy only, have written with moderation and reserve. And while they deal with what seems to them the evidence now available, they make ample provision for retreat if new discoveries should hereafter establish the authenticity of Daniel. It may seem ungenerous to add that not one of these distinguished men has ever given proof of special fitness for an inquiry so difficult and complex. As for the treatise here under review, every part of it gives proof of absolute unfitness for the task. It is easy to convict an accused person if all his witnesses are put out of court and refused a hearing, and his own words and acts are misrepresented and distorted. Yet such is the treatment here accorded to the Book of Daniel. Not one of the champions of faith is allowed a hearing, and the exegesis offered of the prophetic portions of the book would be denounced

as a mere travesty by every intelligent student of prophecy. In not a few instances, indeed, the transparent error and folly of the critic's scheme will be clear even to the ordinary reader.

Take the Seventy Weeks as an example. In adopting what he terms "the Antiochian hypothesis" of the sceptics, the critic is confronted by the fact that "it does not accurately correspond with ascertainable dates." "It is true," he says, "that from B.C. 588 to B.C. 164 only gives us 424 years, instead of 490 years." But this difficulty he disposes of by declaring that "precise computation is nowhere prevalent in the sacred books." And he adds, "to such purely mundane and secondary matters as close reckoning of dates the Jewish writers show themselves manifestly indifferent." No statement could well be more unwarrantable. A "close reckoning of dates" is almost a speciality of "Jewish writers." No other writings can compare with theirs in this

respect. But let us hear what the critic has to urge.

“That there were differences of computation,” he remarks, “as regards Jeremiah’s seventy years, even in the age of the exile, is sufficiently shown by the different views as to their termination taken by the Chronicler (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22), who fixes it B.C. 536, and by Zechariah (Zech. i. 12), who fixes it about B.C. 519.” This is his only appeal to Scripture, and, as I have already shown,¹ it is but an ignorant blunder, arising from confounding the seventy years of the Servitude with the seventy years of the Desolations.

Dr Farrar next appeals to “exactly similar mistakes of reckoning” in Josephus, and he enumerates the following:—

“1. In his *Jewish War* (VI. iv. 8) he says that there were 639 years between the second year of Cyrus and the destruction of the Temple by Titus (A.D. 70). Here is an error of more than 30 years.

¹ Pp. 21, 22 *ante*.

"2. In his *Antiquities* (XX. x.) he says that there were 434 years between the return from the captivity (B.C. 536) and the reign of Antiochus Eupator (B.C. 164-162). Here is an error of more than 60 years.

"3. In *Auth.*, XIII. xi. 1, he reckons 481 years between the return from the captivity and the time of Aristobulus (B.C. 105 - 104). Here is an error of some 50 years."

These "mistakes" will repay a careful scrutiny. In the passage first cited, Josephus reckons the period between the foundation of the first temple by Solomon and its destruction by Titus as 1130 years 7 months and 15 days. "And from the second building of it, *which was done by Haggai*, in the second year of Cyrus the king," the interval was 639 years and 45 days. This, be it remarked, is given as proof that "precise computation" is nowhere to be looked for in Jewish writers! The enumeration of the very days, however, renders it certain that Josephus had before him chronological tables of absolute precision. But in computing the

second era above mentioned, he refers to the prophet Haggai, who, with Zechariah, promoted the building of the second temple in the second year of Darius Hystaspis. As this historian speaks elsewhere of Artaxerxes as *Cyrus*,¹ so here he calls Darius by that title. The period, therefore, was (according to our chronology) from B.C. 520 to A.D. 70—that is, 589 years—that is, about fifty years less than Josephus reckons. In Dr Farrar's third example, this same excess of about fifty years again appears; and if in his second example we substitute 424 years for the doubtful reading of 434 years, we reach a precisely similar result.

What are we to conclude from these facts? Not that the ancient Jews were careless or indifferent in regard to chronology, which would be flagrantly untrue; but that their chronological tables, though framed with absolute precision, were marked by errors which amounted to an excess of some fifty

¹ *Ant.*, XI. vi. 1.

years in the very period to which the era of the seventy weeks must be assigned.

Here, then, we have a solution which is definite and adequate of the only serious objection which the critic can urge against the application of this prophecy to Messiah. Of that application Dr Farrar writes :—

“ It is finally discredited by the fact that neither our Lord, nor His apostles, nor any of the earliest Christian writers, once appealed to the evidence of this prophecy, which, on the principles of Hengstenberg and Dr Pusey, would have been so decisive ! If such a proof lay ready to their hand—a proof definite and chronological—why should they have deliberately passed it over ? ”¹

The answer is full and clear, that any such appeal would have been discredited, and any such proof refuted, by reference to what (as Josephus shows us) was the received chronology of the age they lived in. But what possible excuse can be made for those who, with the full light that history now throws upon the sacred page, not only reject its

¹ P. 287.

teaching, but use their utmost ingenuity to darken and distort it! "From the decree to restore Jerusalem unto the Anointed One (or 'the Messiah'), the Prince"—this, to quote Dr Farrar's own words,¹ describes the era here in view. There is no question that the Holy City was restored. There is no question that its restoration was in pursuance of a decree of Artaxerxes I. The date of that decree is known. From that date unto "the Messiah, the Prince," was exactly the period specified in the prophecy. But Dr Farrar will tell us that the real epoch was not the decree to restore Jerusalem, but the catastrophe by which Jerusalem was laid in ruins. "It is obvious," he says, after enumerating "the views of the Rabbis and Fathers," "that not one of them accords with the allusions of the narrative and prayer, except that which makes the destruction of the Temple the *terminus a quo*."² This sort of talk is bad enough with those

¹ P. 275.

² Pp. 288, 289.

who seek to adapt divine prophecy to what they suppose to be the facts it refers to. But the suggestion here is that a holy and gifted *Chasid*, writing in B.C. 164, with the open page of history before him, described the *destruction* of Jerusalem as "a decree to restore Jerusalem," and then described a period of 424 years as 490 years! And at the close of the nineteenth century of the Christian era, these puerilities of the sceptics are solemnly reproduced by the Dean of Canterbury for the enlightenment of Christian England! To escape from a difficulty by taking refuge in an absurdity is like committing suicide in order to escape from danger.

Other writers tell us that the era of the seventy weeks dated from the divine promise recorded in Jeremiah xxix. 10.¹ But though

¹ Mr Bevan says (*Com.*, p. 155) "the '*word*' [commandment] is of course" this prophecy. The force of this "of course" is solely that this destroys the Messianic application of the angel's message! The term used is one which occurs more than a thousand times in Scripture with many shades of meaning, and in the Book of Esther it is repeatedly used, as here of the decree of a Persian king.

this view is free from the charge of absurdity it will not bear scrutiny. That was not a "commandment" to build Jerusalem, but merely a promise of future restoration. All these theories, moreover, savour of perverseness and casuistry in presence of the fact that Scripture records so definitely the "commandment" in pursuance of which it was in fact rebuilt.¹

Neither was it without significance that the prophetic period dated from the restoration under Nehemiah. The era of the Servitude had ended with the accession of Cyrus, and the seventy years of the Desolations had already expired in the second year of Darius. But the Jews were still without

¹ Neh. ii. Nehemiah, on hearing from certain Jews who had returned from Jerusalem that the walls and gates of the city were still in ruins, was so overwhelmed with grief that the king took notice of his distress, and demanded the cause of it. And his appeal was, "That thou wouldst send me to Judah, unto the city of my fathers' sepulchre, *that I may build it.*" Then follows the record of the royal edict to build Jerusalem, and of the building of it in pursuance of that edict.

a constitution or a polity. In a word, their condition was then much what it is to-day. It was the decree of the twentieth year of Artaxerxes which restored the national autonomy of Judah. The concession may have been an act of policy on his part, the Athenian victory at Cnidos having led to a peace which crippled the power of Persia in Palestine. But the fact, however it be explained, is clear.

And a precedent which is startling in its definiteness may be found to justify the belief that such an era would not begin while the existence of Judah as a nation was in abeyance. I allude to the 480 years of 1 Kings vi. 1, computed from the Exodus to the Temple. If a little of the time and energy which the critics have expended in denouncing that passage as a forgery or a blunder had been devoted to searching for its hidden meaning, their labours might perchance have been rewarded. That the chronology of the period was correctly

known is plain from the thirteenth chapter of the Acts, which enables us to reckon the very same era as 573 years. How then can this seeming era of 93 years be accounted for? *It is precisely the sum of the several eras of the servitudes.*¹ The inference therefore is clear that "the 480th year" means the 480th year of national life and national responsibilities. And if this principle applied to an era apparently historical, we may *a fortiori* be prepared to find that it governs an era which is mystic and prophetic.

¹ Acts xiii. 18-21 gives 40 years in the wilderness, 450 years under the Judges, and 40 years for the reign of Saul. To which must be added the 40 years of David's reign, and the first three years of Solomon, for it was in his *fourth* year that he began to build the Temple. The servitudes were to Mesopotamia for 8 years, to Moab for 18 years, to Canaan for 20 years, to Media for 7 years, and to the Philistines for 40 years. See Judges iii. 8, 14; iv. 2, 3; vi. 1; xiii. 1. The servitude of ch. x. 7, 9, affected only the tribes beyond Jordan, and did not suspend the national existence of Israel. But $8 + 18 + 20 + 7 + 40$ years are precisely equal to 93 years. To believe that this is a mere coincidence would involve an undue strain upon our faith.

CHAPTER VI.

THE Book of Daniel is rejected because, it is alleged, its predictions end with Antiochus Epiphanes, and proofs are abundant that it was written in the Maccabean age. The question arises, therefore, whether any part of the prophecy relates to a later period, and if so, whether it has received fulfilment with a definiteness which ought to carry conviction to the minds of fair and reasonable men. The great central prophecy of the book supplies the answer. This famous prediction of the Seventy Weeks, therefore, demands a fuller notice than has been accorded to it in the preceding chapter.

Here Dr Farrar's taunt is all too well

founded respecting the divergence which marks the rival schemes of expositors; and the effect which the study has had upon his mind has been to lead him to adopt Kuenen's exegesis, which is perhaps the most preposterous of them all. But let any plain man, ignoring everything which has been written upon the subject, turn to the passage with a determination to reject all strained or mystical interpretations, and to accept the words in their simple and obvious meaning, and at what results will he arrive? Here is the text of Dan. ix. 24-27 :¹—

“Seventy weeks are decreed upon thy people and upon thy holy city to finish transgression and to make an end of sins and to make reconciliation for iniquity and to bring in everlasting righteousness and to seal up vision and prophecy and to anoint the most holy Know therefore and discern that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the anointed one (or Messiah) the prince shall be seven weeks and threescore and two weeks it shall be built again with street and moat even in troublous times

¹ See Appendix, Note I.

And after the threescore and two weeks shall the anointed one (or Messiah) be cut off and shall have nothing and the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary and his end shall be with a flood and even unto the end shall be war desolations are determined And he shall make a firm covenant with many for one week and for half the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease."

In the midst of much that is full of difficulty, certain points here are absolutely clear. The realisation of full Messianic blessing for Daniel's people and city was thus to be deferred till the close of a period described as "seventy weeks." Lesser periods are mentioned of "seven weeks," "sixty-two weeks," and "one week." But as these together make up "seventy weeks," they are clearly subdivisions of the main period. The epoch of the era, therefore, was to be the issuing of a decree to rebuild Jerusalem; and after the close of the middle period (the sixty-two weeks) the Messiah should be cut off.

Now, it is not questioned that these "weeks" are sevens of years. It is not questioned that the Holy City was rebuilt—not the Temple, for that is not mentioned here at all, but the street and moat—*i.e.*, the town and ramparts of Jerusalem. It is not questioned that this restoration was carried out by Nehemiah in pursuance of a decree issued by Artaxerxes Longimanus in the twentieth year of his reign. And it is not questioned that the reign of Artaxerxes dated from B.C. 465. Only two possible questions therefore arise, and to these a clear answer can be given: What was the date of the Jewish month Nisan? and of what kind of year was the prophetic era composed?

Though the details of the Jewish calendar in ancient times cannot now be ascertained, the general principles on which it was arranged are definitely known. The New Year was proclaimed at the first appearance of the moon at the season of the

vernal equinox. The date of the new moon in question was (at Jerusalem) 7h. 9m. A.M. on the 13th March B.C. 445,¹ and the phasis may be reckoned as occurring on the following day. The 14th March B.C. 445, therefore, is unmistakably the epoch of the prophetic period.

That the prophetic year was not the ordinary year was noticed sixteen centuries ago by Julius Africanus.² The ancient year of the world was the luni-solar year of 360 days, and it is reasonably certain that this was the form of year in use both at Jerusalem and Babylon at the time the prophecy was given. It was the year in use in the Noachian age, 150 days being specified as the interval between the 17th day of the second month and the 17th day of the

¹ Owing to the cardinal importance of this date, I have not relied here upon my own calculations. When writing my book on this subject (*The Coming Prince*), I referred the question to the Astronomer-Royal, the late Sir George Airy, and the date here given has his authority.

² He fixed upon the lunar year.

seventh month. Tradition testifies that it was the year which Abraham knew in his Chaldean home, and which was afterwards preserved in his family. And Sir Isaac Newton avers that

“All nations, before the just length of the solar year was known, reckoned months by the course of the moon, and years by the return of winter and summer, spring and autumn; and in making calendars for their festivals, they reckoned thirty days to a lunar month, and twelve lunar months to a year, taking the nearest round numbers, whence came the division of the ecliptic into 360 degrees.”

And in quoting this statement, Sir G. C. Lewis declares that “all credible testimony and all antecedent probability lead to the result that a solar year containing twelve lunar months, determined within certain limits of error, has been generally recognised by the nations adjoining the Mediterranean from a remote antiquity.”¹ But this goes no further than to make out a *prima*

¹ *Ast. of the Ancients*, ch. i. § 7.

facie case in favour of the luni-solar year. Decisive evidence may be appealed to in support of it.

First, we have the testimony of the Book of the Revelation, which, referring to the visions of Daniel, twice describes the half of the prophetic week as "forty-two months," and twice as 1260 days. And of course 1260 days are equal exactly to three and a half luni-solar years. And the last proof is equally clear and striking. The occasion of Daniel's prayer was the near approach of the close of the era of the Desolations. He "understood by the books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, for the accomplishing of the Desolations of Jerusalem, even seventy years." It is not certain whether this referred to the scrolls of the prophecies of Jeremiah, or to the books of the Law. In neither case, it may be remarked in passing, is there the least force in the objection of the critics upon this point.

Here, as in many other instances, they blindly follow the German sceptics. We are expressly told that the exiles had the "books" of Jeremiah; and it is simply incredible that Daniel had not the scrolls of the Law. Professor Bevan indeed assumes this; and separating himself here from his allies of the critics, suggests that the passage which Daniel had before him was the warning of Leviticus xxvi., that a sevenfold punishment should be meted out to national sins. But surely to apply this principle *chronologically* is to strain the words unduly. May I offer an alternative suggestion?

It was not until their Holy Temple was dedicated, and the Temple worship established, that the people entered fully into their national responsibilities. Now one of the most characteristic of those responsibilities was the observance of the Sabbatic years; and that ordinance—that every seventh year the land was to lie fallow—had been systematically neglected. The Temple was dedi-

cated at the Feast of Tabernacles in the eleventh year of King Solomon, which year was therefore the epoch of the cycle of Sabbathic years. And the intervening period between that year and the end of the Desolations (B.C. 1005 to 520), when reckoned exclusively, was 483 years, or 70×7 luni-solar years of 360 days. Here, then, is the explanation why the era of the Desolations was fixed at seventy years; and it was presumably the twenty-fifth chapter of Leviticus that Daniel had before him. In the language of the Chronicler, the Desolations were to continue "until the land had enjoyed her Sabbaths: for as long as she lay desolate she kept Sabbath, to fulfil threescore and ten years."¹

One link only is wanted to complete this chain of proof. The connection between the seventy weeks of the prophecy and the seventy years of the Desolations is universally admitted: what, then, was the "year"

¹ 2 Chron. xxxvi. 21.

of the Desolations? The era was computed from the beginning of the siege, for from the day on which the invading army invested the city, the land was laid waste, and all agricultural pursuits were suspended. This was on the 10th day of the 10th month, in the 9th year of Zedekiah¹ (B.C. 589). This, then, was the epoch of the era: can its close be ascertained with equal definiteness?

Here a most striking fact claims notice. For sixteen years the execution of the decree of Cyrus for the rebuilding of the Temple was thwarted by the local authorities in Palestine, and it was not till the second year of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 520) that the work proceeded. In this there was a divine purpose, for the judgment of the Desolations still rested upon the land. But in that year the prophets Haggai and Zechariah were inspired to declare that the "set time" had come. "Consider now," the prophet proclaimed, "from this day and upward, from

¹ 2 Kings xxv. 1; cf. Ezek. xxiv. 1.

the four and twentieth day of the ninth month, even from the day that the foundation of the Lord's Temple was laid, consider it: . . . *from this day will I bless you.*"¹ Now, if I have calculated aright the moon's place for these respective years, the 1st Nisan in B.C. 589 was the 15th March, and in B.C. 520 it was the 2d April.² Therefore the period from the 10th Tebet in the one year to the 24th Kislev in the other was precisely 25,200 days. And 25,200 days make up exactly 70 luni-solar years of 360 days.

To what, then, does all this lead us? The edict for the rebuilding of Jerusalem is to be assigned to the 1st Nisan, B.C. 445. From that epoch "unto the Messiah, the Prince,"

¹ Hag. i. 1, 2; ii. 18, 19; and cf. Ezra v. and vi.

² I find by calculation that in B.C. 589 the Paschal new moon was on the 14th March at about 5 o'clock P.M., and in B.C. 520 it was on the 1st April about noon. The 1st Nisan, therefore, was probably on the following day in both cases, as the new year was not proclaimed until the moon had been actually seen by credible witnesses. See Lindo's *Jewish Cal.*, and Clinton's *Fasti Rom.*, vol. ii. p. 240.

was to be sixty-nine sevens of prophetic years. But 483 years of 360 days contain 173,880 days; and 173,880, computed from the first day of Nisan in the 20th year of Artaxerxes, ended on the 10th day of Nisan in the 18th year of Tiberius Cæsar—the day when, in fulfilment of this, and of Zechariah's prophecy, our Lord made His first and only public entry into Jerusalem.

The well-known words, so exquisite in their solemn pathos, may fitly be repeated here: "And when He was come near, He beheld the city, and wept over it, saying, If *thou* hadst known in *this day*, even thou, the things which belong to thy peace! but now they are hid from thine eyes."¹ "Despised and rejected" He had been during all the days of His sojourn among them, but that

¹ Luke xix. 41, 42. See R.V. and Alford's *Greek Testament*, *in loco*. Also cf. Zech. ix. 9. According to Luke iii. 1, the beginning of our Lord's ministry was in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. No date in history is more definitely fixed, and the date of the crucifixion is thus clearly marked as falling in his eighteenth year. See Appendix, Note II.

was the destined day on which their decision was to be irrevocable and their doom was to be sealed.

As the elucidation of this great prophecy of the Seventy Weeks is my personal contribution to the controversy about the Book of Daniel, I may be pardoned if even at the cost of repetition I emphasise still further this conclusion. The "seventy weeks" of the twenty-fourth verse of the ninth chapter of Daniel are seven times the seventy years of "the desolations of Jerusalem" mentioned in the second verse. As this is universally admitted, it needs no proof. That term of seventy years was a divine judgment upon the holy city and land. The epoch of it is definitely recorded in Scripture, and I may add that for five-and-twenty centuries, and down to the present time, upon the anniversary of that day "the fast of Tebet" has been observed by the Jews in every land. And the *terminus ad quem* of the period is specified with equal definiteness and em-

phasis, for the years were measured out with all the precision of a judicial sentence. The intelligent reader, therefore, can ascertain for himself that, as the era of the neglected "Sabbaths" was measured in years of 360 days, so also the duration of the judgment imposed for that neglect was exactly, and to the very day, seventy luni-solar years of 360 days. And with the plain and simple clew thus obtained he can solve for himself the hitherto unsolved problem of the "seventy weeks." Four hundred and eighty-three (69×7) similar years measured from the twentieth year of Artaxerxes, when the "commandment" to build Jerusalem was given, ended, not vaguely and with a margin of error, but precisely and to the very day, upon that Sunday in Passion Week when, for the first and only time in His ministry on earth, our Lord caused His Messiahship to be openly proclaimed.¹

¹ From the 1st Nisan B.C. 445 to the 6th April A.D. 32 was 476 years + 24 days = 173,880 days, and 69×7 years of 360

The logic of this is inexorable. Either the result is an accidental coincidence, or else it is an overwhelming proof that the visions of Daniel were a divine revelation. A coincidence! Suppose some one averred that the distance between St Martin's-le-Grand and the post-office at Leamington or Gloucester was 173,880 yards, and this were proved to be accurately correct: what would be thought of a man who objected that the result was "an accidental coincidence"? "Credulity of the incredulous!" we might well exclaim.

It is for the reader to judge whether this is an instance of "the acervation of endless conjectures," or a legitimate appeal to plain facts and the positive statements of Scripture.

days=precisely 173,880 days. It would be quite impossible within the limits of these pages to deal with the seventieth week of the prophecy, or to discuss the many incidental questions here involved. Elsewhere I have dealt exhaustively with the whole subject, and have answered every difficulty and objection which can be urged against the scheme. See Appendix, Note II.

CHAPTER VII.

THE critics claim a competency to judge whether this portion or that of the canon of Scripture be divinely inspired, and in the exercise of this faculty they have decided that certain passages of Daniel give proof that the book could not have a divine sanction. Their *dicta* on this subject will have weight with us just in proportion to our ignorance of Scripture. The opening chapters of the book which follows Daniel in the canon present far greater difficulties in this respect, and yet the prophetic character of Hosea is unquestionable. Other Scriptures also might be cited to point the same moral ; but as these pretensions of the critics are

not accepted by Christians generally, the matter need not be further discussed.

Still more summarily we may dismiss Dean Farrar's argument from the absence of references to Daniel in the apocryphal literature of the Jews. Indeed he himself supplies the answer to it, for when he approaches the subject from another standpoint he emphasises the influence which the book exercised upon that very literature.¹ And as for the silence of Jesus the son of Sirach, the argument only serves to indicate the dearth of weightier proofs. The reader can turn to the passage referred to² and decide the matter for himself. If an omission from this panegyric of "famous men" proves anything, Ezra and the book which bears his name must also be rejected.

¹ "The book is in all respects unique, a writing *sui generis*; for the many imitations to which it led are but imitations" (p. 37). This is but one of numerous instances in which Dr Farrar affords on one page a refutation of objections stated upon another.

² Ecclesiasticus xlvi. 20-xlix. 10.

The next point claims fuller notice. Daniel was admittedly received into the canon; but, we are told, "it is relegated to the *Kethuvim*, side by side with such a book as Esther." In the Jewish canon the Old Testament Scriptures were reckoned as twenty-four books. These were classified as the *Torah*, the *Neveeim*, and the *Kethuvim*—the Law, the Prophets, and the Other Writings. Now, the objection implies that the *Neveeim* embraced all that was regarded as prophecy, and nothing else; and that the contents of the *Kethuvim* were deemed inferior to the rest of the canon. Both these implications are false. In the former class are placed the books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings. And the latter included two books at least, than which no part of the Scriptures was more highly esteemed,—the Psalms, associated so inseparably with the name of King David; and Esther, which, *pace* the sneer of the critic, was held in exceptional honour. Dr Driver

avers that it came to be "ranked by the Jews as superior both to the writings of the prophets and to all other parts of the Hagiographa."¹ The Psalms headed the list. Then came Proverbs, connected with the name of Solomon. Then Job, one of the oldest of the books. Then followed the five *Megilloth* (Song of Songs, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, and Esther). And finally Daniel, Ezra and Nehemiah, and Chronicles. To have placed Daniel before the *Megilloth* would have separated it from the books with which it was so immediately associated. In a word, its place in the list is normal and natural.

The Book of Psalms, as already mentioned, stood first in the *Kethuvim*, and in later times gave it its name, for when our Lord spoke of "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms," he thereby meant "all the Scriptures."² Many of the Psalms

¹ *Introduction*, p. 452.

² Luke xxiv. 27, 44.

were rightly deemed prophetic; but though David was a prophet in the highest sense, it was not as prophet but as king that his name was enshrined in the memory of the people, and the book thus naturally found its place in the third division of the canon. For the books were grouped rather by authorship than by the character of their contents. Precisely the same reason existed for placing Daniel where it stood; for it was not till the end of a long life spent in statecraft that the visions were accorded to the Exile. But this is not all. As Dr Farrar urges, though he is obviously blind to its significance, Daniel had no claim to the prophet's mantle. The prophets "spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost": *he* merely recorded the words addressed to him by the angel, and described the visions he witnessed. And the question here, be it remembered, is not what weight would be given to this distinction by our modern critics, but how it would

influence the minds of the men who settled the canon.

And now it is high time to raise a question which the critic systematically ignores, a question which possibly he is incompetent to deal with. For the Higher Criticism claims an entirely false position in this controversy. The critic is a specialist; and specialists, though often admirable witnesses, are proverbially bad judges. To some men, moreover, every year that passes brings more experience in the art of weighing evidence than the theologian or the pundit would be likely to acquire in a lifetime. And such men are familiar with cases where a mass of seemingly invincible proof seems to point one way, and yet fuller inquiry establishes that the truth lies in a wholly opposite direction. But the caution which such experience begets is not to be looked for in the critic. *The Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament* is clearly the work of one who possesses, though he

does not always exercise, the judicial faculty. If the same praise is due to Professor Bevan, his *Short Commentary on Daniel* does him serious injustice. And Dr Farrar's book reminds us of a private prosecution conducted by that type of lawyer whose remuneration is proportionate to the vehemence with which he presses every point against the defendant. It never seems to have crossed his mind that there may possibly be two sides to the question. Here, then, we have everything which can possibly be urged *against* the Book of Daniel: the inquiry remains, What further can be said in its defence? Let us call a few of the witnesses.

First comes the mention of Daniel three times repeated in the prophecies of Ezekiel (xiv. 14, 20, and xxviii. 3). The critics urge that a man so famous as the Daniel of the Exile is represented to have been in the book which bears his name, would have filled a large place in the literature of the

nation, and they appeal to the silence of that literature in proof that no such personage in fact existed. And yet when the testimony of Ezekiel is cited, they declare that there must have been another Daniel of equal if not greater fame, who flourished at some earlier epoch of their history, albeit not even the vaguest tradition of his existence has survived! Such casuistry is hard to deal with.

But here Dr Farrar is rash enough to leave the path so well worn by the feet of those he follows, and to venture upon a piece of independent criticism. He fixes B.C. 606 as the date of Daniel's captivity, and twelve years as his age when carried to Babylon; and he adds—

“If Ezekiel's prophecy was uttered B.C. 584, Daniel at that time could only have been twenty-two: if it was uttered as late as B.C. 572, Daniel would still have been only thirty-four, and therefore little more than a youth in Jewish eyes. It is undoubtedly surprising that among Orientals, who regard age as the chief passport to wisdom,

a living youth should be thus canonised between the Patriarch of the Deluge and the Prince of Uz.”¹

The author's words have been given *verbatim*, lest some one should charitably suppose they have been misrepresented. For the reader will perceive that this pretentious argument has no better foundation than a transparent blunder in simple arithmetic.² According to his own showing, Daniel was upwards of thirty-four, and he may have been forty-six, when Ezekiel's prophecy was uttered. And setting aside the absurd figment that Daniel was but a child of twelve when deported to Babylon,³ his age at the date of the prophecy must, as a matter of fact, have been forty at the least; or “if it

¹ P. 10.

² Any schoolboy can see that from B.C. 606 to B.C. 584 was twenty-two years, and if Daniel was twelve in B.C. 606, his age in B.C. 584 was not twenty-two, but thirty-four. Or if B.C. 572 was the date of the prophecy, his age when it was uttered was forty-six.

³ P. 19 *ante*. If his age at the time was eighteen, he died at eighty-eight.

was uttered as late as B.C. 572," he must have already reached middle age. In either case, he had already attained the prime of his powers and the zenith of his fame.

What, then, are the facts? We have Daniel in a position of dazzling splendour and influence at the Court of Nebuchadnezzar, second only to that of the great king himself. His power and fame, great though they were, cannot fail to have loomed greater still in the estimate of the humbler exiles by the river Chebar, among whom Ezekiel lived and prophesied. Neither "the Patriarch of the Deluge" nor "the Prince of Uz" would have held as large a place in the heart or in the imagination of the people. The name of their great patron must have been on every lip. His power was their security against oppression. His influence doubtless fired their hopes of a return to the land of their fathers. Nor was this all. The college of the Chaldean Magi was famous the wide

world over, and for more than twenty years Daniel had been "chief of the wise men," and thus, in wisdom as well as in statecraft, the foremost figure at the Court of Babylon. Among Orientals, and especially among his own people, the record of the event which gained him that position, and of his triumphs of administration as Grand Vizier, would have lost nothing in the telling. And though his piety was intense and wholly phenomenal, his reputation in this respect also could not fail to be exaggerated. Such, then, was the time and such the circumstances of the prophecy—words of scorn addressed to one of the great enemies of their race: "Behold thou art wiser than Daniel, there is no secret that they can hide from thee;" or words of denunciation of the wickedness which brought such judgments upon Jerusalem: "Though these three men, Noah, Daniel, and Job, were in it, they should deliver but their own souls by their righteousness."

The refusal to accept the testimony of Ezekiel as evidence to accredit the Book of Daniel is proof that neither honesty nor fairness may be looked for from the sceptics. In the judgment of all reasonable men, this single testimony will go far to decide the issue.

The First Book of Maccabees is a work of the highest excellence. It has an authority and value which no other part of the Apocrypha possesses, and even Luther declared it not unworthy to be reckoned among the sacred books of Scripture. The author was indeed "a holy and gifted Jew"; and though the suggestion that he was no other than John Hyrcanus is now discredited, it gives proof of his eminence both for piety and learning. And one of the most striking and solemn passages of this book—the record of the dying words of the venerable Matathias—refers to the Daniel of the Exile and the book which bears his name.¹

¹ 1 Macc. ii. 59, 60. The whole passage is important, but the special reference is to the words: "Ananias Azarias and

Notwithstanding the extraordinary erudition which has been brought to bear upon this controversy, so far as I am aware the full significance of this fact has hitherto escaped notice. There is internal evidence that 1 Maccabees was written before the death of John Hyrcanus (B.C. 106). Allowing, then, for the sake of argument, the wholly improbable hypothesis that the canon was not closed till after the time of Antiochus, the book affords conclusive proof that among the learned of that day Daniel was regarded as the work of the great prophet-prince of the Captivity. It was as such, therefore, that it must have been admitted to the canon. The theory is thus exploded that it was as a "pseud-epigraph" that the Sanhedrim received it; and the fact of its reception becomes evidence of its authenticity which would outweigh the

Misael by believing were saved out of the flame. Daniel for his innocency was delivered from the mouth of the lions." Nor is this all. The words *βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως* in 1 Macc. i. 54 are quoted from Dan. xii. 11.

whole mass of the objections and difficulties which have been heaped together upon the other side.

If space were of no account, numerous points might thus be turned against the argument in support of which the critic adduces them. But these may be safely ignored in presence of other proofs of principal importance. The testimony of prophecy fulfilled has already been appealed to. Another witness of even greater authority still remains to be heard.

It was Sir Isaac Newton's opinion that "to reject Daniel's prophecies would be to undermine the Christian religion." Bishop Westcott declares that no other book of the Old Testament had so great a share in the development of Christianity.¹ To cite a hostile witness, Professor Bevan admits that "the influence of the book is apparent almost everywhere." In this connection he adds: "The more we realise

¹ Smith's *Bible Dict.*, art. "Daniel."

how vast and how profound was the influence of Daniel in post-Maccabean times, the more difficult it is to believe that the book existed previously for well-nigh four centuries without exercising any perceptible influence whatever."¹ On this it may be remarked, first, that it is far more difficult to believe that a "pseud-epigraph" could possibly have had an influence so vast and so profound on the development of Christianity. The suggestion indeed, if accepted, might well discredit Christianity altogether. And secondly, it is extraordinary how any person can fail to see that the influence of Daniel in post-Maccabean times was due to the fulfilment of its predictions relating to those times.

Dr Farrar quotes, though with special reprobation, the dictum of Hengstenberg, that "there are few books whose divine authority is so fully established by the testimony of the New Testament, and in

¹ *Short Com.*, p. 15.

particular by the Lord Himself." And yet the truth of all this no thoughtful Christian can question. St Paul's predictions of the Antichrist point back to the visions of Daniel. And with those visions the visions of St John—the Daniel of the New Testament—are so inseparably interwoven, that if the former be attributed to imagination, the latter must be attributed to lunacy. The Book of Daniel and the Apocalypse stand or fall together.

But the matter becomes far more serious and solemn when we realise how definitely the visions of Daniel have been adopted in the teaching of Christ. Dr Farrar imagines that he has disposed of the matter by the figment that in the twenty-fourth chapter of Matthew the reference to "Daniel the prophet" was added by the evangelist as an explanatory note. But even if such a suggestion could be allowed, every intelligent reader of the passage can see that any such interpolation must have

been based upon the obvious and unmistakable connection between the words of our Lord and the visions of the prophet of the Exile. Here is a dilemma from which escape is impossible. If the Gospels be authentic and true, our Lord has adopted, and identified Himself with, the visions of this now discredited book. If the Gospels be unreliable and fictitious, the foundations of our faith are destroyed, and belief in Christianity is sheer superstition. "To the last degree dangerous, irreverent, and unwise" this may seem in the Dean of Canterbury's judgment, but its truth is none the less obvious and clear.

It cannot be asserted too plainly that Christianity is a divine revelation. Nor need the admission be withheld that, apart from revelation in the strictest sense, the Christian's faith would be without adequate foundation. It is easy, indeed, to formulate a religious system based on the teaching of a traditional "Jesus Christ." But this is no more

than a Christianised Buddhism ; it is certainly not *Christianity*. The main fact on which Christianity as a system rests is the incarnation ; and the man who, apart from revelation, believes in the incarnation, is a credulous weak creature who would believe anything.

“The Nazarene was admittedly the son of Mary. The Jews declared that He was the son of Joseph ; the Christian worships Him as the Son of God. The founder of Rome was said to be the divinely begotten child of a vestal virgin. And in the old Babylonian mysteries a similar parentage was ascribed to the martyred son of Semiramis, gazetted Queen of Heaven. What grounds have we, then, for distinguishing the miraculous birth at Bethlehem from these and other kindred legends of the ancient world ? To point to the resurrection is a transparent begging of the question. To appeal to human testimony is utter folly. At this point we are face to face with that to which no consensus of

mere human testimony could lend even an *a priori* probability.”¹

The editor of *Lux Mundi* and his allies would here seek to save their reputation for intelligence by setting up the authority of “the Church” as an adequate ground for faith. This theory, however, is a plant of foreign growth, which, happily, has not taken root in England. But while on this point the Dean of Canterbury would probably repudiate the teaching with which, in its degenerate days, Pusey House has identified itself, he would doubtless endorse the words which follow. Here is the passage :—

“The Christian creed asserts the reality of certain historical facts. To these facts, in the Church’s name, we claim assent; but we do so on grounds which, so far, are quite independent of the *inspiration* of the evangelic records. All that we claim to show at this stage is that they are historical: not historical so as to be absolutely without error, but historical in the general sense, so as to be trustworthy. All that is necessary for

¹ *A Doubter’s Doubts about Science and Religion*, p. 76.

faith in Christ is to be found in the moral dispositions which predispose to belief, and make intelligible and credible the thing to be believed: coupled with such acceptance of the generally historical character of the Gospels, and of the trustworthiness of the other Apostolic documents, as justifies belief that our Lord was actually born of the Virgin Mary," &c.¹

This language is plain enough. The gospels are not even divinely accredited as true. They are "historical *in the general sense*" indeed, and therefore as trustworthy as history in general. They afford, therefore, ample ground for belief in the public facts of the life and death of Christ. But who denies or doubts these facts? They have their place in the Koran and the writings of the Rabbis, as well as in our Christian literature. But on what ground can we justify our faith in the transcendental facts to which these public facts owe all their spiritual significance? "To these facts, in the Church's name, we claim assent," is the

¹ *Lux Mundi*, p. 340.

only reply vouchsafed to us. Let a man but yield up his judgment and bow before his priest, and he will soon acquire "the moral dispositions which predispose to belief, and make intelligible and credible the thing to be believed." And whether the object of his worship be Buddha or Mahomet or Christ, the result will be the same!

"But," Dr Farrar here exclaims,

"Our belief in the Incarnation, and in the miracles of Christ, rests on evidence which, after repeated examination, is to us overwhelming. Apart from all questions of personal verification, or the Inward Witness of the Spirit, we can show that this evidence is supported, not only by the existing records, but by myriads of external and independent testimonies."¹

Contempt is poured upon our belief that an angel messenger appeared to Daniel, and we are not even permitted to believe that an angel ministered to our Divine Lord in the Garden of Gethsemane.² But if, as the

¹ P. 40.

² This, according to Dr Farrar, has no foundation save in the superstitious imagination of the three disciples

natural outcome of this teaching, we should be led to doubt the reality of the angelic apparition at Bethlehem, the indignation of the teacher will find vent in a scream of hysterical and unmeaning rhetoric.

For the question at issue here is the truth of the opening statement of the Gospel narrative. I allude to Matthew i. 18-25, the last verse especially. To the facts there recorded only two persons in the world could testify, and the witness of Mary and Joseph reaches us only in the very records which, we are told, are unreliable and marred by error. But Dean Farrar will assure us that, while words attributed to our Lord Himself are not to be accepted as genuine and true, the evidence here is "overwhelming." Of the reality of Joseph's visions,

when half dazed with sleep!—*The Life of Christ*, ch. lvii. What authority have we, then, for the words alleged to have been uttered by the Lord in His agony? What confidence can we feel in the narrative at all? The gospels become (to use the critic's words about the Book of Daniel) a charming and elevating romance!

and of the fact of Mary's faithfulness and purity, we are supposed to have satisfied ourselves, first by "*personal* verification," secondly by "the inward witness of the Spirit," thirdly by "study of the existing records"—the very records which he disparages—and lastly by tens of thousands of "external testimonies"! To discuss this is impossible, for here the writer passes out of the region in which reason holds sway, and parts company even with common-sense.

The position of the Christian is an intelligible one. Though he believes in the unseen and the unprovable, his faith is strictly rational; for, assuming a Divine revelation, belief is the highest act of reason. I cannot here discuss the grounds on which he claims to possess such a revelation.¹ I merely note the fact that the Christian maintains such a claim, and that, if it be assented

¹ This, of course, would raise the whole question of Inspiration, the discussion of which would be impossible here. But see p. 11 *ante*.

to, his position is unassailable. But if once the validity of that claim be destroyed, every fearless thinker must fall back upon scepticism as "the rational attitude of a thinking mind towards the supernatural."¹ The story of the Incarnation sinks at once to the level of a Galilean legend, and our faith in Christianity is the merest superstition.

Not that the removal of spurious portions of the canon need necessarily lessen faith in what remains. But, as already urged, if the Book of Daniel be expunged, the Revelation of St John must share its fate, and in view of their exclusion numerous passages in the Gospels and Epistles must be fearlessly re-edited. Some may imagine that the process, if intrusted to reverent hands, would not undermine the fabric of the Bible as a whole, but all will admit that it could not fail to weaken it. Nor is this plea put forward as an excuse for clinging to what is doubtful. It is designed only as a protest and a warn-

¹ *Mill's Essays on Religion*, p. 242.

ing against the recklessness and levity of the critic.

Some may perchance regard it as but a cheap and barren victory to have answered Dr Farrar's *Book of Daniel*. For, they will urge, if the attack were intrusted to a more competent leadership the issue would be different. But the suggestion is untenable. While each year that passes brings to light some fresh evidence to confirm the authenticity of Daniel, the treasury of the critics is exhausted. We have no abler or more trusted exponent of the Higher Criticism than Professor Driver of Oxford, yet in his *Introduction* there is not a single count in his formidable indictment of the book but will be found in the pages of his *apparatus criticus*. Dr Farrar has in his turn reproduced all these stock difficulties and objections. The rhetorical dress in which they appear is his own, but, as has been seen,

his attempt to make original additions to the list is a mere fiasco. And these difficulties and objections have here been discussed and answered. Some of them have been shown to be unreal, all of them to be inconclusive; and positive evidence has been adduced on the other side such as would more than outweigh difficulties far more numerous and weighty.

These pages are not addressed to that class of persons who delight in everything which disparages the Bible. They appeal to the wider class of truth-lovers who, while refusing to bow to tradition or authority, and welcoming honest criticism and fair discussion, are always ready with open mind to accept any reasonable vindication of Holy Scripture. If the Bible were treated with that fairness which is never denied to the heathen classics, or indeed to any secular records, how easily its difficulties might be explained! But when the object in view is to discredit Daniel and prove it in error,

no ingenuity is deemed too subtle—I had almost said, too perverse. The proofs here offered that the book is not only genuine but of Divine authority are overwhelming. And if perchance further inquiry and fuller knowledge should hereafter indicate that it contains some “manifest errors,” the task of true criticism will be to deal with these as corruptions of the text or apocryphal interpolations.¹ But it is a strange and not altogether creditable fact that on this subject so many “men of light and leading” appear incapable even of keeping an open mind.

¹ *Ex. gr.*, Dan. vi. 28 was clearly not written by Daniel himself, and the interpolation may possibly include the preceding verses.

APPENDIX.

NOTE I.

(See p. 71 *ante*.)

AS the punctuation of Daniel ix. 25 is doubtful, I have given the passage without any punctuation whatever. The Revisers decided by a majority vote to follow the Massoretic punctuation; and this has been adopted by Dean Farrar, who fails to see that it is fatal to his pseud-epigraph theory of Daniel. The passage thus read appears to limit to 62 "weeks" the period during which Jerusalem was to remain as an inhabited city. But it is quite certain that no Jew writing "in the days of the Seleucid tyrant, anxious to inspire the courage and console the sufferings of his countrymen," could have framed words which would have been construed to mean that the

destruction of their holy city was imminent. Assuming the genuineness of the Book of Daniel, the R.V. punctuation renders the meaning of the passage more obscure, but it cannot alter it, for as $7+62+1$ make up 70, it is obvious that the lesser periods mentioned are subdivisions of the 70 weeks of the prophecy. It is clear, therefore, that the 62 weeks follow the 7 weeks, and that the death of Messiah (according to verse 26) was to be at the close of the 69th week.

As every one knows, there are no punctuation marks in the old Hebrew Scriptures, and the insertion of these is largely a matter of editing. And further, "The Received, or, as it is commonly called, the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament Scriptures has come down to us in manuscripts which are of no very great antiquity, and which all belong to the same family or recension" (Preface R.V.). In adopting the Massoretic punctuation of Daniel ix. 25, the Revisers have followed the accepted axiom of criticism, that of various readings the more difficult is to be preferred. But that rule is of course inapplicable when the difficult reading can be accounted for. And as in this instance a very slight change in the punctuation sufficed to obscure, though it could not destroy, the Messianic reference of the passage, it is impossible not to suspect that the Jewish editors thus

sought to lessen the overwhelming weight of proof which Daniel affords of the truth of Christianity.

There need be no hesitation, therefore, in reverting to the punctuation which has the authority of the A.V., the distinguished American Company of the Revisers, and the margin of our own R.V.

I will only add, that whether the Book of Daniel be regarded as a divine prophecy or a literary fraud, the idea that such a prediction of blessing to the Jews could have been framed without any reference to their Messiah is so preposterous that it would be mere waste of time to discuss it. The force of this is wholly independent of the fact that Messiah was manifested and "cut off" at the identical time which the prophecy indicated — namely, "after the threescore and two weeks" — that is to say, at the close of the 69th week of the era. In other words, the death of Messiah was to take place 483 years after the issue of the decree to rebuild Jerusalem.

NOTE II.

(See pp. 81, 84 *ante.*)

Just as in apostolic times a false tradition concealed the meaning of the First-fruits as a type

and prophecy of the resurrection, so (as already shown, p. 64 *ante*) prevailing errors in Jewish chronology destroyed the moral value of Daniel's testimony to the truth of Christianity; and if the force of that testimony was thus lost even in apostolic times, it is still more hopelessly disparaged to-day. Common men are but little influenced by what needs a treatise to enforce it. And this is precisely the position in which the well-meaning but mistaken zeal of Christian expositors and "reconcilers" have now placed the great prediction of the ninth chapter of Daniel. Theologians are wanting in confidence in the Bible, and thus, instead of being content to leave a pressing difficulty unsolved, they are too apt to have recourse to wild hypotheses to explain it.

It is by Christian exponents alone that any doubts have been raised respecting a single date involved in the problem of the seventy weeks. But to them we owe it that such a cloud of conjecture now envelops the whole question that the prophecy is almost lost both to Church and world. The epoch of the era was declared to be "the going forth of the commandment to restore and build Jerusalem." The words may imply a secret and *divine* decree; but the public fact referred to was the edict of the 20th year of Artaxerxes Longimanus, in virtue of which the city was in

fact rebuilt. But finding, as they supposed, that the era, if computed from that date, would not work out correctly, some maintained that the decree of the king's 7th year was meant, though this had no reference at all to the building of the city; and others, relying upon the errors of Ctesias, set themselves to "cook" the whole chronology of Artaxerxes' reign. But the date of the battle of Actium is not more certain than the date of this, the *terminus a quo* of the prophetic era. And the *terminus ad quem* can be fixed with equal certainty.

In the whole range of history, sacred or profane, there is not a chronological statement more unequivocal and definite than that contained in the opening verses of the third chapter of St Luke's Gospel. The 15th year of Tiberius was a date as well known in the days of the Evangelist as is the 15th year of Victoria in our own. And in that very year every one of the persons named held the position there assigned to him. It is thus made absolutely certain that our Lord's ministry began in the latter part of A.D. 28, and thus we are enabled to fix A.D. 32 as the year of the crucifixion. But here, again, apologists and reconcilers have raised difficulties innumerable; and though every one of these can be solved and silenced, the discussion this involves would half

fill a volume. I have not overlooked a single one of them. But I must take the liberty of referring the reader to my book, *The Coming Prince, or The Seventy Weeks of Daniel*, where I have dealt exhaustively with the whole subject.

While it is idle to expect the many to follow such discussions, I claim from the student and the scholar due recognition of the fact that, so far as this prophecy related to Messiah, it was literally fulfilled, and of the proof that fact affords of the authenticity of the Book of Daniel.

NOTE III.

(See pp. 34, 35 *ante.*)

The following is Professor Sayce's rendering of the concluding (decipherable) portion of the An-nalistic tablet :—

“On the fourteenth day of the month Sippara was taken without fighting; Nabonidos fled. On the sixteenth day Gobryas (Ugbaru), the Governor of the country of Kurdistan (Gutium), and the soldiers of Cyrus, entered Babylon without fighting. Afterwards Nabonidos was captured, after being bound in Babylon. At the end of the month Tammuz the javelin-throwers of the country of Kurdistan guarded the gates of E-Saggil; no cessation of services took place in E-Saggil and the other temples, but no special festival

was observed. The third day of the month Marchesvan (October) Cyrus entered Babylon. Dissensions were allayed before him. Peace to the city did Cyrus establish, peace to all the province of Babylon did Gobryas his governor proclaim. Governors in Babylon he appointed. From the month Chisleu to the month Adar (November to February) the gods of the country of Accad, whom Nabonidos had transferred to Babylon, returned to their own cities. The eleventh day of the month Marchesvan, during the night, Gobryas was on the bank of the river. . . . The wife of the king died. From the twenty-seventh day of Adar to the third day of Nisan there was lamentation in the country of Accad ; all the people smote their heads. On the fourth day Kambyzes the son of Cyrus conducted the burial at the temple of the Sceptre of the world. The priest of the temple of the Sceptre of Nebo, who upbears the sceptre [of Nebo in the temple of the god], in an Elamite robe took the hands of Nebo, . . . the son of the king (Kambyzes) [offered] free-will offerings in full to ten times [the usual amount]. He confined to E-Saggil the [image] of Nebo. Victims before Bel to ten times [the usual amount he sacrificed].”

If this were, what it purports to be, the translation of the undoubted words of the inscription, Professor Sayce's name would be a reasonable guarantee of its accuracy. But the reader's surprise will naturally be excited on learning that the tablet is so mutilated and defective that the text has here and there to be reconstructed, and

that on many points the correctness of Professor Sayce's reconstruction of it is doubtful. I will confine myself, however, to one point of principal importance. Mr Pinches of the British Museum, by whom this very tablet was first brought to light, is perfectly clear that the reading "the wife of the king died" cannot be sustained. In a letter to the Rev. John Urquhart, whose recent work, *The Inspiration and Accuracy of the Holy Scriptures*, deals with the Daniel controversy, he writes as follows¹ (I omit the cuneiform characters):—

"Professor Sayce has adopted a suggestion of Professor Schrader. The characters cannot be . . . 'and the wife of,' but must be either . . . 'and' (as I read it at first) or . . . 'and the son of.' This last improved reading I suggested about four years ago, and the Rev. C. J. Ball and Dr Hagen, who examined the text with me, adopted this view. Dr Hagen wrote upon the subject in Delitzsch's *Beiträge*, vol. i. Of course, whether we read 'and the king died,' or 'and the son of the king died,' it comes to the same thing, as either expression could refer to Belshazzar, who, after his father's flight, would naturally be at the head of affairs."

The following extract is from the article "Belshazzar" by this same writer in the new edition of Smith's *Bible Dictionary*:—

¹ I wish to acknowledge my obligation to Mr Urquhart for placing this letter at my disposal.

“As is well known, Belshazzar was, according to Daniel v., killed in the night, and Xenophon (*Cyrop.*, vii. 5, 3) tells us that Babylon was taken by Cyrus during the night, whilst the inhabitants were engaged in feasting and revelry, and that the king was killed. So in the Babylonian Chronicle, lines 22-24, we have the statement that ‘On the night of the 11th of Marcheswan, Ugbaru (Gobryas) [descended?] against [Babylon?] and the king died. From the 27th of Adar until the 3d of Nisan there was weeping in Akkad. All the people bowed their head.’ The most doubtful character in the above extract is that which stands for the word ‘and,’ the character in question having been regarded as the *large group* which stands for that word. A close examination of the original, however, shows that it is possible that there are two characters instead of one—namely, the *small* character for ‘and,’ and the character *tur*, which, in this connection, would stand for *u mâr*, ‘and the son of,’ in which case the line would read, ‘and *the son of* the king died.’ Weeping in Akkad for Belshazzar is just what would be expected, when we take into consideration that he was for many years with the army there, and that he must have made himself a favourite by his liberality to the Akkadian temples. Even supposing, however, that the old reading is the right one, it is nevertheless possible that the passage refers to Belshazzar; for Berosus relates that Nabonidus, on surrendering to Cyrus, had his life spared, and that a principality or estate was given to him in Carmania, where he died. It is therefore at least probable that Belshazzar was regarded, even by the Babylonians, as king, especially after his father’s surrender. With this improved reading

of the Babylonian text, it is impossible to do otherwise than identify Gobryas with Darius the Mede (if we suppose that the last verse of the 5th chapter of Daniel really belongs to that chapter, and does not form part, as in the Hebrew text, of chap. vi.), he being mentioned, in the Babylonian Chronicle, in direct connection with the death of the king's son (or the king, as the case may be). This identification, though not without its difficulties, receives a certain amount of support from Daniel vi. 1, where it is stated that 'it pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hundred and twenty princes,' &c.—an act which finds parallel in the Babylonian Chronicle, which states that, after Cyrus promised peace to Babylon, 'Gobryas, his governor, appointed governors in Babylon.'"

On this same subject I am indebted to Mr St Chad Boscawen for the following note:—

"Owing to the mutilated state of the latter part of the tablet, it is extremely difficult to arrange the events, and also in some cases to clearly understand the exact meanings of the sentences. As far as I can see, the course of events seems to have been as follows. Sippara was taken on the 14th of Tammuz, and two days later Babylon. Nabonidus had fled, but he was still recognised as king by the majority of the people, especially by rich trading communities such as the Egibi firm, who continued to date their contracts in his regnal years. At Sippara the people seem to have recognised Cyrus as king earlier than at Babylon, as the tablets of his accession year are *all*, with one exception, the source of

which is not known, from Sippara. On the 3d of Marchesvan Cyrus entered Babylon and appointed Gobryas (the prefect of Gutium) "prefect of the prefects" (*pikhat-pikhate*) of Babylon; and he (Gobryas) appointed *the other prefects*. That reading of the sentence is perfectly legitimate. Cyrus seems only to have occupied himself with the restoration of religious order, and on restoring the gods to their temples who had been transported to Babylon. We have then a remarkable passage. Sayce reads 'the wife of the king died'; but Hagen reads the son of the king, and I have examined this tablet, and find that although the tablet is here broken, the most probable reading is . . . the *son*, not the *wife* . . .

"In Dan. v. we read, and 'Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years.' In a second passage, however, this is modified. We read, 'In the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans' (ix. 1); and again, 'It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom a hundred and twenty princes' (vi. 1). Here we have, I cannot help saying, an exact parallel to the case of Gobryas. Gobryas, as I shall show, was a Manda—among whom were embraced the Medes, for Astyages, an undoubted Median king, ruler of the Median capital of Ecbatana, is called . . . a soldier of the Manda, or barbarians. He is appointed on the 3d Marchesvan B.C. 538—after taking the kingdom on 16th Tammuz—'prefect of the prefects'; and he appoints *other prefects* over the kingdom. His reign did not last more than one year, terminating in either Adar 538 or early in B.C. 537. The end is rendered obscure by the fractures in the tablet. . . .

“ If, then, Gubaru or Gobryas was prefect of Gutium before his conquest of Babylon in B.C. 538, there is nothing whatever against his being a Mede ; and as Astyages was deposed by a revolt, when ‘ he was taken by the hands of the rebels and given to Cyrus ’ (Chronicle Inscr), it is very probable that Gobryas was the leader of the conspiracy. Indeed he seems to me to fulfil in every way the required conditions to be Darius the Mede. . . . The appointment of the satraps does not seem exorbitantly large, nor are these to be confounded with the satrapies of the Persian empire.”

I will only add that, in view of the testimony of these witnesses, both thoroughly competent and thoroughly impartial, it is not easy to restrain a feeling of indignation and wonder at the dogmatism of the critics.

I N D E X.

- Airy, Sir George, 74 *n.*
 Angels, 3, 105.
 Annalistic tablet, the, 28, 30, 32, 33, 117-123.
 Antiochus Epiphanes, 13, 14, 70.
 Apocryphal literature of the Jews, 86.
 Aramaic of Daniel, 44, 45.
 Artaxerxes Longimanus, 63, 65, 68, 73, 81, 83, 115, 116.
 Astyages, 39, 122, 123.
- Behrmann, 26.
 Belshazzar, 12, 23, 24, 29-31, 35, 36.
 " his death, 31, 33, 37, 120.
 Berosus, 17, 20, 41, 120.
 Bevan, Prof., 58, 66 *n.*, 77, 91, 98.
 Borsippa, 24.
 Boscawen, Mr St Chad, 121.
 Buddhism, 49 *n.*, 102.
- Calendar, the Jewish, 73, 80.
 Captivity, era of the, 21, 61.
 Carchemish, 17, 18.
 "Chaldeans" = wise men, 48.
 Cheyne, Prof., 52, 58.
 Chief Rabbi, the, 26 *n.*
 Christianity, 101, 107.
 Chronicles, Book of, 15, 61, 78.
- Chronological difficulties, 60.
 Chronology of the Captivity, 21, 22, 60, 61.
 Church, the, 103.
 Clinton, Fynes, 80 *n.*
 Cnidus, battle of, 68.
 "Commandment," use of the word, 66 *n.*
 Cyaxares, 39.
Cyropædia, the, 39, 120.
 Cyrus, 22, 23, 27, 29, 33, 34, 36, 120, 122.
- Daniel, his age when exiled, 19, 20 *n.*, 92, 93.
 " his age when he received the visions, 89.
 " his position in Babylon, 94, 95.
 " his scholarship, 50.
 Darius Hystaspis, 42, 63, 67, 79.
 Darius the Mede, 12, 32, 37-43, 122.
- Desolations, era of the, 21, 22, 61, 67, 76, 78, 79, 81, 82.
 De Wette, 5.
 D'Orsay, Count, 37 *n.*
 Driver, Prof., 2, 23, 40, 45, 58, 87, 90, 109.
- Ecclesiastes, Book of, 55, 88.

- Ecclesiasticus, Book of, 54, 86.
 Eichhorn, 4, 5.
 Esther, Book of, 66 *n.*, 87, 88.
 Ezekiel, Book of, 48 *n.*, 91.
 " testimony of, to Daniel, 91-96.
 Ezra, Book of, 42, 80 *n.*
- Faith of the Christian, the, 107.
 Farrar, Dr, his blunders, 3, 13, 14, 17, 19, 21, 24, 25, 58, 60, 61, 66, 93.
 " Dr, his estimate of the Bible, 10, 21, 100, 105 *n.*
 "Father," meaning of, in Hebrew, 23.
 First-fruits, the, 114.
- Gethsemane, 105.
 Gobryas, 33, 39, 120, 122, 123.
 Great Synagogue, the, 46.
 Greek words in Daniel, 44, 45, 49.
 Greeks in Palestine, 49, 50.
- Haggai, Book of, 42, 63, 79.
 Hebrew of Daniel, 44, 45, 52.
 " Old Testament, 54, 55.
 Hengstenberg, 99.
 Higher Criticism, the, 1, 3, 4, 11, 46, 57, 90, 111.
 Historical errors in Daniel, 12-43.
 Hosea, Book of, 85.
- Incarnation, the, 102, 105, 106, 108.
 Inspiration, 11, 103, 107 *n.*
- Jehoiakim, 12, 15, 16, 18, 22.
 Jeremiah, 21, 22, 61, 66, 76.
 Josephus, 17 *n.*, 39, 42, 61, 62, 63.
 Julius Africanus, 74.
- Kautzsch, Prof., 26.
Kethuvim, the, 87, 88.
 Kings, Book of, 15, 16 *n.*, 19, 68, 87.
 Kuenen, 7, 71.
- Lewis, Sir G. C., 75.
 Lindo's *Jewish Calendar*, 80 *n.*
 Luke, Gospel of, 81, 116.
Lux Mundi, 103, 4
- Maccabees, Books of the, 96, 97.
 Margoliouth, Prof., 54.
 Mary, the Virgin, 102, 106, 107.
 Massoretic text, 113.
 Matthew, Gospel of, 100, 106.
Megilloth, the, 88.
 Mill's *Essays on Religion*, 108.
- Nabonidus or Nabunahid, 23, 24, 27, 29, 30, 33-36, 121.
 Nabopolassar, 18, 20.
 Nebuchadnezzar, 13, 16-20, 23, 29.
 " spelling of the name of, 47.
- Nehemiah, 67.
Neveim, the, 87.
 Newton, Sir Isaac, 75, 98.
- Persia, Kings of, 14 *n.*
 Persian words in Daniel, 44, 45, 50.
 Philological difficulties, 44-55.
 Pinches, Mr, 119.
 Porphyry, 57.
 Prophecy, Dr Farrar's view of, 21.
 " character of, 89.
- Psalms, the, 87, 88.
 Pseud-epigraph theory of *Daniel*, 7, 13, 40-42, 97, 112.
 Punctuation of *Daniel* ix., 112-114.
 Pusey, Dr, 30 *n.*, 46, 51.
- Rawlinson, Prof., 24, 30 *n.*
 Rehoboam, 19.
 Revelation, Book of the, 76, 100, 108.
- Sabbatic years, 77, 78, 83.
 Sayce, Prof., 27, 29, 30, 33, 34, 38, 49, 117-119.
 Sceptics, the, 6, 28, 77.
 Semiramis, 102.
 Servitude, era of the, 21, 22, 61, 67.
 Servitudes of Israel, the, 69.
 Seventy Weeks, the, 60-84, 112, 113, 115, 116.
 Sippara, 30, 33-35, 121.
 Specialists, 90.

- Tablets, the contract, 34, 38. See Westcott, Bishop, 39, 98.
 "Annalistic tablet."
 Talmud, the, 46. Xenophon, 39, 120.
 Tebet, fast of, 82.
 Tel el-Amarna tablets, 50. Year, the prophetic, 73, 74.
 Temple, chronology of the, 62, 68.
 Tiberius Cæsar, 81, 116. Zechariah, Book of, 42, 61, 63, 79,
 81.
 Torah, the, 87.

THE END.

WORKS BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

I.

THE COMING PRINCE :

OR, THE SEVENTY WEEKS OF DANIEL.

WITH AN ANSWER TO THE HIGHER CRITICISM.

Fifth Edition. Cloth, 5s.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27 PATERNOSTER ROW.

II.

HUMAN DESTINY.

Fourth Edition. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

LONDON: HODDER & STOUGHTON, 27 PATERNOSTER ROW.

A HANDBOOK ON THE ESCHATOLOGICAL CONTROVERSY, BEING AN ANSWER TO THE WORKS ENTITLED 'ETERNAL HOPE,' 'ETERNAL LIFE IN CHRIST,' 'SALVATOR MUNDI,' AND 'THE RESTITUTION OF ALL THINGS.'

III.

A DOUBTER'S DOUBTS ABOUT SCIENCE AND RELIGION.

Second Edition. Cloth, 3s. 6d.

KEGAN PAUL, TRENCH, TRÜBNER, & CO., LTD.,
PATERNOSTER HOUSE, CHARING CROSS ROAD.

From the Right Hon. W. E. GLADSTONE, M.P.

"I wish to thank you for your *Doubter's Doubts*, and to say that I have read it with a great deal of sympathy. . . . I presume to hope that you will follow up the subjects of your volume with the same care, force, and exactitude which in it you have bestowed especially upon the main argument."

IV.

THE GOSPEL AND ITS MINISTRY.

A HANDBOOK OF EVANGELICAL TRUTH.

Seventh Edition. Cloth, 2s. 6d.

JAMES NISBET & CO., 21 BERNERS STREET, W.

V.

FOR HIS NAME'S SAKE :

A PLEA FOR REVERENCE.

Cloth, One Shilling.

JAMES NISBET & CO., 21 BERNERS STREET, W.