Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

632ND ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL, WESTMINSTER, S.W., ON MONDAY, MAY 23RD, 1921, AT 4.30 P.M.

PROFESSOR T. G. PINCHES, LL.D., M.R.A.S., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed, and the Hon. Secretary announced the Election of the Rev. John Wick Bowman, M.A., D.D., as an Associate.

PROF. PINCHES rose to explain that, owing to the unfortunate illness of Dr. St. Clair Tisdall, he had been asked to read the paper. He undertook the task with considerable diffidence, owing to the very special nature of the paper.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL: SOME LINGUISTIC EVIDENCE REGARDING ITS DATE. By the Rev. W. ST. CLAIR TISDALL, D.D.

Τοῖς τοι δικαίοις χὠ βραχὺς νικᾷ μέγαν.

(Sophocles).

THE question of the date of the composition of the Book of Daniel, as it at present exists in the Massoretic Text of the Old Testament, has long been under discussion. The Higher Critics have given their verdict regarding its genuineness, and they have, in their own opinion, decided its date within a very few years. To mention one of their latest pronouncements, the Peake Commentary on the Bible says : " No Old Testament Scholar of any repute now maintains that the Book was written by Daniel " (p. 323). This writer admits, however, that it is referred to in the so-called Sibylline Oracles (dating from about 140 B.C.), the " Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs " (109–107 B.C.), and the First Book of Maccabees (*circa* 100 B.C.). Notwithstanding this, the Higher Critics in general have persuaded themselves that the Book of Daniel was written only a few years before the earliest of these works, *viz.*, in 167–165 B.C., and yet within a little over a score of years had grown famous and gained credence far and wide, even among people speaking a language

entirely different from the Semitic tongues in which it was composed. Even those critics who are willing to allow an earlier date are convinced that its origin cannot be put back farther than to a period considerably later than Alexander the Great's conquest of Palestine in 332 B.C.

It is not our duty to state the arguments brought forward in support of this conclusion. They may be read in a multitude of books which deal with the subject. Our purpose in the present Paper is to consider only the question what light the language of the original documents, illustrated by others of ancient and known dates recently discovered, throws upon the matter.

The late Professor Driver, in his well-known *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, and again in his little work on Daniel in the *Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges*, though admitting evidence from many other sources also, rightly lays great stress on the information to be gained as to the date of the Book from a careful study of its words in the original languages, Hebrew and Aramaic. New evidence has been brought forward since Dr. Driver wrote, which seems to me to necessitate an entire reconsideration of the subject. This is drawn largely from the facts learned from the Aramaic papyri discovered comparatively recently in Egypt, and especially in the ruins of some houses in the remains of ancient Syene (Assouan) and Elephantine.

Do these new facts confirm the Critics' conclusions or confute them ? In answering this question it will be well in the first place to hear Dr. Driver's own words, and then see whether they can any longer be maintained to be correct.

Dr. Driver wrote in 1894 (*I.L.O.T.*, pp. 467–476) : " In face of the facts presented by the Book of Daniel, the opinion that it is the work of Daniel himself cannot be sustained. Internal evidence shews with a cogency that cannot be resisted that it must have been written not earlier than *circa* 300 B.C., and in Palestine ; and it is at least *probable* that it was composed under the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes, B.C. 168 or 167." Dealing with the evidence of language alone, he proceeds to sum up his conclusions thus : " 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 ; though συμφωνία as the name of an instrument (considering the history of the term

in Greek) would seem to point to a date somewhat advanced in the Greek period." Elsewhere he refers to two other Greek words, ψαλτήριον and κίθαρις, contained in Daniel as still further confirming his argument. He adds : " Whatever may be the case with κίθαρις, it is incredible that ψαλτήριον and συμφωνία can have reached Babylon *circa* 550 B.C."

Let us examine this latter point first, since Dr. Driver lays so much stress upon it. He is willing to give up κίθαρις, because, as is well known, Homer uses* it in Asia Minor (probably) long, perhaps many hundreds of years, before Daniel's time ; and hence Dr. Driver admits that both the word (used in Dan. iii, 5 ; vii, 10, 15) and the thing may have been well known before the Macedonian Period in Palestine. To the ordinary mind it does not seem altogether impossible that, if *one* Greek musical instrument had become known in Babylonia before Daniel's time, two others should have been introduced along with it, especially as the names of *other* instruments mentioned in the same connexion, whether themselves Greek (as was at one time affirmed by critics, though they now admit their Eastern origin) or not, were not long afterwards known in Greece. To insist, as Dr. Driver does, that these two names of musical instruments prove " a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great " for the composition of the Book of Daniel because they occur in it seems hardly justifiable. But if he is right, what are we to say to the occurrence of even *more* words of, Greek in *dated* Aramaic papyri found in Egypt and belonging to a time *considerably earlier than* the Macedonian conquest of that country ? Although the papyri from Assouan and Elephantine are all more or less fragmentary, yet in the small collection published in the original Aramaic by Arthur Ungnad in 1911, the total bulk of which is considerably less than that of the Aramaic part of Daniel, there are several Greek words. About *three* of these there is no room for doubt. These are the words : στατήρ, ἀρσενικόν, and κιθών. About yet another word† there may be some doubt, though Levi, in his *Chaldäisches Wörterbuch* seems to be convinced of its Greek origin. These papyri date from 494 B.C.‡ to about the end of that century, and are therefore

---

* *Iliad* III, 54 ; XIII, 731 ; *Odys.* I, 153 ; VIII, 248.
† סם : which Levi derives from τάξις, probably in error.
‡ See p. 210.

much earlier than the date (332 B.C.) assigned by Dr. Driver as the very earliest possible for the composition of Daniel, on the ground of its containing *two* Greek words. Moreover, these words in the papyri are not the names of two musical instruments among a group of the same kind, as in Daniel. One is the name of a Greek coin, a second that of a colour, the third denoting an article of Greek dress. Nor are the words found all together in a group : they are scattered in different manuscripts. If we apply Dr. Driver's argument to them, it breaks down utterly. *Is not the same conclusion inevitable when applied to the Book of Daniel?* If the occurrence of *three*, or even *four*, Greek words in these papyri does not (and cannot, because of the dates of the documents) prove their date to be that of Alexander the Great, or perhaps much later, how can *two* Greek words in Daniel " demand " the assignment of the book to a late date ? It can hardly surprise us if a few Greek words found their way in return into, not the cultivated Babylonian vernacular, but the colloquial Aramaic, the lingua franca of the mercantile community of the Jews resident in Babylonia in the latter part of the sixth century before our era. At any rate, even if the date of Daniel be held to be more recent than this, the existence of Greek words in the book cannot " demand " its relegation to the period after the Macedonian conquest of Palestine. The Book of Daniel may well belong, even on the grounds chosen by Dr. Driver for argument, to somewhat the same time as the writing of the Assouan-Elephantine papyri.

What period was this ? and what certainty of the date can there be ? It is not a matter of conjecture but of certainty. Many of the Assouan-Elephantine papyri have the date of writing given in them even more precisely than our modern letters and other documents. They mention not only the *year* but the *month* (often in two calendars, the Egyptian as well as the Hebrew-Aramaic) and the *day* of composition. In some cases, the papyri being somewhat torn or worm-eaten, the date can no longer be read ; but the number of documents in which these particulars are preserved is sufficient to shew that they all belong to the period between 500 and 400 B.C. Thus, taking Arthur Ungnad's little collection entitled *Aramäische Papyrus aus Elephantine*, the first document—a letter from the Jewish community of Yeb (Elephantine) to Bagoas (in the original *Bagohi*), Persian Governor of Judæa (mentioned by Josephus in *Ant. of Jews*, XI, vii, 1), complaining in forcible language of the destruction of

the Jewish Temple at Elephantine three years previously—is
dated : " 20th of Marcheswan, year 17th of Darius the King." As
Darius II reigned from 424 to 405 B.C., it is not difficult to discover
that the appeal was written in 407 B.C. In the same way, omit-
ting the days and months (the latter, as I have said, often given
in two notations), other papyri are dated as follows :—

Ungnad, Doc. 2a, Strassburg Papyrus, 14th year of Darius II,
    410 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 5, Cairo Mus., P. 13480, 37th year of Artaxerxes
    I, 428 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 6, Cairo Mus., P. 13464, 5th year of Darius II,
    419 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 8, Cairo Mus., P. 13492, 12th year of Darius II,
    412 B.C.
*Ungnad, Doc. 15, Cairo Mus., P. 13470, 15th year of Darius II,
    409 B.C. (?)
Ungnad, Doc. 27, Cairo Mus., P. 13493, 2 ? year of Xerxes (?)
    482 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 29, Cairo Mus., P. 13475, 2 ? year of Xerxes (?)
    483–2 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 28, Cairo Mus., P. 13467, 4th year of Artaxerxes
    I., 461 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 30, Cairo Mus., P. 13491, 9th year of Artaxerxes
    I, 456 B.C.
Ungnad, Doc. 31, Cairo Mus., P. 13489, 27th year of Darius I,
    494 B.C. (?)
Ungnad, Doc. 37, Cairo Mus., P. 13476, 5th year of Amyrtaeus,
    circa 400 B.C.

---

* Papyrus No. 13470 had a number, now illegible, after the 15. It is
not absolutely certain, though very probable, that the name erased in
P. 13475 is that of Xerxes. In P. 13489 there is some slight doubt
whether Darius I or Darius II is the king referred to. Ungnad's note
runs thus : " The No. 20 is not quite clear : it has not the usual shape.
That a 10 is meant is not completely excluded. In the latter case we are
dealing with the seventeenth year of Darius II (424–405); in the former case
only Darius I (521–486) would come into consideration, for Darius II
reigned only nineteen years. Then our document would be (from the
year 494) the most ancient Papyrus from Elephantine. The writing,
however, speaks rather in favour of Darius II." If the latter king is
meant, the document dates from 407 B.C., and P. 13493, of B.C. 482, is the
earliest.

As the last date which Daniel the Prophet mentions in the
tenth chapter of his Book is the third year of Cyrus, 535 B.C.,
the interval between the composition of the Book, if ended then
(and it may not have been composed for some years later, if
we for the moment presume it to be genuine) and the writing of
the earliest of the Assouan-Elephantine Aramaic documents
would be very short, not more than forty-one years, if
P. 13489 be the oldest in the collection, and only fifty-
three years if P. 13493 occupy that position. We must
now enquire whether the language of the Book shows any
reason to suppose that, instead of being by that short period
of years earlier than the recently discovered documents, the
Book is really more recent. Dr. Driver's attempt to prove this by
the evidence of two Greek words in Daniel seems to me to have
failed, since these Egyptian-Aramaic papyri contain at least
three, and are certainly not compositions of the post-Alexander
period. As these documents extend over the greater part of a
century, deal with a considerable variety of subjects, from the
destruction of a Jewish temple and the request for permission to
rebuild it, to legal documents, agreements and correspondence, we
ought to be able in some degree to estimate the amount of change
in the Aramaic language which took place during the fifth century
B.C. We may also learn to what extent the language was being
affected by Persian influences, whether the grammar agrees at
all closely with that of the Aramaic of Daniel, and whether the
amount of Persian in Daniel is or is not in excess of that found in
these Aramaic papyri, which, if the Higher Critics are right, must
have been written a long time, possibly several centuries, before
the Book of Daniel. If, on the other hand, the traditional view
of the date of the Book is correct, it was composed such a short
period before these documents in Egyptian Aramaic that the
resemblance between them should be great. The Aramaic of
Ezra should also be taken into consideration, since, if genuine,
some chapters belong to the period during which the Assouan-
Elephantine papyri were drawn up. It is evident that we have
a mass of information at our disposal which should yield important
results when carefully studied.

Dr. Driver calls attention to the number of Persian words used
in Daniel—especially in the Aramaic part of the Book. These he
estimates at fifteen, though he is of opinion that there are two more
(" Daniel," pp. lvi and lvii). There is not the slightest doubt that
all these seventeen words are Old Persian, as I now proceed to show.

1. *Partĕmīm*, Dan. i, 3, 6 (*cf.* Esther i, 3 ; vi, 9) is the Hebrew plural of the Avestic Persian word *Fratema*, "foremost," and hence "Chief, Leader." In Achæmenian Persian the word is hence "Chief, Leader." In Achæmenian Persian the word is *Fratama*, "first," so we have in that dialect "*fratamā martiyā*," leading men : "Dahvyunām fratemā-dhātō" in Yasht x, 18 = "prae-positus (prae-fectus) provinciarum." In the word we are considering we have the superlative of the root Fra, of which the comparative occurs in the Strassburg Papyrus (Ungnad 2*a*, line 4), in the word *Fratara-k(a)*, with the termination -*ka*. The word denotes an officer of a certain rank.

2. *Pathbāg* (Dan. i, 5, 8, etc.) : rightly explained in the B.D.B. Hebrew Lexicon as Avestic *pati-baga*, "special portion," *i.e.*, food assigned to the king ; in Ass. it appears as *pati-pa-baga** (Hilprecht, Series A, Vol. IX) : Sans. *prati-bhāga*, share, division, present of fruit, flowers, to a king.

3. *Azdā* : from the Gāthic *azda*, Vedic Sanskrit addhā, from *a*, this : = thus, certainly, = certain. In the Strassburg Pap., line 3, *azda* occurs, = enquiry, information : Armenian *azd* = notice, information ; *azd linel*, to be informed ; *azdem*, I inform. In papyrus 13480, lines 5 and 7, the Persian *azdakara* occurs, meaning "an intelligence officer," perhaps.

4. *Haddām* : the Avestic *han-dāma*, limb ; in Syr. and later Aramaic the word occurs only as verb in Pa'el, "to dismember."

5. *Dāth* : law. Avestic *Dāthem*, n., law, justice, from root *dā*, Sans. *dhā*. The word seems undoubtedly Persian [though its Babylonian origin might be asserted, for in Ass.-Bab. inscriptions (Knudtzon, "Assyr. Gebete an den Sonnengott," Nos. 293, and 1, 23, 116, *b*, 21, etc.) we find *Dītu, dīti, dati*, meaning "decision, rule, law," perhaps from the Semitic root *dūn, dīn*, to judge. For example : "Dati sha imni wa shumēli ishten-ta-an halqa," "*The laws of the right hand and of the left hand have perished every one*" (Muss-Arnold, p. 270)]. If *Dati*, etc., are really from the Persian, their occurrence in Assyrian inscriptions of this class shows that a certain number of Persian words had been introduced into the *written* classical Assyrian even *before* the Persian conquest. A few such words, as we shall see later, had thus been borrowed from the Persian before Cambyses' time. In both the Assouan-Elephantine papyri and in Assyrio-Babylonian tablets, principally of the time of Artaxerxes I (466–425 B.C.), the compound

---

* *Vide* p. 228, No. 27, below. The extra -*pa* is probably a mistake of the scribe.

Dātabār, Persian tax-gatherer, occurs not infrequently. Such officials become numerous in Babylonia (Hilprecht, *Bab. Exp. of Univ. of Pennsylvania*, Series A, Vol. IX, p. 8).

6. *Ahashdarpān* : Satrap. Achæmenian Persian Khshatrapāvan, from *Khshatra*, realm, and root *pā*, to protect. Hence Greek ἐξατράπης, σατράπης. The ξ for *khsh* recalls the English habit (in Bombay) of representing the Sansk. *Ksh* by *x*.

7. *Rāz* : a secret, = Avestic *razah*, loneliness ; Sansk. *rahasya*, secret. (It is retained in Pahlavi and modern Persian *rāz*, a secret.)

8. *Adargāzar* : an official title, perhaps "counsellor." Avestic Adhara, within, and perhaps root *ghzhar*, to flow.* Whether the mediæval Persian *andar-zhaghar* is connected with our word may be doubted.

9. *Zan* : P. 13480, "Kind, sort" ; Achæmenian and Avestic *zana*, race (of men) ; Armenian *zan*, sort. Root *jan*. Av. *zan*.

10. *Pithgām* : message, decree ; word, thing. Achæmenian *Pati-gāma*, from *Pati-gām*, to come to ; Armenian *patgam* ; mod. Persian *paighām*, a message.

11. *Haddābar* : *cf.* Eg.-Aramaic *hamda-kar* (P. 13492, line 4) ; the doubled *d* representing *md* or *nd*, the words probably formed similarly, only *kar* (doer) for *bar* (bearer). [Or possibly *Haddābar* for *Haudabar*, from Achæmenian *Khauda-bar*, Avestic *Khaoda-bar*, "helmet-bearer."] But perhaps Driver is right in suggesting *gadābar*, as in the Eg.-Aram. papyri the *h* (ﬡ) closely resembles the *g* (ﬡ).

12. *Gadābar* : Avestic *gadhāvara* (which, if it occurred, would be *gadāvara* in Achæmenian, club-bearer ; from gadhā, a mace, club (perhaps, as Ungnad says, a club for throwing). In the Avesta the term *gadhāvara* is applied to Keresāspa, just as the equivalent *gadhā-bhrit* in Sanskrit is to Krishṇa and the Latin *claviger* to Hercules. In modern Persia the mace-bearer (*chūb-dār*) "carries a long staff with a large head covered with embossed silver." In India at native courts the mace-bearer is in Urdū styled *sonte-bar-dār*. Xenophon (VII, iii, 10, and VIII, i, 38 ; iii, 15, Cyropædia) mentions the high position of the σκηπτοῦχος at the Persian court ; as does Tacitus (*Ann.* VI, 33) at other Eastern courts. It is likely that the same office existed in Babylon,

---

* *Cf.* our word *influence*.

since Herodotus states that every Babylonian man of any importance carries a staff (σκῆπτρον) with an ornate top.

13. *Sarak*, a chieftain, head man, from Avestic *sarah-*, head. The termination *-aka* (later *-ak*) was often adjectival in ancient Persian ; but it occurs with nouns also, as here ; more frequently in the papyri than in Dan. It became very common in Pahlavi. Perhaps *sarak* is the only occurrence of the termination forming a noun in Daniel, but in the Eg.-Aram. papyri we have *fratar-ak* (P. Strassburg, line 4), *gūshak* (*ibid.*, B, line 4) [and *Sewānakānīn* (P. 13472, line 6), " people of Syene " ; here we have not the *-ka* but *-kan* or *-kani*]. The termination *-ka*, as *adjectival*, is common in Sanskrit, Pali, Avestic, etc., as well as in Greek and practically in all Āryan tongues ; but as forming *nouns* it is very rare in the oldest dialects of Persian. In the three words we have quoted, *sarak* (Daniel), *gūshak* and *fratarak* (Eg.-Aram. papyri) the termination does not form a *diminutive*, as in the later Persian is so common (*cf.* Sansk. *Prathama-ka*).

14. *Nidneh* or *nidnēh* (Dan. vii, 15) is a word which assumes various modifications at the hands of editors (including the conjecture בְּגִין דְּנָה, which hardly needs consideration). Baer reads נִדְנֶה, Kautzsch נִדְנַהּ, Nöldeke and Bevan נִדְנַהּ, considering that the feminine pronominal suffix is incorporated. In the Talmud and Targums the word occurs in use as נִדְנָא and לְדִנֶה. It occurs as נֵדֶן and נֶדֶן in the Hebrew of I Chron. xxi, 27, where it clearly denotes the sheath of a sword. (This is evidently not the somewhat similar word which is found in Ezek. xvi, 33, and which is from the Assyrian *nadnu, nidnu, nindanu, nudnu, nudunnu, nudinnu,* " a gift, a dowry.") The word we are now considering does not actually occur in either Avestic or Achæmenian texts, but no doubt is possible about its derivation. The root in Avestic is *dā*, to give, to put (δίδωμι, τίθημι, dare), Sansk. *dhā*, to place, *dā* to give. (In Av. and Ach. the distinction between these roots is generally lost, though preserved in Greek and Sanskrit.) In both Avestic and Achæmenian the root forms compounds with the preposition *ni-* ; hence we have Avestic *ni-dā*, to give up, hand over ; Sansk. *ni-dhā*, to deposit, put in, fix in. From the compound root we have in Avestic the words *nidhāiti, nidhāta*, a putting off, put down, connected ; nature, abundance ; stored up ; and in Sanskrit *nidhāna*, a receptacle. This latter word must

have existed in Old Persian too, probably in both dialects, in the form *nidāna* or *nidhāna*. We find in Pāli also *nidhāna*, receptacle, treasury, store, and in modern Persian the Avestic word becomes *nihān*, hidden, secret. It must therefore have existed in the old language of the country. In Sanskrit the term for the sheath of a sword was *pi-dhāna*, from the same root *dhā*, with another prefix, *pi-* (for *api-*, Greek ἐπί).

15. *Appeden* : Achæmenian *Apa-dāna* (root *dā*), a castle, palace, literally a place set apart. In Sanskrit *apa-dhā* (Skt. apa = Gk. ἀπό) means to set apart. It is noteworthy that the same Persian word has been taken into Armenian, only with the *d* changed into *r* and the Armenian plural termination *k'h* added, thus becoming *aparank'h*, palace. *Appadān* occurs in Babylonian too (Muss. Arn., p. 79).

16. *Nebizbāh* occurs in the Aramaic of Dan. ii, 6 ; v, 14. As the Massoretic Text is generally so correct in the *consonants* of the Hebrew and Aramaic words, I hesitate to suggest any change. But the word as it stands does not seem at all explicable. I venture, therefore, to conjecture that the second *b* here may have originally been *n*. The word in the alphabet used in the Eg.-Aram. papyri would then be ת ﬞ ﬞ instead of ת ﬞ ﬞ.* From the context the meaning required is " reward " or " gift." A. ben Ezra says the word means *gift*, as it stands in the Massoretic Text ; but its etymology is not clear. If written as I suggest, נִבְזְנָה, and read *nibāzĕnāh*, there is no difficulty. The first element in the word is the prepositional *ni*, which occurs so often in Persian words and equals Greek ἐνί, Russian *Na*, etc. Then follows the root *bag-* (*baž-*), to take part in, to share ; hence in the Gāthas, the oldest part of the Avesta, *baga* means share, lot, which in later Avestic poems becomes *bagha*. In Achæmenian inscriptions *Baga* [later *Bagha*] means God, a God (*cf.* Russian *Bog*, pronounced *Bokh*). In Sanskrit the root is *bhaj* and *bhanj*. It is found in Armenian also, in the form *baž*, an impost, a tax ; *bažel*, to tax ; *bažin*, part, share ; *bažanel*, to divide. If to *ni-baz-* we add the Avestic noun-ending *-ana* or *-anā*, we get *nibāzanā*, a gift, which in Aramaic would be written נבזנה.

---

* The *n* (𐤍) of the Siloam inscription alphabet (*circa* 700 B.C.) is identical with the *b* (𐤁) of the Eg.-Aram. papyri.

17. *Sarbāl* (Dan. iii, 21, 27) is doubtless the Avestic *sāra-vāra**, literally "head-covering." In the Avesta itself the word means helmet. In later Avestic the word *sar-* in the dual number denotes the body, hence the word *sarbal* seems to have had several different meanings at different times. The LXX render it by ἀναξυρίδες†, tight trousers, and apparently also by ὑποδήματα, shoes. Its modern Persian form, corrupted into *shalvār*, means trousers. Herodotus (vii, 61, 62) says that the Persians and Medes in Xerxes' army wore trousers. But these private soldiers would not wear the same dress as did the learned men of Babylon. Regarding the Babylonians, Herodotus informs us (i, 195) that their long hair was bound round with *tiaras** (which word has many significations in Greek), and gives other details of their dress. Theodotion uses the Persian word itself in Dan. iii, 21.

18. *Hamnīkā*; in Dan. v, 7, 16, 29, is variously read. The Kthīb has Hamōnīkā, Hamōnkā, or Hamnōkā; the Qrī has Hamnīkā; this the LXX and Theodotion render by μανιάκης. The Syriac word is Hamnīkā, which in the Targums becomes Manīk, probably shortened from the Greek. In the Talmud the forms Hamnikkā, Mōnyāq, monyāq, and mūnyāq occur. Polybius uses the Greek form of the word to denote the armlet or necklet (torques) worn by the Kelts. It has long been known that the word in Daniel means necklace, but what is its origin ? The B.D.B. Hebrew Lexicon suggests that in its indefinite form the word in the text should be read Hamyānak, and that it is " a diminutive of the Persian Hāmyān." But Hāmyān is merely the modern Persian pronunciation of the Arabic Himyān, which is a genuine Arabic derivative from the Arabic root *hama'* (to fall, etc.), and means (1) a loincloth, (2) a girdle, (3) a purse hanging from the girdle. Now Arabic words taken into *modern* Persian only very rarely take the diminutive -ak, which seems much more recent *as forming diminutives* than even the " time of Alexander the Great." Moreover we lack the very slightest proof that Arabic vocables had won an entrance into *Old* Persian

---

* In Vendidad XIV, § 9, the *sāravara* is the *turban* of a charioteer, and so, perhaps, *sarbāl* here. But there are two difficulties in the way of a Persian derivation of *sarbal*: (1) that *b* can hardly represent the Persian *v*; and (2) that there is no *l* in Old Persian in either dialect, and the only way in which the second *r* in *sāravāra* can be accounted for changing into *l* is by supposing that the change was made to prevent the repetition of the *r*.

† In some MSS.

and there formed diminutives. The derivation of the word, however, is quite clear. In Avestic we have a word *maini* (Sanskrit *mani*, a gem), an ornament, and especialy a necklace. In the Avesta " with a golden collar " (*zarenu-mainish*) is a term applied to a vulture. Combining this word *maini* in the sense of an ornament with the prefix *ham* (Sanskrit *sam*, Greek συν, Latin *cum*) we have Hammaini in Avestic, which in Achæmenian would be Hammani (written *hamani*). With the *-Ka* termination (not in the diminutive sense) the Achæmenian form of the word would be *Ham(m)ānīka*, a collection of gems, a necklace. Probably, therefore, the Qri form *Hamnīkā* is correct, meaning " the neck-ornament."

19. *Tiphtāyē*. Most scholars until recently fancied that this word in Dan. iii, 2, 3, was due to a scribal blunder, and various conjectures were resorted to in order to correct it. Now, however, we know that the reading is correct, for the word occurs in line 4 of Section B of the Strassburg papyrus, dated year 14 of Darius II (Ungnad, pp. 8, 9), with only this difference that a *yod* is inserted after the initial consonant, making the syllable long, or at least fully written, and confirming the correctness of the traditional vocalisation of that syllable. The B.D.B. Lexicon does not attempt to explain its etymology, all attempts previously made being deemed erroneous. The meaning of the word had been lost *even before the LXX version of Daniel was made*. The Peshiṭṭā version merely transliterates the word with the change of a single letter. The word being Persian, it is evident that the second element in it is the vocable which in Achæmenian is *pati*, lord, and in Avestic *paiti* (in Sanskrit *pati* = Greek πόσις). The first part is *ti*, which is a shortened form of the particle *ati* (Achæmenian), Avestic *aiti*, Sanskrit *ati*. Neither dialect of Old Persian actually affords an instance of the omission of the initial vowel in this word; but the particle itself occurs only once in the Achæmenian inscriptions. In the cognate Armenian, however, several words are formed with this particle, and in every instance the initial vowel is lost. Thus we have *Ti-air* (contracted *tēr*) from (*a)ti*, over, and *air*, man ; hence *tēr* = lord ; *Ti-kin* (= γυνή), over-woman, lady ; *Ti-ezerk'h* " over-limits," the world, the universe. The particle *ati* does not lose its initial vowel in Sanskrit, nor is *ati-pati* found in that language ; but words similarly compounded do occur, as, *e.g.*, *ati-rājā*, *ati-strī*, *ati-mānusha*, *Atīndriya*. Compounds similarly formed with *adhi*, a prefix of similar meaning to *ati*, also occur: as *Adhi-pati*

(ruler), *adhirājā, adhipurusha* ; so, too, with the preposition *api* (= Greek ἐπί), only in this case the first vowel is often lost, as in *pi-dhā, pi-nah, pi-dribh*. *Adhi* too often loses its first vowel, as in *dhi-shthita*.

20. Another undoubted Persian word is Nebrāshtā (Dan. v, 5). The first element here is *ni-*. Then the Avestic root *brāz-*, to shine = the Sanskrit *bhrāj* with the same meaning. In Avestic the *z* becomes *sh* regularly before *t* ; the participle would be *brāshta*, or, with the prefixed *ni-*, *nibrāshta*. In the Aramaic *nebrāshtā* the final vowel is, of course, the definite suffix. The Persian word would mean " illuminated," and hence the Biblical term would no doubt denote a lamp, a chandelier.

21. The word *Zĕman* is also most probably taken from the Persian. In the Avesta we find *Zrvān*, time. The word has been adopted into all the main Semitic languages, the *v* being changed to *m* in Heb., Aram., Arab., Aeth., and into *b* in Syr., Sam., etc. (In modern Persian the word *zamān* has been borrowed once more from the Arabic.) It occurs quite frequently in the Eg.-Aram. papyri.

Dr. Driver says that there are at least fifteen Persian words in Daniel. We have found about twenty-one, and our investigation has shewn that they are undoubtedly Persian, though some of them have not previously been considered as certainly borrowed from that language, nor has their etymology been in every case previously established.

It might seem that our examination has thus strengthened the argument *against* the antiquity of the book. But this is not so, as will be perceived when all the linguistic evidence is before us.

Eduard Meyer* has shewn that the Aramaic documents contained in Ezra are to be held genuine. They would hardly be worth including in his work by the historian were it otherwise. The part of Ezra which is in Aramaic is : Chapters iv, 8, to vi, 18, and vii, 12 to 26, both inclusive. Even Dr. Oesterley speaks of Ezra iv, 8, to vi, 18, as an " Extract from an Aramaic document " (Peake's *Commentary on the Bible*, p. 327). Now anyone who examines these portions of Ezra will perceive that the style and language employed are the same as in the rest of the Aramaic part of the book. Dr. Oesterley states that " In so far as these sources " (those from which the earlier parts of Ezra-

---

* A hostile critic: in his *Entstehung des Judenthums*, Halle, 1896. Hommel, *Die altisraelitische Überlieferung*, pp. 22 *sqq.*

Nehemiah are drawn) " are brought into connexion with the names of Persian kings, and assuming that this is correctly done, the dates of the kings in question will, of course, be the approximate dates of those parts of the book. So that the earliest portion will belong to the time of Cyrus, about 537, while the latest parts of the sources, the memoirs of Nehemiah, cannot have been written later than the end of the reign of Artaxerxes, about 424 " (*Op. cit.*, p. 325). He proceeds, however, to assert that the book " in its present form belongs to the Greek age, in all probability later than 300 B.C." He affirms this, however, not on philological but on historical grounds, because Josephus mentions *a* High Priest Jaddua as living in the reign of Alexander the Great (*Antiq.* XI, vii, 2 ; viii, 7). We have nothing to do at present with this latter point, but only with the admission that at least part of the Aramaic is possibly of as early a date as 537 B.C. This is earlier than we should venture to claim for the Aramaic of Daniel, earlier than any of our Assouan-Elephantine papyri. If we accept Dr. Oesterley's statement as meaning this, then *there is philologically no reason for denying that the Book of Daniel may be genuine*. At any rate the Egyptian Aramaic papyri bring us back to 494 B.C. (P. 13489), or at least to 482 B.C. (Pp. 13475 and 13493), and down to about B.C. 400, as has already been pointed out.

Now those parts of the Aramaic sections in Ezra which are generally admitted to be genuine and long anterior to Alexander's time (332 B.C.), to say nothing of the date commonly accepted by the Higher Critics for the composition of Daniel (*c.* 167–5 B.C.), contain rather *more* Persian words, comparatively speaking, than does Daniel—certainly not less. So do the papyri. If Daniel had been composed in Alexandrian times in Palestine, we should have expected it, in consequence of the long continued influence of the Persian language, to have contained a larger Persian element by far than either the Aramaic of Ezra or that of the Egyptian papyri. Or, if not, it would certainly have absorbed into its vocabulary a considerable proportion of Greek terms. In nearly two centuries of Greek influence, it might at least have acquired more than *two* solitary Greek musical terms. But, if the critics are right, its rate of progress in Greek was remarkably slow. Not only Macaulay's but even our own schoolboys could beat it. Of course, our critical friends may reply that the pious forger of the book was clever enough to guard against any extensive use of Greek vocables, lest he should thereby be detected. What a strange thing it is, then, to find him so much off his guard,

not only as to let himself be detected through the use of two quite unnecessary Greek words, but also to be oblivious to the fact that his use of some twenty Persian terms would render him liable to suspicion. On the other hand, we might say that the comparative smallness of the number of Persian words in Daniel, and the almost total absence of Greek, form a good argument in favour of the authenticity and genuineness of the book.

It has been argued that there is an utter absence of Persian in the Babylonian tablets before the Persian acquisition of that country. If this were correct, and not merely comparatively so, it would not be a matter for surprise. Cuneiform Babylonian, as now known to us, was an old and long established literary language, which would admit foreign words only very gradually and with great reluctance. Aramaic was the lingua franca of the day, which, though reduced to writing long before, had not yet become the language of any considerable literature. Proper attention has not yet, to our knowledge, been paid to this most important fact. Yet a parallel case may easily be cited. In China there is a considerable difference between the literary language written in the characters handed down by literary men for many hundreds of years and the vernacular of the various provinces. English and other foreign terms may effect an entrance into the spoken tongue, but it will be far harder to acclimatise them in the literary tongue. Again, in vernacular English we find it easy to speak and write of the *Alake* of Abbeokuta, the *Sheikhs* of Arabia, the *Maliks* of Baluchistan, the *Mullās* (mad or otherwise) of the Soudān, the *Shāh* of Persia, the *Sultān* of Turkey or of Egypt. But if we were writing in a classical tongue like Latin or Greek, it would be hard to compel ourselves to admit such words into our composition. Latin in this case represents the classical cuneiform Assyrio-Babylonian tongue, while English, whether spoken at home or abroad, assumes the place of the Aramaic language commonly used by the foreign and trading community of the great city. The Aramaic dockets attached to cuneiform tablets found in Babylon long before Daniel's time attest this fact.

It has been assumed that Persian words cannot have been used in Babylon until a considerable time had elapsed after the Persian supremacy had been established in that city. But this is by no means certain. The Babylonians had come into close contact with the Medes and Persians (who spoke dialects of one and the same language) hundreds of years before that time. Contact

had been established at least as early as Tiglath Pileser the First's days, for his inscriptions show that he overran the Iranian plateau about 1100 B.C., while the inscriptions of Shalmaneser mention the Medes (Mādai) in the account of his expedition into the land of Namri in 837 B.C.. In 744 B.C. Tiglath Pileser IV carried captive from Media to Calah no less than 60,500 prisoners, and multitudes more in 737 B.C. Nebuchadnezzar had among other wives Amytis, daughter of Astyages (Ishtuvegu), the last king of Media. Others say he married the daughter of Cyaxares (Uvakhshatara), Astyages' father,—in either case a Median princess. This would cause close social and some commercial intercourse between the Iranians and the Babylonians. The result would be some effect on the main trading language of Babylonia, that is to say Aramaic. [In a lesser degree contact with the Greeks might introduce a few Greek words ; for Croesus of Lydia (560 B.C.) was in alliance with Sparta as well as with Nabu-nahid, and he ruled certain important Greek cities in Asia Minor. We are apt to underrate early Greek influence in Asia as well as in Egypt. Greek mercenaries were in Nubia as early as 660 B.C.* Were there no Greeks in Babylonia before Alexander ? Sardes fell in 546 B.C. Herodotus found no difficulty in reaching Babylon about 450 B.C.† and in making himself understood by means of interpreters. It is not the *large* number (only *two*), but the *small* number of Greek vocables in Daniel which surprises us.]

It has been said that in Daniel there is an anachronism in the use of so many Persian titles of Court and State officials in references to the time of Nebuchadnezzar, before such Persian officials could have existed at the Babylonian Court. It is true that in chapter iii, 2, 3, out of seven such titles five are Persian. This cannot represent the actual fact. That is to say, these Persian titles must have come into use in Aramaic after the Persian domination had begun. But it must not be concluded, therefore, that a long time must necessarily have elapsed between the Persian conquest and the composition of the book. When England received the Mandate for Mesopotamia, it was not found possible in every instance to express exactly in Arabic the precise titles assumed by the British officials. It was not only convenient but necessary to introduce certain English terms. This was

---

* Under Psammetichus, 664–610 B.C.
† He was born between 490 and 480 B.C., and lived to about 425 B.C.

important, too, in order to distinguish, say, the English Judge from a native Qāḍī, an English Paymaster from a native one. The difference was real from several points of view. Nor did it take a considerable number of years before the natives of the country learnt to use the foreign terms. Somewhat similarly the Babylonians would speedily learn to apply Persian titles to Persian officials. At least the Jews in Babylonia would feel no prejudice against applying the new terms soon after the establishment of Persian rule to certain Babylonian officials, when speaking of them a very few years later in Aramaic. It was, no doubt, an anachronism, yet not one difficult to make allowance for. It implies, doubtless, that Daniel composed the book, even the earlier part of it, *after* the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. But this is not strange, for the capture of the city *is recorded* in the book. We do not know how long afterwards Daniel continued to survive, but a few years would suffice. As it is not likely that he spent all the rest of his life in Babylon, but was probably found useful elsewhere, perhaps at Susa (Shushan), where he had been before, his Aramaic might easily adopt a few Persian terms in everyday use at the Persian court at Susa, and very soon, probably, at Babylon too.

Dr. Driver urges that " The numerous contract-tablets which have come down to us from the age of Nebuchadnezzar and his successors, and which represent the everyday language of commercial life, show no traces of Persian influence ; and if the language of Babylonia was uninfluenced by Persia, that of Israel would be far less likely to be so influenced." (*Daniel*, Introduction, pp. lvii, lviii.) This argument, however, is quite fallacious. For the fact that the Babylonian contract-tablets are in *Babylonian*, the legal and classical language, not in the *Aramaic* lingua franca, makes the above comparison unjust and unsatisfactory. Moreover, it is not correct to say that even classical Babylonian was in its vocabulary unaffected by Persian. Even before the Persian conquest some few words from that language had possibly been borrowed [for example, the *Dati* (also *ditu*, *diti*) already referred to]. Though this word may possibly not be Persian, yet there can be no doubt about certain others. In a tablet of Cambyses' sixth year, lines 1, 6, 9, 12 and 18, we find the word *Pardīsu*, for example. Although Professor Sayce tells us that the Babylonian scribes tried to derive it from a Babylonian source as if it were *Par-ēsu* (Sayce, *Rel. of Eg. and Bab.*, p. 272), yet it is the Avestic

Pairidaēza, an enclosure walled round, from *pairi* (= Gk. περί) and the root *daēza*, to wall in, the whole denoting a park: becoming in Greek παράδεισος. (Strassmeier, *Inschriften von Cyrus*, 213, 3 : *Amal uras sha pardīsu*, park-keeper.) Again the Persian measure which in Greek became ἀρτάβη, is mentioned as *Artabu** (Strassmeier, *op. cit.*, 316, 1 and 6). Another *possible†* " trace of Persian influence " is the word *Pīru* (also written *Bīru*), which Tiglath Pileser III, Sennacherib, and Sargon use in their inscriptions (*vide* Muss-Arnolt, Ass. Dict. *s. v.*). The word means elephant, and the terms *shinni pīri*, ivory, *mashak pīri*, elephants' hide, occur in the accounts of these kings' expeditions. But *pīru* is perhaps from the Sanskrit word *Pīlu*, elephant, so called from the supposed resemblance between that animal's ear and the leaf of a *pīlu*-tree (*Careya Arborea* or *Salvadora Persica*, Linn.). The word in Assyrian is also written *Pīlu*. In this form it was derived from Sanskrit directly ; but the other form *Pīru may* have come through the Persian, for Persian had not the letter *l* in either the Achæmenian or the Avestic dialect, changing that letter into *r*. It cannot be denied, even by the Higher Critics, that Sennacherib, Sargon, and Tiglath Pileser lived before the establishment of the Persian domination over Babylonia, yet even into Assyrio-Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions some Persian words seem in their time to have made their way. The occurrence of a Persian word in an inscription of Cambyses proves the same thing, for the word must have already acquired a firm place in the Babylonian vocabulary or his scribe would not have used it. We have quoted only three Persian words in this connexion, but if Dr. Driver holds that the use of only *two* admittedly Greek words in Daniel is sufficient to justify him in affirming that these two " Greek words *demand* a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great " for the composition of the Book of Daniel, what shall we say of the occurrence of *three* Persian words in the Babylonian Inscriptions ? Do they

---

* Having already assumed a Babylonian termination.

† I say *possible*, and mention the word with some hesitation, because the word, explained in an Assyrian bilingual text as pronounced *pīru*, is *expressed* by the compound ideograph AM–SI ; the reading of this ideograph was unknown till discovered by Prof. Pinches of the British Museum. He says : " This carries the date of its introduction back to about 2000 B.C. The form *pilu*, if I remember rightly, is found later. As elephants were hunted near Haran, it seems more likely that *pīru* was a native word, and not derived from the Sanskrit."

suffice to prove that the Persian conquest of Babylonia must have taken place before the times of the kings named in the inscriptions from which we have quoted ? If so, we shall have to ask the critics to re-write the history of Assyria and Babylonia for us, as they have already so kindly done that of Israel and Judah.

It should be observed that the Persian words used in Daniel belong in every case to the Achæmenian rather than to the Avestic form of the tongue. This is important as bearing upon the age of the book. The Achæmenian inscriptions are *dated* nearly as exactly as are the Assouan-Elephantine papyri, for they bear the name of the king who in each instance commanded them to be inscribed. The extant inscriptions give us, however, the knowledge of only a few hundred Achæmenian words. The Avestic vocabulary is much more extensively known, for we find a large number of words in the remains of the Avesta. We have often to refer to that dialect in order to supplement the defects in our scanty store of Achæmenian vocables ; but this must be done with care, because we are not certain of the exact date of the composition of the different parts of the work. There are also some differences of reading in different MSS., none of which is of great antiquity. Tradition tells us a few slightly disquieting stories about the revision made under the Sāsānides. Yet the language of the Gāthas is, in its essentials, so little removed from that of the Rig Veda that its antiquity needs no other demonstration. The other and more recent parts of the book, as we now have it, are evidently in the same language, in a form much more ancient than the Pahlavī, in which alone certain traditions are preserved. Unfortunately, the Avesta deals exclusively with religion, and hence it omits all the part of the language which treated of secular matters. Therefore many words are absent which we should like to know. But as we know the grammar and composition of the language fairly well, we are able oftentimes to detect Persian words in Aramaic that are not actually extant in the Avesta or in the Achæmenian inscriptions. This enables us to state with certainty that not a few words in Daniel, Ezra, and the Egyptian papyri are Persian, and often to ascertain approximately their meaning. This much it is necessary to explain in order to anticipate some possible objections, though none such can arise with reference to two of the three Persian words which we have quoted from the Assyrio-Babylonian inscriptions.

It should be noted that the Avesta contains no Semitic words at all, except the single term *Tanura*, an oven for baking, in Vendidad VIII, 91. This is an additional proof of its antiquity.

It is evident from the study of the Assouan-Elephantine Aramaic papyri that they contain a *larger* Persian element than does Daniel. This must show that they were composed when a *longer time* had elapsed between their composition and the establishment of the Persian dominion in Western Asia. But as the papyri are *dated*, we are thereby taught that Daniel must have been written at a date *earlier* than they. We must now, however, proceed to produce evidence of the existence of this large Persian element in the papyri, as we have done in reference to Daniel, taking nothing for granted.

Beginning with the papyri given by Ungnad, and taking the words generally in the order in which they occur in his little book, we instance the following, including the Greek vocables :—

(1) כרשׁן, Aram. pl. of Pers. *karsha*, a certain weight (= κέρσα κόρσιον, Hesych.), root *karsh*, to draw, pour out, etc. ; equivalent to 10 shekels.

(2) דוׁשׁכרתח : Avestic *Dushkeret*, adj., evildoing, from *dush-*, prefix, ill, and *kar-*, to do, make (Skt. root *kri-*) ; here the Aram. word is a noun, = an evil deed.

(3) פרתרך, would be *frataraka* in Ach., from *Fratara*, comp. adj. from root *fra* (Eng. *fore*), with noun-termination *-ka* ; hence = " one more to the fore," a foreman, hence a military commander of some important grade. The superlative is *Fratama*, Ach., *fratema*, Av., found in the pl. in the word פרתמים in Daniel, meaning nobles.

(4) הנדיז : from Av. *han-* (often *ham-*, cf. Skt. *sam-*) together, and root *daēz-* to heap up, to dam up ; hence in Aram. *handēz* must mean " surrounded, besieged."

(5) אזד : the word occurs in Daniel as *azdā* and is rendered " certain." (See der. given on p. 212.)

(6) תיפתיא : occurs in Dan. iii, 2, 3, the defective form, omitting the first *yod*, being there adopted, as it very often is in other words in the papyri also. (See explanation of the word in p. 217 above.)

(7) גושׁך : from Ach. *gausha*, Av. *gaosha*, the ear, with affix *-ka*. Here title of some Persian official ; in the Aram. in the pl. definite. With this title *cf.* what we are told about the

Persian official entitled the "King's ear," Plutarch ii, 522, E, also *cf.* Lucian "Adv. Indoct.," 23 ; so, too, the term the "King's eye," Herod. i, 114 ; Ar. Ach., 92 ; Aesch. Persae, 985.

(8) אודים : the Av. *ava-daēsa*, from *ava*, yonder, on the other side, and *daēsa* a sign, indication ; hence *avadaēsa* (Ed. Meyer), the word here used in Aram. means an intimation, direction, order.

(9) ארדבן : Aram. pl. of Persian word which in Gk. becomes ἀρτάβη and in Bab. *artabu*, a Persian measure. Derivation perhaps Ach. *arta*, Av. *ereta* (Skt. *r̥ita*), right, law, religious duty, and root *pa*, to protect.

(10) נשתון : a word which occurs in Ezra iv, 7, 18, 23 ; v, 5 ; vii, 11, in both Heb. and Aram. passages. In Ezra the R.V. in v, 5, renders it "Answer." The B.D.B. Heb. Lexicon translates "letter," giving it as a Persian word (though noting Meyer's doubts), and suggesting the derivation from the root from which comes the modern Persian *nivishteh* (older *nibishtah*), "written." This derivation, however, is quite impossible. For the word taken from the Ach. *pais*, Av. *paēs*, to colour, adorn, with prep. *ni* prefixed *ni-paēs*, to write down, occurs in Darius' inscriptions as *nipishtam*, written down, Inf. *nipishtanaiy*. It is clear that the form *nishtewān* is not the same as *nipishtam*. The two Ach. verbs from which these two distinct words come both occur, strangely enough, in a passage in Darius' Besitūn Inscriptions, running thus : "Adam ni-yashtāyam imām dīpim nipishtanaiy," I bade write this tablet. The root of *nishtewān* is really *stā*, to stand (Ach. and Av.; in Skt. *sthā*), which, with the prefix *ni* becomes *ni-shtā* in Ach., *ni-shtā* in Av., and *Ni-shthā* in Skt. Its causative stem *ni-shtāya* occurs in the Achæmen. inscriptions, meaning "to cause to stand in," and hence to "appoint, enjoin, command." The past part. of the Skt. verb means fixed, firm, settled. The verbal adj. *nishthavat.* (in one form *nishthavān*) means perfect, complete. In Av. the verbal would be *nishtavant*, and in one form *nishtavān*, just the word found in the Aram. (allowing, of course, for the fact that the vowels in Aram., as in Heb., are not due to the original text). The word occurs in P. 13480, line 3, as well as in Ezra. It means something enjoined, fixed, settled. It might denote "statement, report, document, memorial." It might assume the sense of "letter," only if used as the message of a superior, which Persian politeness might express by a word strictly signifying a command, as at

the present day. The term in Aram. for a letter in Ezra is *iggereth* (Ezra v, 6), derived from the Assyrian *ēgirtu*. This word is often found in the Eg.-Aram. papyri, as well as in Biblical Aramaic. The LXX render *nishtewān* by φορολόγος, tax-collector ! This is a fair specimen of the knowledge these translators had of the foreign words occurring in Daniel and Ezra.

(11) אזדכר : informant, intelligence agent ; the termination -*kara* in Old Persian being added to express the doer, agent ; here it is added to the *azd*, or *azda* mentioned above (p. 225, No. 5).

(12) זן : *zan* has been explained above, p. 213.

(13) רתכר : from Av. *ratha*, a chariot, hence *rathakara*, a charioteer or driver, wagon-driver.

(14) נופת : Pers. *nāvapat*, evidently meaning a ship-captain. In Ach. *nāvaya*, adj., means, when applied to water, able to bear a *ship*, navigable. Ach. must have had the word *nāv-*, = Gk., Lat. and Skt. stem meaning a ship. The termination is Ach. *pati*, Av. *paiti*, master.

(15) אופשר : the first element in the word is *upa*, near, etc., found in Av., Skt., etc., and perhaps the root *sar*, Av., to unite. The Aram. word is often read with *d* instead of *r* for the penultimate letter. Meaning unknown.

(16) המדכר : *Hamdakara* as a Persian word reminds us of the *haddābar* of several passages in Aram. of Daniel. That the words are Persian seems clear, but the derivation and meaning are unknown.

(17) גנז : found in Ezra and elsewhere, meaning treasure. It was borrowed in Assyrian in the forms *ganzu* and *gunzu*. We find also the compound *ganzabaru*, representing Old Persian *ganzabara*, which became (according to the usual rule of assimilation) *gazzabara*, wrongly punctuated *gizbār* in Ezra vii, 11.

(18) פרמנכר : "commander," from Ach. *framānā*, command ; *cf.* Skt. *pramāna*. (In modern Persian the word is *farmān*.)

(19) אופכרת : fr. *upa*, as above, and either root *kar*, to make, or root *keret*, to cut ; hence *upa-keret*, to cut in, cut to shape ; in either case Persian.

(20) הנדון : from *han* = *ham*, together, and *perhaps* Av. root *dvan*, to fly.

(21) אפסר : Probably Persian, *apasara*. (It may be the word *afsar*, found in modern Persian, meaning a crown.)

(22) פחטמוני : is the construct. pl. of פחטמון, which looks like a Gk. word. Can the latter part be a corruption of ἀρτέμων, topsail ?

(23) טסן : pl. of טס, which Levi derives from τάξις, probably not correctly. Brockelmann doubts this. He is certainly wrong, however, in deriving the word, in the sense of a plate, dish, from modern Persian *tasht*, with which not a single letter corresponds.

(24) זרניך. I agree with Sachau that *zarnīk* (P. 13492, line 17) is the Gk. word ἀρσενικόν, which occurs in the same form in Syriac also, and in modern Persian, Turkish, etc., as *zarnīk, zarnīq, zarnīkh, zarnī*. The various methods of spelling and pronouncing the word show that it is borrowed. It does not denote *arsenic* in the modern sense, for in Greek it was applied to a paint, and hence suits the context, which deals with shipbuilding. The document contains a large number of Persian and Babylonian words, shewing how much these languages had affected Aramaic by the date (413 B.C.) when the papyrus was written. A few Greek words had also been adopted. Aramaic had evidently the same tendency to adopt foreign words then that it manifested in its later history. This was very natural in a commercial tongue.

(25) אשרנא : the word occurs quite frequently in the papyri, also in Ezra v, 5, 6. The meaning is not quite clear, but it does not mean "a wall," as generally rendered. Nor, perhaps, does it mean *forecourt*, as others suggest. It occurs in P. 13492, lines 5, 9, 21, as also, *e.g.*, in P. 13495, line 11. Some suggest a Bab. etymology, which seems doubtful. Possibly it may be Persian, from some word cognate with Skt. *śaraṇa*, a refuge, sanctuary.

(26) פתיפרס, also written פתפרסן : evidently from the root which in Av. is *fras*, to ask, to enquire. In course of conjugation the stems *peres, peresa, parsa*, etc., occur. The verb is used in Ach. too, and in the Gāthas. As a noun *frasa*, a question, occurs in the Gāthas. With the prefixed prep. *pati* (= Av. *paiti*, Skt. *prati*, Gk. ποτί,, πρός),= to ask, to seek out; to read : *patiparsāhy*, thou readest, Behistūn Inscr. IV, 8. Hence *patipars* here means an enquiry, investigation, and *patipars-īn* is its Aram. pl. masc. *Cf.* Skt. *pratipraśṇa*, enquiry.

(27) סתתר is the Gk. στατήρ: it occurs in Ass. (in Artaxerxes' time) as *istatiru* (Hilprecht, *Bab. Exp. of Univ. of Pennsylvania*, Series A, Vol. IX). Persian words too occur there, such as

databari, ustarbari, uzbarra, pitipabaga, etc. Herodotus tells us that Gyges of Lydia struck coins about the seventh century B.C. These were used in Babylonia and Persia. Specimens exist of staters struck in Sidon bearing a Persian king in a chariot. The Greek word here quoted from P. 13468, line 12, occurs also in P. 13476, line 4.

(28) כתון : P. 13490, lines 8, 9, 13 : evidently the Ionic Gk. κιθών , Attic χιτών. Herodotus says the Persians and Medes in Xerxes' army wore *chitons* (Herod. vii, 61, 62).

(29) פתיפא : the Av. *paiti-pā* (like Skt. *pratīpa*) means " against the current "; in Skt. comes the sense of " adversary."

(30) אביגדן : vocalisation perhaps *abigadan* or *abigeden*, from Ach. *abi*, Av. *aiwi, aivi*, against, and root *gad*, to ask, demand, is from the context = to penalty fixed for breach of agreement. That the Persian element in Aram. in the papyri, (as in Biblical Aram.) is in the Achæmenian dialect is clear from, *e.g.*, the Ach. *abi* in contrast with the Avestic *aiwi, aivi* (P. 13466, line 6).

(31) הנגית : from *Han, ham*, together, and *Gaëtha*, family, Av., of the same family, relative.

(32) הנבקא : from *han* and *baga*, Ach., *bagha*, Av. share, lot, or *baghā*, part, portion, hence the word means partner. The sense is clear also from the equivalent genuine Aram. phrase in line 5 : " Bar lī wa barāh lī, akh wa akhāh lī, qarīb wa rakhīq "; a son of mine and a daughter of mine, a brother and sister of mine, a relative and a stranger. (The use of *qof* to represent the sound of *gh*, called *ghain* in Arabic, is noteworthy, because (1) in the single Aram. verse in Jeremiah x, 11, we find the word for earth* written both ארקא and ארעא ; and (2) in Persia to the present day the same letters are sometimes interchanged with one another. E.g., *āghā* and *āqā* have to a Persian ear the same sound, though not in Arabic. (Native Persian scholars have assured me that they can detect no difference in the sounds of *q* and *gh* in Persian.)

(33) זפרגן : whatever the word may mean, it seems to be derived from Av. *zafar*, mouth (of a demonic being), and *gan*, to smite, slay. (Probably name of a grain.)

In the language of Daniel (and Ezra), besides the Persian words which we have commented on, there is a small number

---

* So, too, in Eg.-Aram. papyri.

of Babylonian terms. The same fact is true of these papyri. It may be well to give a few examples from Biblical sources first, and then from these papyri, in order to show that no distinction can be found in this linguistic point between the two series of documents.

Omitting for the present the Assyrio-Babylonian proper names, such as Arioch, Meshak, Shadrak, Abed-Nego, besides those of Kings Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, and Daniel's own appellation Belteshazzar, all of which will require notice later, we proceed to give a list of a number of words in Daniel borrowed from Babylonian :—

(1) אָשַׁף : Ashaph, from Bab. Ashshapu, ashapu (ashipu, ishipu), an enchanter, diviner ; from ashāpu, to bewitch, divine.

(2) אַתּוּן : Attūn : from Bab. utunu, atinu, hearth, fireplace, furnace.

(3) בְּלוֹ : Belo : Bab. biltu, tribute, tax, from Abālu, to carry. The suggested derivation from the Persian root bar-, to bear, carry, is not possible, for Old Persian in neither dialect possessed the letter l. If, as Meyer states, there is a Persian word bara, in Bab., this is an additional example of the fact that even Cuneiform Babylonian was not quite inaccessible to the influence of Persian.

(4) הֵיכַל : Heykāl, temple, palace ; Bab. (H)ēkalu, from Sumerian E, house, and gal, great.

(5) זִיו : Bab. zīmu, features, face ; appearance, splendour.

(6) כְּנוֹת : Bab. kinatu, servants ; associates, companions.

(7) כַּרְבְּלָא : Bab. karballatu, name of some article of clothing, according to Andreas and Meissner a cap ; Oppert compares κύρβασις, a helmet (Herod. vii, 64).

(8) מְלִצַר : Bab. maṣṣaru for manṣaru, from root naṣāru, to guard, watch (the inf. of verb used in last element of name Nebuchadnezzar (Nabiu-kudurri-uṣur). The change of n to l is quite common in such circumstances in Aram.

(9) נְולֹו : Bab. nawālu, namālu (Jensen), ruins ; (Muss-Arn.) reeds ; property, gain ; power ; perhaps the phrase in Dan. means to confiscate to the Royal treasury. The root in latter sense is amālu, to be strong ; in the other, to work (Arab. عمل).

(10) נְזַק : Bab. nazāqu, to suffer injury.

(11) נְטַל : Bab. natālu, to look, look up.

(12) סְגַן : Bab. sagnu, Ass. Shaknu, deputy, prefect. governor ; root shakānu, to put, place, set ; do, make.

(13) עִדָּן : Bab. adannu, fixed, appointed ; stated time.

(14) עֳפִי : perhaps from Bab. upu, cloud ; apu, reed ; foliage in Dan. iv, 9, 11, 18.

(15) פֶּחָה : Bab. pakhātu, prefecture ; pikhātu, satrap ; root pikhū, to control, command.

(16) פֶּחָר : Bab. pakhkharu, a potter.

(17) שֵׁגָל : not from Ass. Shigrēti, "harem-women" (Haupt), but from Sumerian ushum-gallu (so in Ass. form), ushē-gal, from ush, serpent, and gal, great (cf. Egyptian uraeus, placed in effigy on Pharaoh's head*) : [or from esh, house, and gal, great house, palace, hence monarch (cf. Pharaoh (per and 'aā, great double house, monarch).] Whichever the etymology, in Ass.-Bab. ushum-gallu means "vehement, sovereign, serpent, dragon" (Hommel,† Jensen, Pinches, Muss-Arnolt). Hence the etymology seems clear. The word shēgāl, introduced into Heb. and Aram. assumed the meaning of "Feminine monarch," hence "Queen consort." So in modern Persian the word khānum (in Turkish literally "my lord") has come to mean "lady."

(18) שֵׁיזִב : from Bab. Shūzubu, to deliver, save, Shaphel of Ezēbu, to leave, forsake, cease.

(19) שֵׁיצִיא : from Bab. shūṣu, Shaphel of aṣū, to come out, go out, Heb. יָצָא : hence shēyṣey means to complete, end, finish.

These are the principal Babylonian (Assyrian) words used in Daniel. There are also a few words of unknown origin and meaning, to wit :—Petish, Dakhawān, and the proper name Ashpenaz. (We omit the Greek words συμφωνία, ψαλτήριον and κίθαρις.) Taking these in the above order, we have (with suffix of 3rd pl.) in the Kthīb both paṭṭishēyhōn and ptishēyhōn ; in the Qrī ptishēyhōn, which is used in some MSS. in both Kthīb and Qrī. The LXX render (perhaps) by tiaras, Theodotion by leggings. Evidently the meaning was unknown to both, as it still is. The etymology is not known. Nor is this surprising,

---

* Dr. Pinches doubts this etymology because of the accent falling on the first syllable of úshum gallu.

† The word שֵׁגָל occurs several times in Cooke's Glossary of Aramaic Inscriptions. Vide Hommel's Sumerische Lesestücke, p. 127.

as doubtless words were adopted from Elamitic and other tongues then spoken, but of which we possess only a very few words (Dan. iii, 21). The term evidently means some kind of garment. Possibly the LXX conjectured its derivation from the Gk. πέτασος. *Dakhawān* (Dan. vi, 19) is not translated by the LXX, but Theodotion renders ἐδέσματα, possibly by conjecture, as the same verse says that Darius was fasting. Possibly it is from an unknown Persian word, as in Armenian we find a word in the pl., dahamounk'h, meaning meat offerings, oblations. The sing. would be da*h*am, which corresponds with the Aram. word in the text, if we take the *W* for the *m*, as in Sumerian the two sounds were not distinguished from one another. If this conjecture be correct, the word must have been taken into Sumerian from Armenian and thence into Assyrio-Babylonian before being adopted into Aramaic. Or both Aramaic and Armenian may have taken it independently from Sumerian. But it may be genuine Armenian from the root which in Av. is dag, and from which in Av. comes dakhma, a burning-ground for dead bodies. The root means to burn, in Av., and in Skt. (dah), and hence *may* have meant to cook, in Armenian. Against this, however, it must be said that no root of the word has been detected in Armenian, so it is probably a word introduced into that tongue, possibly from the Persian. Jerome follows Theodotion's conjecture, rendering the term by *cibi*. The name Ashpenaz (Dan. i, 3) is apparently from some language now unknown. Nor is it strange that such should be the case. In the Aram. papyri there are many such names, most of them probably Egyptian, but it should be observed as negative evidence in favour of the authenticity of Daniel that no *Egyptian* name occurs in it. As Ashpenaz is called " chief of the eunuchs," the probability of his having a foreign name, unless (as in other cases) he had been given a Babylonian one, is not remote.

Turning now to the Egypto-Aramaic papyri, we find in them a considerable number of Egyptian, Persian, and Babylonian proper names, and a number of Babylonian words. Omitting the Egyptian element, we may mention the following as a few among those of Persian origin :—

Amudath, Bagafrana, Arshama, Napayan, Mithradath, Artaban, Bagabakhsha, and Ashyadath. Of Babylonian names are the following :—Nusku-idri, Ataidri, Mannu-ki, Nabu-kuduri-, Bel-bani-, Ishum-kuduri-. It will be noticed that several

of these are given in a contracted form, the final element being omitted. The same thing still occurs in colloquial Arabic, where we hear 'Abdul for 'Abdu'llāh, Bū-Maḥmad for Abū-Muḥammad, etc. This renders it possible to suspect the same system to be the explanation of something similar in the few Babylonian names in Daniel, as we shall soon point out.

Among common nouns derived from Babylonian we have the following, as well as others, in the papyri :—*Eru*, and Erzu, kinds of cedar-tree ; Ṭappu, breadth, coping (of wood) ; khinnu, part of a ship ; kitinnu, cotton ; khalluru, a small part of a shekel ; bābu, gate, door ; rubū, interest on money ; appūnā-(ma), to the utmost ; She'u, one one-hundred-and-eightieth part of a shekel ; dīnu u dabābu, judgment and speech ; etc. Others doubtless occur which are not recognizable through the fragmentary nature of the papyri ; but the Babylonian element in the language of the papyri seems to be slighter than in Daniel. Were Daniel later than the papyri, one would expect the contrary to be the case, as the Babylonian words would tend to become fewer with the length of time that had elapsed since the departure of the Jews from Babylon.

If the Higher Critics are right in assigning a very late date to Daniel, then, remembering the free way in which the book admits the adoption of Persian official titles, it is astounding that we utterly fail to find in it a single *Greek* official title. The Assouan-Elephantine papyri, too, exhibit the same phenomenon. This is natural, because their dates show that they were composed long before the Macedonian conquest of Palestine and Egypt. Is the explanation of the omission of Greek titles in Daniel due to the fact that the book was written long before the same event ? What other explanation can be offered ? If the author, writing (according to the critics) about 167–165 B.C., was careless enough to betray himself by using *Persian* titles, is it not strange that he was so clever as to see that the employment of *Greek* titles must be avoided for fear of disclosing the fraud ?

Some critics still venture to affirm that the occurrence of the word " Aramaic " in Dan. ii, 4, implies that the writer of the book was of opinion that Aramaic was then the vernacular of Babylon ! This is obviously an impossible explanation of the word ; for, even about 167–165 B.C., the supposed date of the book (according to the Higher Critical hypothesis), the Babylonian tongue was still spoken there, and the assumed Palestinian

forger cannot have been so ignorant as not to have known the fact. But, apart from this, the writer of Daniel represents *all* the persons mentioned in the book [with the obvious exceptions of Ashpenaz, Cyrus, Darius the Mede, and Xerxes (Ahashuerus)] as having in Babylon not Aramaic but *Babylonian* names conferred upon them. Thus the names there given to Daniel himself and his companions (Belteshazzar, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego) are in no case Aramaic, though their original names were quite intelligible to an Aramaic-speaking people, such as some critics still imagine the author of the book to fancy the Babylonians to have been. It is worth while to study these Babylonian names bestowed on foreign captives, in accordance with what Hilprecht (*ut supra*, vol. ix, p. 28) remarks : " That captives and slaves, without regard to their former position and nationality, as a rule received a new name from their Babylonian masters is illustrated by the large number of slaves with pure Babylonian names in the Neo-Babylonian contracts."

Nebuchadnezzar, in Dan. iv, 8, speaks of Daniel's Babylonian name, Belteshazzar, as being " according to the name of " his " God." Dr. Driver (*Camb. Bible for Schools, etc.*, p. 48) kindly explains this by saying : " *Viz.* Bel.* The *Bel* in Belteshazzar is not really the name of the god but, as explained on I, 7, is part of the word *balâtsu*, his life ; but it may be only an assonance which the king is represented as expressing," etc.

We are constantly struck with the gracious condescension with which our Higher Critics correct the " blunders " of the Biblical writers, as in this instance, and make allowances for their ignorance of their own and other tongues, which our critics, of course, know so much better ! But here (and elsewhere) the ignorance is not that of the Biblical writer but that of the critic. The name Belteshazzar† (Mu)-ballit-shar-usur (*cf.*

---

* Though the LXX confound the names Belshazzar and Belteshazzar with one another, and write Βαλτασαρ for both, the former occurs in the inscriptions as Bel-shar-uṣur, " May Bel protect the King." In *this* name, though *not* in Belteshazzar, *Bel* is the first element.

† Dr. Pinches, however, says : " The form Mu-ballit-šar-uṣur does not sound right." He suggests that *Belet-shazzar* (the Massoretic pointing) may " possibly be for [Nabu-] beletsh-aṣṣar, or (perhaps better) [Bēl-]beletsh-aṣar, *i.e.*, ' Nebo (or Bēl), protect thou his life.' This may have been still further shortened to *Balatsu* or *Balatu*, of which there are many examples in late Babylonian contracts."

Belshazzar, *i.e.* Bel-shar-uṣur) means " May the Life-giver preserve the king." Mu-ballit (participle act. of the Piel of balâtu, to live), is a frequently used title of Merodach (Maruduku), who was the god specially honoured by Nebuchadnezzar. This is clear from the names he gave his sons, Marduk-nadin-akhi, Marduk-shum-uṣur, and Awel -Marduk (Evil-Merodach) (*vide* Dr. Pinches' paper, " Babylon in the Days of Nebuchadnezzar," *Journal of Vict. Inst.*, vol. lii, pp. 199–208). He speaks of Merodach with deep devotion, as, *e.g.*, in the following passage : " Merodach, all-knowing lord of the gods, glorious prince, thou hast created me and conferred upon me the sovereignty of multitudes of men." Merodach was the great patron-god of Babylon, the seat of his worship. The magnificent temple of E-Šag-ilā was dedicated to him. Even Cyrus represents Merodach as seating him on the throne of Babylon. The omission of the first syllable of the long name, Mu-ballit-shar-uṣur, is in accordance with the custom of contracting such names, as already explained, and as illustrated in the contraction of *shar-uṣur* into *shazzar* in Belshazzar. So Nebuchadnezzar was right in speaking of Daniel's Babylonian name as being in accordance with " the name of his god."

Shadrach* (Shudur-aku) means the " Command of Aku," the Moon-god ; Meshach is Mē-sha-aku, = Who is what Aku is ? (*cf.* examples of *mē*, who ?, used in place of the usual *mannu*, in Muss-Arnolt, p. 503) ; and Abed-nego is either a purposely made Jewish corruption of the actually occurring Abdu-Nabu (*cf.* Ish-Bosheth for Ish-Baal in the Old Testament), or, less probably, a textual corruption of Abed-Nannā, Nannā being a well-known Babylonian goddess. In these names the Divine name of the Hebrew appellations of the captives is replaced by that of a Babylonian deity.

The names given to these men in Babylon are so distinctly *not* Aramaic that it is quite evident that the writer did not fancy or seek to imply that the latter tongue was then the ordinary language of the country. His use of Babylonian, on the contrary, proves that he knew and was convinced that Aramaic was recognised by his readers as *not* being the language of Babylon. Why, therefore, is this part of the book composed in Aramaic ?

---

* Dr. Pinches says : " Shadrach and Meshach remain for me puzzles, as their names do not occur in the inscriptions, and theorising about them is unsafe."

It is hardly possible to answer this question with any certainty, nor is it necessary. The theories on the subject are many. Paul Haupt, while saying, " I cannot believe that the author regarded Biblical Aramaic as the language of Babylonia," assumes that the book was originally written all in Hebrew, and that a certain part being afterwards lost was replaced from an Aramaic version *made by the author soon after writing the original.** (Polychrome Bible, *sub loco.*) That the Aramaic, part was by the author is not at all a strange supposition, for it was customary, at least in Darius' time, to publish versions in several languages, all with the same authority, as the different versions of Darius' inscriptions at Besitūn show. Not a few modern commentators agree in Paul Haupt's suggestion, so we need not say anything more on the point. He may be right, too, in holding that the word " Aramaic " in Dan. ii, 4, is a " later addition to mark the beginning of the Aramaic sections."

It may be well to call attention, in connexion with Babylonian proper names, to a casual remark of Dr. Driver's about Nebuchadnezzar's name as given in Daniel. He writes : " Daniel himself, also, it is probable, would not (unlike both Jeremiah and Ezekiel) have uniformly written the name Nebuchad*n*ezzar incorrectly." (*Daniel*, Introd., p. lxii.) A slight degree of care in examining the text of Daniel would have prevented Dr. Driver from using this argument against the genuineness of the book, for Ginsburg's edition of the Hebrew Bible in I, 1, and in several other places, gives various readings of the king's name, and shows that some MSS. have Nebuchad*r*ezzar, as in Jeremiah and Ezekiel. But the objection has not much weight in any case, for a modern English writer could not be condemned for writing of the Kaiser as " William," though called in Berlin " Wilhelm."†

---

* Such things still occur. For instance, after writing my book entitled *Yanābī' u'l Islām* in Persian, I not long afterwards translated it into English (with modifications), and published it in both languages. I mention this to show that Haupt's suggestion is not an unlikely one.

† Or again a Latin writer about a certain important period of Spanish history could not be accused of ignorance if he used the form *Boabdilus* for the monarch whom Arabic writers entitle Abū 'Abdi-'llāh (ابو عمد اﻟﻠﮧ). In all such cases the popular form would be used in any language but the monarch's own.

We can hardly consider the expression " the Great Sea " (Dan. vii, 2) as a proper name, though the Mediterranean is so called in Joshua i, 4, etc. But in any case the expression is in Babylonian applied to both the Persian Gulf and the Mediterranean. The former is more fully described as " the great sea of the going forth of the sun " (*Tiāmtum rabītum sha ṣit shanshi*, Sennacherib, Taylor Cylinder, IV, 24, and Sch. K.A.T., p. 140, *bis*, also called *tāmtim shaplīti sha ṣet shamshi*, the Lower Sea of the sun's going forth), and the latter as " the Upper Sea of the setting of the Sun " (*Tamtim ēlēnītu sha shalam shamshi*), and " the Great Sea of the Amorite land " (K.A.T., pp. 91, 157, 140).

There are various other Babylonianisms in Daniel, apart from Babylonian words already dealt with. For instance, " ' im lēylyā " (Dan. vii, 2), *with the night, i.e.,* at night, during the night, is like the Assyrio-Babylonian *itti balṭi*, with (*i.e.*, during) life (Muss-Arnolt, p. 127). This is accounted for by what we contend was the place of the composition of the book.

II.

We now proceed to deal with the Grammar of Biblical Aramaic as compared with that of the Aramaic papyri. Referring to this subject in general, Eduard Sachau says : " The language in which they " (*i.e.* the Egyptian Aramaic papyri) " are written is in all essential parts identical with that of the Aramaic chapters in the books of Ezra and Daniel, and their phraseology affords close points of contact with that of the official documents in the Book of Ezra."*

This testimony is true, as every student of the subject will admit.

There is only one point in which a slight exception has been detected, viz., that the relative pronoun in Daniel and Ezra (in fact, in all Biblical Aramaic) is uniformly DI, whereas in the papyri it is usually ZI, as is the case also in the short Aramaic inscriptions found in Nineveh and Babylon, as well as in Cilicia,

---

* " Die Sprache, in der sie geschrieben sind, ist in allen wesentlichen Stüchen identisch mit derjenigen der aramäischen Kapitel in den Büchern Esra und Daniel, und ihre Phraseologie bietet nahe Berührungen mit derjenigen der amtlichen Urkunden im Esrabuch " (*Drei aramäische Pap.*, p. 3).

Tema, Egypt, and some other places. Dr. Driver, however, makes far too much of this matter when he styles it "A particularly clear indication that the Aramaic of Daniel was not that spoken in Babylon in the fifth century B.C." (Dan., Introduction, p. lx). The fact is that, though (as we have said) ZI is *generally* used in these papyri, it is not *always* employed. The same may be said with reference to the demonstrative pronoun, which in Daniel and Biblical Aramaic in general is dēk, dikkēn, *m.* ; dāk, *f.* ; děnāh, *com.*, dā, *f.* ; but in Egyptian and Cappadocian Aramaic zēk, *m.* ; děkā, děkī, *f.* ; zěnāh, zěnāk, *com.* Dr. Driver holds that the difference is distinctive as shewing that (1) the forms with a Z are *older* than those in *D*, and (2) that they are Palestinian, whereas those with Z are Babylonian. Hence he thinks the Book of Daniel *cannot* have been composed anywhere but in Palestine, nor can it belong to an early date. But the papyri, when carefully studied, seem to me to refute the second conclusion and seriously to modify the first. *For we find forms in D here and there in the papyri*, as :—In P. 13478, line 9, and in P. 13491, line 23, we have děnāh ; and in P. 27198, lines 7, 11, 16 (dated 10th of the month Mesere, = 3rd of Chisleu, in the nineteenth year of King Artaxerxes, *i.e.*, 446 B.C.) dīlakī is used, not zīlakī (Cowley and Sayce, *Aramaic Papyri from Assouan*, pp. 40, 41). In a papyrus dated thirteenth of Ab, in the twenty-fifth year of Artaxerxes (440 B.C.), fragments 6 and 9 respectively, děkā and děkī occur. The B.D.B. Hebrew Lexicon itself admits this. Hence it follows that at the time of the writing of these papyri, which were *not* written in Palestine, nor in the Macedonian period, both the forms in Z and those in D were in use. But the difference between the two forms was this, that the Z form represents the older way of writing such words, and was generally retained in writing long after the D form had taken its place in ordinary speech. The tendency was for the latter gradually to win its way into writing also. But we are dealing not with two *dialects*, but merely with the older and the later way of writing. There can be no doubt at all as to the relative antiquity of the Z and D forms, as in the Assyrian and Babylonian dockets in Aramaic affixed to Cuneiform documents the D never occurs, only the Z form. Hence we may grant that, if genuine, the Book of Daniel must have originally had the Z, not as at present the D forms. But it would be a natural thing to adopt the D forms throughout the book, instead of the older method of spelling, when the older

had gone completely out of use. That a later, but unsuccessful, attempt to bring the spelling up to date was made with reference to other words also is clear from the fact that the Qrī is much nearer to the spelling of the *Targums* than the Kthīb. Not a page of Ginsburg's edition of the text is destitute of examples of this. But in this later revision the text was not altered, only the pronunciation. The change of the Z forms into those in D must have been made much earlier.

To shew the error of Driver's contention that the use of the D forms in Daniel proves its composition to be late, it is enough to urge two other considerations. One is that the D forms are in the present text used throughout *all* Biblical Aramaic, and yet it is admitted fairly generally that the historical documents in Ezra-Nehemiah are genuine. If the D *versus* Z argument fails here, and is admitted to be of no validity, the same applies to Daniel too. The other matter of importance is to note Eduard Sachau's change of mind as to the time when the alteration in the pronunciation of Aramaic introduced the D forms into the spelling. He writes : "The transition in Aramaic from the oldest to the younger sound-duration is thus prepared for, not in the age of Alexander, as I formerly assumed, . . . but, on the contrary, as early as the middle of the time of the Achæmenides" (*op. cit.*, p. 35). It is right that such a distinguished German Orientalist should thus frankly admit that he was mistaken in fancying that it was in the Alexandrian period that the D forms gradually took the place of those in Z, whereas it is now evident that the change occurred much earlier. But his admission confutes Dr. Driver's contention that Daniel could not have been written in Babylon or in a period earlier than the Alexandrian.

We may remark that it was not only in certain pronouns that the change of Z into D gradually took place in Aramaic but in many nouns too. It is well known that one of the characteristic features in that language is its use of D where in Hebrew Z occurs.* But these Egyptian Aramaic papyri introduce us to a period at which, though the D had come into the pronunciation very commonly, it had not yet been generally accepted in place of Z in writing. Sachau quotes the following

---

* So, too, the change of *sh* into *t* or *th* is characteristic of Aramaic. In P. 13491, line 5, dated 457 B.C., חקל occurs for the usual שקל. *Cf.* Dan. v, 25.

instances of the change in nouns, giving the reference to his edition of three papyri, viz., מדבחא in II, line 24 ; and III, line 3 ; also דבחן in I, line 28. In P. 13491, line 9, the later form דהב, gold, occurs for the earlier זהב, so too elsewhere.

Anyone acquainted with the Near East and the Semitic words used in the dialects of modern Arabic and adopted into modern Persian, Urdū, and Turkish, will find no difficulty in understanding the change from Z into D in Aramaic. For instance, in the modern Arabic vernacular dialects of Syria and Palestine, while in one village the word for " male " is pronounced *Zeker*, in another one hears the pronunciation *Deker*, while the literary form of the word is *Dhakar*, which is still recognised as the correct way of pronouncing it. Again, the classical Arabic word Dhū, Dhī, is in some places pronounced Dzū, Dzī, in others Zū, Zī. So the Classical Hā-dhihi (this, *f.*) is commonly changed in the vernacular of Syria into Dī, placed after instead of before its noun. The Arabic letter *Dh* (ذ : in form a dotted D) represents the transition between the older Z sound and the later D sound in Aramaic. Thus the earlier Z was often doubtless pronounced Dhi, before it finally became D. In the Semitic languages the change is quite an easy and gradual one even to the present day.

Here we should call attention to the degree in which the grammar of the Aramaic (of both Biblical Aramaic and the language of the Aramaic papyri) has been affected by the influence of the Babylonian language ; or at least how the Aramaic of the fifth century B.C., Biblical or otherwise, while differing from later Aramaic, both Western and Eastern, agrees in certain respects with the Babylonian language. Assyrio-Babylonian tablets show that it was quite a usual thing to use the *masculine* instead of the *feminine* form of a verb when coupled with a feminine noun ; and also that the affixed pronoun often remained *masculine*, though referring to a preceding feminine noun. A few examples will suffice to prove this fact, which is well known to all Assyrian scholars. For instance, in the Creation Tablets we read : " Tiamat annita ina shemishā maḫḫutash *itēmi*, ushanni ṭēnshā " ; on her hearing this Tiamat *spoke* (masc. form) distractedly, she (lit. *he*) changed her mind. (Tablet IV, 87, 88.) So too : " Ipush-mā sapara shulma qirbish Tiāmat ; irbitti shārī ushtiṣbita, ana lā aṣie mimmēshā : shāra shūta, shāra ishtāna, shāra shadu, shāra amurra " ; And he

made the net safe (?) around Tiāmat, he seized the four winds that she might not in any wise escape, the south wind, the north wind, the east wind, the west wind. (Tablet IV, 41, 43.) Of Ishtar it is said : " Ana shamami ētēlā " ; She (lit. *he*) went up to the skies. (Nimrod-Epos, 45, 81.) Again : " Teumman kiam iqbi, sha Ishtar *ushannu* milik tēmeshu " : So spoke Teumman, the course of whose plan Ishtar *had deranged* (masc. form). (Smith's *Assurbanipal*, 119, 23.) In Daniel the same construction frequently occurs, though it is contrary to the grammar of later Western and Eastern Aramaic alike. Examples will be found in Dan. vii, 8, 19, etc., where in the Kthīb the *masc.* form of the verb is used, just as in these Assyrio-Babylonian examples with *fem.* nouns. In the Qrī, on the contrary, the grammar is changed and the verb used in the *fem.*, according to later usage. So masculine pronominal suffixes are constantly employed instead of feminine ; as, *e.g.*, in Dan. vii, 8, 12, 19, and in many other places. *All such are corrected in the Qrī.* They are not, however, mistakes of the transcriber, but proofs of antiquity ; for *the same thing is found in the papyri*. For instance, in P. 13495, lines 18, and 20, 24, 27, the masc. occurs for the fem.,[*] but no attempt has been made at correction, the idiom being then admitted as in Daniel. Here again the papyri prove the fact that Daniel was not the composition of the late period to which the Higher Critics in general attribute it.

A glance at the various readings in the Massoretic text of Daniel, published by Ginsburg, will convince the reader that the Jews in later, but still early, times found that in a large number of details the spelling and the grammar of Daniel (and in somewhat slighter measure that of the Aramaic of Ezra-Nehemiah) differed from that finally recognized as correct. That is to say, the Biblical Aramaic is in these respects archaic in comparison with what ultimately came to be recognised as the proper literary standard for composition in the language. For example, in Daniel and Biblical Aramaic generally the definite pl. of masc. nouns ending in -*ay* in the sing. is -*āyē*,

---

[*] As another instance of the same idiom from Assyrian we give the following : " Issuk mulmula, ikhtepi karash-sha (var. -shu) " ; He placed the spear, he rent her (var. *his*, though referring to Tiamat) belly (Creation Tablets, IV, 101). So in Contract Tablets, -*ka* (thy, masc.) is often used for -*ki* (thy, fem.), especially, perhaps, in Nabu-nahid's time. *Vide* Tallquist, " Die Sprache der Contracte Nabu-na'ids," and Muss-Arn., p. 362.

R

(רֵין) and so too in the papyri; but in the later Aramaic it becomes -āēy (רֵין). Hence in Dan. iii, 2, the Kthīb has Tiphtāyē (תִּפְתָּיֵא), as in line 4 of Section B of the Strassburg Papyrus (there written תיפתיא), while the Qrī has *tiphtāēy*, in accordance with later idiom. Instances of this kind are very numerous. In Daniel the termination ה is often used where later usage prefers the easier sound א. So, too, the shin is preferred to samech in the word שַׂגִּיא, though in later works the samech always takes the place of the rougher *shīn* :—*sīn* (שׂ), being put into the older books to represent the transition stage in this word. In Daniel the 2nd pl. masc. suffixed pers. pronoun assumes in the Kthīb the form -āyk; and so too in the papyri; but in the Qrī we find, as in the Targums and later Aramaic, the form -āk (ךָ). The 2nd sing. masc. pronoun, *thou*, is in the ordinary language *ant*, and is so written in the papyri, but in Daniel the longer and older form *antāh* (אַנְתָּה) occurs, which must be an earlier form, judging by the form of the word in Arabic. The verb in Biblical Aramaic has long been admitted to preserve conjugations* which became either entirely obsolete or at least very rare in later Aramaic, both Eastern and Western. Thus we find the causative Haphel instead of Aphel, forming a connecting link between the latter and the older Shaphel, common in Babylonian, and in Daniel represented by two verbs. שַׁיְצִיא שֵׁיזֵב, borrowed directly from the Babylonian. So, too, Daniel often uses Hithpeal and Hithpaal instead of the later Ithpeal and Ithpaal respectively; Hophal occurs some ten or eleven times, though very rarely in what might be called classical Aramaic. However, it is occasionally found in Nabathæan inscriptions. All this is true of the verbal forms in use in the papyri also. Perhaps the only construction found in Daniel and not (with two possible exceptions)† in the papyri is the future with preformative *l*. But this is doubtless due to the use of the prefix *lu* used in Babylonian. In the later Aramaic this *l*, except in "the language of legal style, in some ancient proverbs, and in all standing expressions " (Levias, *Aramaic Grammar*, p. 68), more commonly

---

* In Daniel and in the papyri, for instance, we find the conjugation *Hanphel* with verbs commencing with ע, such as עלל. *Vide* Dan. ii, 21; iv, 3.

† *Vide* לחויא in P. 13495, line 7, and P. 13467, line 6.

n, forms the preformative of the future; but in Biblical Aramaic the old preformative *y* is employed, as in the papyri. The *l°* had originally an optative or jussive meaning, as it usually has in Daniel, though sometimes it has the meaning of the future. In Daniel it occurs only in the verb " to be."

The personal pronouns of the 3rd pers. pl. in Biblical Aramaic are not those used in classical Aramaic, but agree with those found in the papyri.

It is remarkable that, while the papyri generally spell the Persian regal name Darius somewhat differently from that adopted in Biblical Aramaic, the only place in which the spelling of this word is precisely the same as in the Bible is in P. 13489, which is in all probability the oldest in the whole collection from Assouan and Elephantine, being dated second of the month Epiphi, year thirty-seven of Darius (I), *i.e.* 494 B.C. In this MS. the king's name is written דריוש, as in Dan. vi, 1 (Aram.); while in other and later papyri the spellings are דריהוש, etc.* Strangely enough, on the other hand, in the next oldest papyrus, P. 13493, dated the twenty-eighth of Paophi, second (?) year of Xerxes, *i.e.* 482 B.C., *that* king's name is *not* spelled quite as in the Biblical Aramaic, but in a manner which is nearer to the original Persian. Yet here, too, we find that there is a reason, for the Biblical spelling of the name is taken from the *Babylonian* Akhshiwarshu, represented exactly in the form used in Dan. ix, 1. This serves to shew a close connexion between Babylon and the composition of Daniel. The Biblical form of each name is thus proved not to be late, but very early, and to have good authority to support it.

It would expand this Paper too much were we to mention in detail all the various matters in which a careful study of the papyri supports the antiquity of Daniel. But we cannot conclude without a brief mention of one other fact of no slight importance. There are in Daniel not a few words regarding the meaning of which the LXX translators were in considerable perplexity, and this perplexity expressed itself in later translations also. Sometimes the translators made a guess at the meaning of such words, guided by the context, at other times they contented themselves with merely transliterating what they could not translate. Examples are not far to seek. For in Dan. i, 11, 16, the LXX cannot translate המלצר, but

---

* The form in Dan. is that used in Bab., the other the Persian.

substitute (it is hard to say why) the name 'Αβιεσδρί. In Dan. v, 2, 23, they omit the words that mean " thy queens and thy concubines," being unable to interpret them. So in Dan. vi, 19, the word דחון, which we have shewn probably denotes food, is either rendered λυπούμενος or omitted. In Dan. i, 5, a mistake of much less importance, but still an error, occurs, when פת־בג, meaning royal delicacies, is represented by τράπεζα. In Dan. iii, 2, 3, in one MS. Dr. Swete gives θαβθαιους as representative of the term תפתיא, rather a bad attempt at transliteration. In Dan. i, 20, אשפים (the enchanters) is rendered φιλόσοφοι. In Dan. ii, 5, 8, אזדא, which means " certain, fixed ; information," is represented by 'απέστη, which is evidently a bad guess founded on the context. In Dan. ii, 27, the word גזרין is merely transliterated, no attempt being made to translate it. The explanation of this is clear. Dr. Swete* well says, " In the majority of instances transliteration may be taken for a frank confession of ignorance or doubt." But, if we for a moment assume the Higher Critics' theory that Daniel was composed about 167–5 B.C. in Palestine it is impossible to give a satisfactory explanation of such ignorance. We do not know who the translators of the Book of Daniel into Greek were, though for convenience' sake we speak of the LXX version of Daniel in contradistinction to Theodotion's version. At any rate they did their work very badly and carelessly. But at latest it would be rash to date the translation later than about 100 B.C. In fact it is probably a score or so of years earlier. If, then, the Critics' theory be correct, in the course of some three score years a number of Aramaicised words used in Daniel had become so completely forgotten in Egypt (where the LXX version is supposed to have been made) that they had become unintelligible, and had either to be (erroneously) guessed at or merely transliterated. That some of these very words were used in the papyri and intended to be understood both in Egypt and Palestine not long before makes the matter still more strange. But all difficulty is removed if we are right in concluding that Daniel was composed in Babylonia, or by one who had long lived there, not long after the Persian acquisition of that country, who knew Babylonian and at least the Persian words most likely to be in use in Babylon late in the sixth

---

* *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*, p. 324.

century B.C., and who, both in Hebrew and Aramaic, wrote in almost colloquial style and, being an honest, God-fearing man himself, wrote for the information of men like minded in his own and future generations, leaving the issue to his God.

Οὐκ ἄρα πάνυ ἡμῖν οὕτω φροντιστέον, τί ἔρουσιν οἱ πολλοὶ ἡμᾶς, ἀλλ' ὅ τι ὁ ἐπαίων περὶ τῶν δικαίων καὶ ἀδίκων, ὁ εἷς, καὶ αὐτὴ ἡ ἀλήθεια.

(*Socrates.*)

APPENDIX.

KINGS OF THE NEW BABYLONIAN EMPIRE.

Nabopalassar	..	..	.. 625–604 B.C.
Nebuchadrezzar II...	..	..	604–561.
Evil-Merodach	..	..	561–560.
Nergal-sharezar	..	..	559–556.
(Labosoarchad)	..	..	556.
Nabo-nidus (Nabu-nahid) ..		..	555–539.

PERSIAN KINGS.

Cyrus..	..	..	..	.. 538–529 B.C.
Cambyses	..	..	..	.. 529–522.
Bardiya.				
(Nidinta-Bel).				
Darius I	..	..	..	.. 521–486.
Xerxes I	..	..	..	.. 485–466.
Artaxerxes I	..	..	..	466–425.
Xerxes II	..	..	..	.. 424–424.
Darius II	..	..	..	.. 424–405.
Artaxerxes II	..	..	..	405–358.
Artaxerxes III	..	..	..	358–338.
Arses	..	..	..	.. 338–335.
Darius III	..	..	..	.. 335–332.

Alexander the Great overthrew Darius III and made himself master of the Persian Empire, including Palestine and Egypt, in 332 B.C.

DISCUSSION.

After reading the paper Professor PINCHES then said : The paper is now open for discussion. I have already, when reading it, spoken of a few points which occurred to me, and these I will now repeat with any others which may seem desirable.

We all know that it is utterly impossible for two nations to be in close connexion without borrowing from each other, and Dr. Tisdall has rightly included in his paper all the philological arguments which could possibly be brought forward. In opening the discussion, I feel bound not only to refer to the arguments in favour of his views, but also those against—absolute correctness is essential in such a case as this, the date of the Book of Daniel. For this reason the argument from the Sumerian *ukkin*, compared with the Greek ὠκεανός is inadmissible. On the other hand, in the matter of the date of the word for " elephant " in Assyrio-Babylonian, the point is greatly strengthened when the real history of the word *pîru* is stated. This word does not occur spelled out in the wedge-written characters of the Assyrian historical inscriptions, but is there always given ideographically, expressed by the characters AM-SI. It is from the bilingual lists that we get the Semitic Babylonian pronunciation of *pîru*. Now, the date of the drawing-up of these lists is doubtful, but a moderate estimate would fix their compilation somewhere between 1500 and 2000 B.C. If the word came from Persia, this would give an example of the introduction of a Persian word at a much earlier date than the author indicates. The question remains, however, whether the non-existence of *l* in old Persian would argue against this. [The occurrence of *l* is common enough in modern Persian, and it seems, therefore, exceedingly unlikely that the ancient Persians were unable to pronounce that sound.]

It is needless to say that the wealth of philological material which the author has collected to prove his argument is of the highest importance, and forms in itself an exceedingly strong series of arguments in favour of an early date for the composition of the Book. To my mind, however, the strongest argument which he brings forward is that to which I have already referred, namely, the ignorance of the Septuagint translator of the meanings of certain doubtful words in the Book of Daniel. [Among these may be mentioned the

author's reference to the Heb. *hammelṣar*, reproduced in the Gk. by *Abiesdri*—Bagster's Septuagint, however, has the bad transcription *Amelsad*, for *Amelsar* ; the rendering of *ashshaphim*, " necromancers " as *philosophoi*; the transliteration of *gazrin*, " fate-determiners," etc.] These alone necessitate a much earlier date for Daniel than 167 B.C. With regard to the interchange in the Aramaic dialects of *d* and *z*, it is to be noted that the latter is the natural outcome of the former. In English the soft *th*, in the mouth of a foreigner easily becomes *z*, and this is also the case in the Semitic languages, [It was the case likewise in Assyrian, where *iththi*, with the sound of sharp *th*, became, in the provinces, *issi*.] I hope that sufficient of this important paper has been read to enable it to be discussed— probably members of the audience have been able to read some of the omitted portions in the intervals of waiting.

Lieut.-Col. MACKINLAY said : I have the greatest pleasure in seconding this vote of thanks to our learned author, and I join with our Chairman in sincere wishes for his speedy recovery.

Our Chairman has piloted us skilfully through this somewhat formidable but very valuable paper. I cannot pretend to any knowledge of the linguistic questions involved, but, thanks to the clearness of expression of our author, the main outline of his paper seems to be simple.

It appears that the Higher Critics have given an illustration of the old saying that " a little knowledge is a dangerous thing." Misled by some acquaintance with the ancient languages, they falsely assumed that the inclusion of foreign words in the records of a nation indicates that it has been conquered by that foreign country to which the words belonged. A moment's consideration should have assured the critics of the rashness of their assumption. As well might it be assumed that because we adopt, for instance, the words *bazaar* and *hookah* we have been conquered by the natives of India.

But Egypt contained, as our author has pointed out, plain evidences which have thoroughly upset the confident assertion of more than a quarter of a century that " no Old Testament scholar of any repute now maintains that the book was written by Daniel."

The evidences now produced by Dr. St. Clair Tisdall could have

been examined by Dr. Peake when he wrote his recent commentary, but he was not apparently up to date, and he failed to find out what our author has recognised, that the language of the book of Daniel corresponds in linguistic details with the comparatively recently discovered Assouan and Elephantine papyri which are so elaborately dated during the period 500 B.C. to 400 B.C.

This is not the first time that the confident assertions of Higher Critics have been negatived by the records preserved in the dry climate of Egypt. Some twenty years ago it was their habit confidently to say that Luke was in error in saying that people went to be enrolled at their own homes, because no such record outside the New Testament was known. A confident argument based on negative evidence is always dangerous, and after this rash denial of St. Luke's accuracy was made, the actual Roman enrolment documents were discovered in Egyptian rubbish heaps, some being of the first century, ordering all to go for enrolment to their own homes.

Thus in two instances documents have been found in the dry sands of Egypt which contradict the deduction of critics who denied the truth of Scripture. Having proved the Higher Critics false guides in these two instances, is it not wise to decline to follow them in others ?

We owe a debt of gratitude to our author for proving so conclusively the early date of Daniel, and we trust his paper may be widely circulated and studied.

The Rev. A. H. FINN said : It would be an impertinence for me to attempt to criticise a paper the greater part of which deals with matters outside the range of my own studies. I can only sit humbly at the feet of so erudite a scholar as the writer. Yet there are two little points on which I can offer remarks which may be of some little use.

(1) Interchange of D and Z (pp. 237–239) :

Familiar from my childhood with colloquial Arabic, I can testify to the fact that in Palestinian Arabic the letter *Dhal* is frequently pronounced as Z. Is it not possible that this may be a survival of the Western Aramaic pronunciation ? That would account for the Z found in the Aramaic of the Egyptian papyri. In that case, it

would be the more improbable that the Aramaic of " Daniel," showing the D form, was composed or written in Palestine.

(2) LXX rendering of הַמֶּלְצַר in Dan. i, 11, 16 (p. 243) :

What MS. authority there may be for the substitution of Αβιεσδρί, I do not know, but Carpzov's edition gives 'Αμελσὰδ as the reading of the Vatican Codex, and 'Αμερσὰρ as that of the Alexandrian. Both these seem to be derivable from an original 'Αμελσὰρ which would be the ordinary Greek transliteration of the Hebrew letters, treating however the definite article as though it were part of a proper name, an error found in other parts of the LXX.

Allusion was made by the last speaker to the transliterations and mistranslations in the LXX version of the Psalms, especially in the superscriptions. Precisely similar evidences of ignorance are to be found even in the Pentateuch, and these seem to me to be clear indications that the translators were dealing with documents that were already of great antiquity.

Mr. W. E. LESLIE said : On p. 239 Dr. Tisdall suggests that there has been an alteration of the Kthīb (the Z–D change). On p. 241 a change is found in the Qrī only. If some changes were made while the text was fluid and others after it had solidified, should not this fact furnish additional material for the determination of the date ?

Mr. THEODORE ROBERTS referred to Dr. Tisdall's point on p. 233, that no Greek titles occurred in the Book of Daniel, which could hardly have been avoided by one writing long after the conquest of Palestine by the Greeks, as the Critics held was the case, while the use of Persian titles by Daniel was quite likely, seeing he no doubt wrote in his old age some years after the Persian conquest of Babylon.

The fact that foreign words did not appear in inscriptions and legal instruments about the date of Daniel, while he made use of them, proved nothing, as was seen to-day by the fact that French terms occurred in the present-day literature while they were not found either in the inscriptions or legal contracts of to-day which were usually framed in purer English of a somewhat archaic type. He had recently noticed in reading some parts of Scott which he had

not perused before certain words which he had hitherto regarded as quite modern, at least in the way they were now used. His acquaintance with literature of the age of Scott, though small, embraced more, comparatively speaking, than all that had come down to us of the age of Daniel, which shewed how unsafe it was to argue that a word appearing in Daniel could not have been in use in his lifetime merely because it was not found in the small fraction of literature of his age which had reached us.

Dr. Tisdall's argument at the close of his paper, based on the Septuagint transliteration of some words, that they must have been sufficiently archaic to have become unintelligible to the translators was paralleled in the case of the titles of many of the Psalms. Both these incidents showed that the respective works in which the words occurred must have existed for a sufficient time before the translation was made for the meaning of these words to have been lost, which proved that the Higher Critics were wrong in dating the Psalms for the period of the Exile, and Daniel for the reign of Antiochus the Great, as those dates were too near that of the Septuagint to allow of the meaning of the words to have been lost—a longer time being necessarily required in the case of Psalms in daily use than that of literary remains like Daniel.

He thought we might congratulate ourselves on the fact that two such learned men as Dr. Tisdall and our Chairman, Dr. Pinches, were satisfied that there was nothing in the Book of Daniel inconsistent with his having written it, and he pointed out the importance of this in consequence of the prophecy (in the ninth chapter) of the Seventy weeks, which fixed the time when the Messiah was to come, over four hundred years before He came, a thing impossible without divine revelation.

When a Higher Critic like Professor Peake writes that no Old Testament scholar of any repute now maintains that the Book was written by Daniel he appears like the fabled ostrich which when pursued by its enemies hid its head in the sand in order to imagine that its pursuers did not exist.

The Rev. J. E. H. THOMSON, M.A., D.D., writes : I was particularly glad when I saw in the syllabus of this session of the Victoria Institute Lectures that one was to be on the date of Daniel, and by so competent a scholar as Dr. Tisdall. It is approximately

thirty years ago since I contributed a series of articles to a theological magazine, since defunct, on the Aramaic of Daniel. As at that time the papyri of Assouan and Elephantine were as yet undiscovered, my efforts were directed to prove that the Aramaic of Daniel was older than that of Ezra and very much older than that of the *Targums*. Shortly after I was employed by the editor of the *Pulpit Commentary* to write that on Daniel, which was published some four and twenty years ago. All these things gave me a very special interest in Dr. Tisdall's paper.

The paper itself has more than justified my expectation. The numerous illustrations from Persian and from the cuneiform inscriptions were decidedly refreshing and make me regret that Dr. Tisdall's lecture had not been published twenty-five or thirty years, so that I might have benefited by it in my commentary on Daniel. Dr. Tisdall will, I am sure, pardon me when I venture a few criticisms. I understand Dr. Tisdall to hold that in Babylon it was only the foreign and trading population (p. 220, l. 10 from the bottom) who spoke Aramaic. I am under the belief that Babylonian—the language of the inscriptions—had long ceased to be spoken, and it seems to me that the fact that, while the contract tables are in the Babylonian language and in cuneiform character, the doquets are usually in Aramaic proves this. A parallel case may be found in Scotland. Certain deeds in connexion with the transference of land were, about two hundred years ago, usually written in Latin and in black letter, but the doquets were always in English. The natural interpretation of this, it seems to me, is that Aramaic was the language spoken by everybody, but that documents of importance were written in Babylonian. This is the decision of Dr. Hugo Winckler in his *History of Babylonia and Assyria* (p. 179), writing of the reign of Asshur-nazir-pal— " Aramaic soon became the language of social intercourse in nearly the whole of Mesopotamia and expelled the Assyrio-Babylonian, which continued only as a literary tongue." It is possible that Dr. Tisdall does not mean to restrict the speaking of Aramaic merely to " the foreign and trading community " of Babylon; if so, I crave pardon for misunderstanding him. There is another point I wish Dr. Tisdall had taken into consideration, *i.e.* the fact that the Aramaic of Daniel and Ezra is Western, not Eastern, Chaldee—

to use the older name, not Syriac. My own idea is that it resulted from the copyists. As the ancient scribes wrote to dictation the reader of the MS. would be prone to assimilate the language he read to that he was accustomed to use. A parallel instance is the Anglicization a Scottish song undergoes when it is printed in London. While Dr. Tisdall notes the fact that זי (zi) of the monuments is replaced by די (di) he does not notice the use of אַרְעָא instead of the older אַרְקָא found on the monuments and in Jeremiah x, 11. I would suggest that the pronunication of the cognate Arabic letters in Palestine affords a parallel. The letter *qoph*, so difficult for an Occidental to pronounce, is softened, into *ain* or even further to *hunza* or little *ain*. The change in regard to *zi* is the converse; many Palestinians pronounce dotted *dal* as if it were *zeel*. A scribe who knew Western Aramaic would be prone to assimilate the Eastern Aramaic to the dialect to which he was accustomed. The question of the Greek names of musical instruments assumes a a slightly different aspect when the result of scribal variation is taken into account. In regard to *symphonia* : its position in the text is by no means certain, as it seems to me, though certainly as a piece of controversial tactics it was perhaps well to give the opponents all the advantage they can claim. We have to do with five texts : the Massoretic Kthīb and Qrī—the LXX—Theodotion and the Peshitta—and there are four successive times in which the list of instruments occur in each of these. In the Massoretic in the second list, III 7, *sumphonia* does not occur at all; in the third the Kthīb gives *siphonia*, although according to the Qrī it is to be read *sumphonia*; in the LXX it occurs in the first and last lists ; in Theodotion only in the last; while in the Peshitta the place of *sumphonia* is occupied by *tyiphonia*, which appears to be the same word as *siphonia* according to the Kthīb in the third list. These phenomena would be explicable if *sumphonia* was added as an explanation. It must be observed that *sumphonia* does not in passages in Polybius *necessarily* mean a musical instrument; it may mean a chorus of singers. It is assumed the *pesanterin* must be *psalterion* ; but another possible derivation is from the Egyptian *pe sautore*, " the chorus." I do not say it is a true etymology, but it might be one which would suggest itself to a Greek-speaking Egyptian and he would add as explanatory of *sumphonia* on the margin. The frequent intercourse

between the Jewish communities in Egypt and Palestine might lead to the same explanatory note being added to the margin. Perhaps it is better to assume the claim to be correct, but call upon the Critics to recognise that musical terms pass easily from country to country.

I have a somewhat higher estimate of the Chisian Daniel than has Dr. Tisdall. There has certainly been some carelessness in translation, but in some cases I am under the impression that the LXX translator had another Hebrew before him and that this explains some of its differences from the Massoretic text and also from Theodotion. I think there is another thing to be considered. Is it not probable that the several chapters of the Book of Daniel were issued as separate tracts and that they continued separate for some time and sustained separate treatment—the separate tracts—both in Egypt and in Palestine ? We must remember that the text of Daniel was not protected as was the Law and the Megilloth by being read in the synagogue. May I remark I am puzzled by a statement Dr. Tisdall makes in regard to *Sarbāl* (p. 216) : " The LXX render it by *anaxurides*," adding in a note " In some MSS." I understand that the *Codex Chisianus* was the sole exemplar of the Hexaplaric text of Daniel. Schleusner quotes Symmachus as having this rendering.

I have already given too long an excursus on Dr. Tisdall's paper. At the same time let me express a hope that he will give us further results of his study of Daniel. Perhaps the Critics will listen to him. Usually they ignore opponents. Mr. Sonnenschein, who wrote a guide to readers in Dr. Williams' Library, condemns indiscriminately all who defend the traditional date of Daniel and commends with equal lack of discrimination all who assail it. He even commends that blundering book of the late Dean Farrar, a book that blunders even in arithmetic and founds arguments on these blunders. The Critics are afraid of their opponents, they endeavour to hinder publication of books or articles, and if published try to keep people from reading them. It seems to me that the main obstacle to the critical acceptance of the authenticity of Daniel is the presence in it of the miraculous. But a Christianity without miracle would have no salvation for man. Again let me thank Dr. Tisdall.

Professor W. M. FLINDERS PETRIE writes from the British School of Archæology in Egypt and Egyptian Research Account, University

College, Gower Street, London: "The question about Greek words in Daniel hardly needs any notice in your paper. The intercourse of Jew and Greek must have been incessant at the frontier garrison Tahpanhes from 660 B.C. onward. The refugees of Johanan's party (who left behind the name of 'The palace of the Jew's daughter') were preceded doubtless by others flying from the sieges and invasions of Jerusalem in 607, 603 and 599, as well as in 588 B.C. As I wrote (thirty-three years ago): 'Numbers of the upper and more cultivated classes were continually thrown into the company of Greeks; all who could afford to flee, had to become more or less acquainted with Greek language and ideas,' there was 'a continual ebb and flow of alternate dwelling in the Greek settlement and of return to their own land. . . . The bearing of this on the employment of Greek names for musical instruments . . . is too obvious to need mention in detail' (*Tanis II, Nebeshek, and Defenneh*, pp. 49, 50; 1888). 'For three generations before the end of the monarchy the Greeks must have been familiar to the more enterprising of the Jews; and probably many a *kaithros, psanteria* and *sumphonyah* . . . had been traded over to Jerusalem to the Greek colony' (*Egypt and Israel*, pp. 87, 88; 1911). You will find the matter in detail in these two books. I congratulate Dr. Tisdall on his paper."

The PRESIDENT then said: It is exceedingly regrettable that the author has been unable to attend and comment upon the points raised by those who have kindly joined in the discussion. The Rev. A. H. Finn's remarks were especially interesting, and I am glad to know his opinion concerning the interchange of *d* and *z*— as he has lived in the nearer East, he can naturally speak with authority on this point. The change between *d* (*dh*) and *z* is common in the Semitic languages—it is the distinguishing mark between the Aramaic and the Hebrew branches.

With regard to the other points touched upon, in the absence of the author, and at this late hour, I think it best to leave them un-answered—we do not know what the author's reply would be if he were here. I will only ask you, therefore, to join in a vote of condolence with him and his family in the illness from which he is suffering.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I am very grateful to those Members of the Victoria Institute who have so kindly criticised my paper, and specially so to Dr. Pinches, who has communicated to me certain suggestions in writing. These I have incorporated in the revised edition of the paper. To this fact I owe the excision of my suggested derivation of ὠκεανός, referred to in Dr. Pinches' remarks on p. 246. Of course, the ancient Persians may have been able to pronounce the letter *l*, which occurs so frequently in modern Persian; but neither the Achæmenian nor the Avestic alphabet contains any sign for that letter. I am glad to find that my arguments as to the antiquity of the Book of Daniel are confirmed by such scholars as Dr. Pinches and Prof. Flinders Petrie.

I should perhaps add that my references to the Septuagint are to Dr. Swete's edition of the LXX, as published at the Cambridge University Press in 1912 (Vol. III). The Editor informs us that in this edition "The Septuagint text has been derived from Cozza's transcript of the Chigi MS., but it has been thought desirable to follow Tischendorf's example and to give at the foot of the page the readings of the Syro-hexaplaric version, our only other authority." But in Dan. i, 3, 11, 16, Swete does not note any reading but Ἀβιεσδρί. Hence, though aware that other editions have Ἀμελσάδ and Ἀμερσάρ, I did not mention them. Dr. Thomson has not noticed my reference to Jer. x, 11, in p. 229, No. 32. I take this opportunity of thanking all the scholars who have dealt so kindly with my paper.