



---

The Composition of the Book of Daniel

Author(s): George A. Barton

Source: *Journal of Biblical Literature*, Vol. 17, No. 1 (1898), pp. 62-86

Published by: The Society of Biblical Literature

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/3268806>

Accessed: 12/03/2010 14:22

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=sbl>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).



*The Society of Biblical Literature* is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Biblical Literature*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

## The Composition of the Book of Daniel.

PROF GEORGE A. BARTON.

BRYN MAWR, PENN.

### 1. Previous Theories.

SINCE the Neo-Platonic Porphyry at the end of the third century A.D. put forth his theory that the book of Daniel was composed by a Palestinian Jew in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, the book has been the subject of much interesting discussion. It has attracted students of all sorts as a candle does moths on a summer night, and though many have singed their wings, few have imparted to their successors a sufficient dread of their painful experience to deter others from flying towards the attractive but fateful candle. Those whose morbid fancy leads them to contemplate unduly the "last things" have sought to fathom the mystery of its symbolic numbers; the critically minded have tried to demonstrate its Maccabæan origin; the scholarly orthodox have endeavored to prove that it is a genuine exilic work of Daniel; while a few critics have appeared who would divide it between two or more authors.

It is with considerable hesitancy that I venture to express on such a book views which differ in some respects from those of all my predecessors; but, having reached the conclusion that the work is composite, and that the analysis must proceed on lines different from any hitherto attempted, I have ventured to propose a new solution of the problem, in the hope that it may contribute something to the discovery of the truth.

That Daniel is an Apocalypse and not a prophecy, is now so generally accepted as to need no proof. That it is a product of the Maccabæan and not of the exilic age has been so abundantly demonstrated by others that it may pass without further discussion. The attempts hitherto made to detect differences of authorship in Daniel have not met with marked success. So far as I know, Spinoza was the first to doubt the unity of the book. In his *Tractatus Theologico-Politicus*, x, he declares that ch. 8-12 were no doubt written by

Daniel, but suspects that ch. 1-7 are extracts from the annals of the Chaldæan kingdom. Sir Isaac Newton in his *Observations upon the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John*, p. 10,<sup>1</sup> held that the last six chapters contained prophecies written at several times by Daniel himself, while the first six are a collection of historical papers written by others. Similarly Beausobre<sup>2</sup> held that the first six chapters were not written by Daniel, but that his prophecies begin with the seventh.

Towards the close of the last century and in the early part of the present, the idea that Daniel is not a unity was revived by Michaelis, Eichhorn, and Bertholdt. J. D. Michaelis, in consequence of certain phenomena in the version of the LXX, held that ch. 3-6 did not belong to the original work.<sup>3</sup> Eichhorn divided the book into two parts, ch. 2-6 forming one, and ch. 1, 7-12 the other. The former part, he held, was a tradition concerning Daniel written by an earlier Jew, upon which the latter part was engrafted by a Jew of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes.

Bertholdt in his *Daniel neu übersetzt und erklärt* (Erlangen, 1806), is more thorough-going than any of his predecessors. He divides Daniel among nine different authors as follows : 1. Chapter 1, which he dates in the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus ; 2. Chapter 2, which he assigns to the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus ; 3. Chapter 3<sup>1-30</sup>, written in the Greek period later than ch. 2 ; 4. Chapter 3<sup>31</sup>-4, which he places late in the Greek period ; 5. Chapters 5 and 6, to which he assigns no higher antiquity than in the case of the previous section ; 6. Chapter 7, from the time of Antiochus Epiphanes ; 7. Chapter 8, written after the death of Epiphanes ; 8. Chapter 9, written after Antiochus Epiphanes had defiled the temple ; and 9. Chapters 10-12, which he assigns to the same reign, but to a somewhat later period. Bertholdt was followed in this analysis by Augusti.

Meinhold in three different publications<sup>4</sup> has within a few years revived the theory of Eichhorn. He separates ch. 2-6 from the rest of the book, dating them about 300 B.C., and regards the rest as Maccabæan. Strack<sup>5</sup> in 1885 held that a book of stories about Daniel

<sup>1</sup> London, 1732.

<sup>2</sup> *Remarques sur le nouveau Testament*, 1742.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. his *Übersetzung des A. T.—Anmerkungen zum Proph. Dan.*, p. 22, and his *Orientalische und Exegetische Bibliothek* iv. 26-30.

<sup>4</sup> *Die Composition des B. Daniel*, 1884, *Beiträge zur Erklärung des B. Dan.*, 1888, and *Daniel* in Strack & Zöckler's *Kgf. Kom.*, 1889.

<sup>5</sup> Zöckler's *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften* i. 171-173; *Einleitung in das A. T.*, 1888, p. 69 ff.; Herzog's *Realencyclopädie* vii. 419.

was issued in Aramaic in the time of Alexander the Great, to which the visions were added in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. In the latest edition of his *Einleitung* (1895), he appears to have receded from this position.<sup>6</sup>

Lagarde<sup>7</sup> expressed the opinion in 1891 that Daniel is a collection of disconnected pamphlets, some of which, viz., ch. 7 and 9-12, were unknown to Josephus and were not written till 69 A.D.<sup>8</sup>

On the other hand, most scholars hold firmly to the unity of the book. Bleek<sup>9</sup> dismisses the idea of a duality of authorship in a few words. Schrader<sup>10</sup> likewise gives little consideration to that point of view. Budde in his review of Meinhold's theory (*Literaturzeitung* 1888, No. 26) rejects it. Cornill<sup>11</sup> argues strongly for the unity of the work, and suggests<sup>12</sup> that the great haste in which the book was composed accounts for the "wood-cut fashion" (*Holzschnittmanier*) of the author. König,<sup>13</sup> Behrmann,<sup>14</sup> Driver,<sup>15</sup> Bevan,<sup>16</sup> and Kamphausen<sup>17</sup> may be put in the same class, though Driver admits<sup>18</sup> that perhaps not enough weight has been given to Meinhold's arguments; while von Gall<sup>19</sup> in a work devoted to the demolition of Meinhold's theory endeavors to demonstrate the unity of the book.

With the exception of Bertholdt's work the analyses of Daniel which have been proposed are based on the difference of form which appears when ch. 1-6 are compared with ch. 7-12. Chapters 1-6 are narratives in which Daniel is spoken of in the third person, while ch. 7-12 are visions which Daniel himself recounts in the first person. The replies to these arguments have been based chiefly on the two facts that the different parts exhibit the same historical environment,

<sup>6</sup> See pp. 145, 146.

<sup>7</sup> *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen*, 1891, p. 508 ff. Behrmann, *Das Buch Daniel*, p. xv, mistakenly attributes this to Reuss.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. König, *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 384.

<sup>9</sup> *Introduction to the Old Testament*, translated from the German ed. of 1865 by Venables, 1888, Vol. ii., p. 199 ff. He had, however, expressed his views more at length in the *Jahrbücher für deutsche Theologie*, 1860.

<sup>10</sup> De Wette's *Einleitung*, 8 ed., 1869.

<sup>11</sup> *Einleitung in das A. T.*, p. 259.

<sup>12</sup> *Die siebenzig Jahrwochen Daniels*, p. 31 n.

<sup>13</sup> *Einleitung in das A. T.*

<sup>14</sup> *Das Buch Daniel*, in Nowack's *Handkommentar*.

<sup>15</sup> *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Test.*

<sup>16</sup> *The Book of Daniel*, Cambridge, 1892.

<sup>17</sup> *The Book of Daniel in Hebrew*, in Haupt's *Sacred Books of the Old Test.*

<sup>18</sup> *Op. cit.*, pp. 482, 483.

<sup>19</sup> *Die Einheitlichkeit des Buches Daniel*, Giessen, 1895.

and that the similarity of language and of conception in the different parts implies unity of authorship. Against the first of these arguments, as will appear, we have nothing to say, but the second of them, though valid as against divisions of the book hitherto proposed, has some striking points of weakness which its advocates have overlooked. In my judgment Bertholdt has come nearer than any other writer, unless it be Lagarde, to an appreciation of the real character of the book, though he erred in assigning widely different dates to the different parts, and in finding the work of too many authors in the book.

Before passing in review the contents of Daniel, a word should be said with reference to the languages in which it is written. As is well known, the portion of the book between ch. 2<sup>d</sup> and 7<sup>th</sup> is in Aramaic, while the rest exists in Hebrew. This Aramaic section crosses the line between ch. 6 and 7, where the division in the book has usually been made by critics, and cannot well be made an element in the analysis. Chapter 7, which belongs to the visions, is written in the Aramaic tongue, in which the history is narrated.

On the whole, the best explanation of the presence of the two languages is that now accepted by several scholars<sup>20</sup> who hold that it was written in Hebrew, and that then the author, or some friend of his, issued an Aramaic edition. Later, when a part of the Hebrew was in time of persecution lost, its deficiency was supplied from the Aramaic version, hence the present bi-lingual form of the book.

It is, however, in this Aramaic portion that those expressions occur upon which most writers rely for those earmarks of style by which they prove unity of authorship.<sup>21</sup> If, however, it should appear that the so-called author, who may have made the Aramaic version, was simply an editor who compiled the work and wrote the preface (ch. 1), the marks of style might then conceivably be due to the liberty which the translator allowed himself. Some features of the case, which will appear more clearly at a later point, render this supposition improbable.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. Bevan, *op. cit.*, p. 27, and Haupt on 2<sup>d</sup> in Kamphausen's *Daniel in Hebrew*.

<sup>21</sup> The phrase "peoples, nations, and tongues" (עַמִּים וְלָשׁוֹנוֹת וְגוֹיִם) occurs in 3<sup>d</sup>. 7. 29 3<sup>31</sup> (4<sup>1</sup>) 5<sup>19</sup> 6<sup>26</sup> 7<sup>14</sup>, and not elsewhere in Daniel. The phrases "God of heaven," "Lord of heaven," and "King of heaven," for which Professor Moore claims that our author has a predilection (this JOURNAL, xv. 193), are found in the Aramaic portion (cf. ch. 2<sup>18</sup>. 19 5<sup>23</sup> and 4<sup>34</sup>), but we look in vain for them elsewhere. These are but examples. The most striking characteristics of style are in the Aramaic sections.

Noting, then, the fact that the presence of the Aramaic tongue cannot be urged in favor of a duality of authorship, and the further fact that those marks of style which have been most forcibly urged against a critical analysis are in the Aramaic sections, we pass to a review of the contents of the work itself.

## 2. The Analysis.

Chapter 1 is a preface to the rest of the book. It tells us of Nebuchadnezzar's siege of Jerusalem, of the capture of Hebrew princes including Daniel, of Daniel's training at Babylon, and of his superiority to the magicians in interpreting visions and advising the king.

When this chapter is compared with the rest of the book, the following difficulties appear: 1. It is implied in vs.<sup>5 and 18</sup> that three years intervened before these Hebrew princes were brought to the Babylonian court; and yet 2<sup>1</sup> tells us that Daniel was brought to the court in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar, although Nebuchadnezzar was already king (1<sup>1</sup>) when Daniel was taken captive.<sup>22</sup> 2. We are told in vs.<sup>21</sup> that Daniel continued till the first year of Cyrus, but in 10<sup>1</sup> we find him still active in the third year of Cyrus. The author did not make the statement in 1<sup>21</sup> on this point as large as he might.

It should be noted in passing that we know from no other source of a siege of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in Jehoiakim's third year, and that this date for such a siege is in all probability a year at least earlier than the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign.<sup>23</sup>

The second chapter recounts Nebuchadnezzar's dream of the great composite image, interpreted by Daniel to represent successive kingdoms, of which Nebuchadnezzar's was the most glorious, and the last of which should be destroyed by the Messianic kingdom. Daniel was then made ruler of the province of Babylon, while his friends, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, were, at his request, given offices in his province.

<sup>22</sup> Various expedients have been proposed to harmonize these statements. Rashi explains the 'second year' to mean the second year after the destruction of the temple. Hengstenberg, Hävernick, and Zöckler suppose that in 1<sup>1</sup> Nebuchadnezzar is reigning conjointly with his father, Nabopolassar, and that 2<sup>1</sup> refers to the second year of his independent reign. Ewald, Lenormant, and Kamphausen emend the text so as to make it the twelfth (שְׁתַּיִם עָשָׂרָה) year. These methods are all violent.

<sup>23</sup> Cf. Jer. 25<sup>1</sup>. Jehoiakim probably began to reign in 609 or 608 B.C., and Nebuchadnezzar in 604.

As to the exegesis of this chapter, it plainly represents the history of the successive empires down to the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms. It then represents the conquest of these kingdoms by the Jewish people, symbolized under the figure of the stone cut out of the mountain. It is expected by the author that the Jewish kingdom will subjugate the world.

It must be admitted that, although the exegesis of the chapter leads us to the Greek period, it does not clearly indicate the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. There is nothing in it inconsistent with that reign, and it is difficult to think of any other which would form so probable a background for it; but the picture is indicated with such a dim outline that if this chapter stood alone we could not insist upon the Maccabæan date. One is tempted to think that this chapter formed an independent narrative, written when the lines of battle were just beginning to be drawn between Antiochus and the Jews, and before the issue became so sharply defined. This would account for the more general character of the vision.

As to the form of the chapter, it should be observed that it is not, strictly speaking, correct to contrast this with ch. 7-12, and count this as narrative and those as apocalyptic in form; for this chapter contains an apocalyptic vision, and the whole point of the chapter centres in the Apocalypse.<sup>24</sup> This fact weakens considerably the force of the contrast which has often been made between the first and the second half of Daniel.

It should be noted that in vs.<sup>17</sup> the friends of Daniel are called Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, while in vs.<sup>49</sup> they are Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Could it be shown that ch. 2 and 3 were originally separate and independent compositions, to which ch. 1 had been prefixed after their union, the explanation of this fact would then be that Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah were the names of Daniel's companions known to the author of ch. 2, and that vs.<sup>49</sup> is an editorial device to harmonize it with ch. 3, a device which was anticipated in his preface (1<sup>6,7</sup>). This leads us, however, to some other considerations to be taken up in connection with ch. 3.

The third chapter (Aram. vs.<sup>1-30</sup>) narrates how Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego were cast alive into a furnace of burning fire for refusing to worship the great image set up by Nebuchadnezzar. Their miraculous deliverance was followed by a decree that no one should speak against their God, and they were promoted in the province of Babylon.

<sup>24</sup> Cf. Bevan *in loco*.

The first thing which impresses one here is the absence of Daniel. Why does he not share the fidelity and fortunes of his brethren? In a book devoted to his life and exploits it seems strange indeed that he should be excluded from one of the principal episodes. Bevan (pp. 78, 79) explains the discrepancy as follows: "The reason seems to be that he [Daniel] could not be introduced without marring the effect. To represent him as being cast with his friends into the furnace would have involved too gross and startling an inconsistency, after the scene of ch. 2. On the other hand, if Daniel had intervened to save his friends, there would have been no opportunity for the display of divine power, preserving them unhurt amidst the flames of the furnace. On these grounds the non-mention of Daniel is perfectly natural."

But are these reasons satisfactory? Does not the whole history of Oriental monarchy teach us that nothing is more natural than for a monarch's favorites of one day to be in danger of their lives the next? Has Bevan forgotten Haroun ar-Rashid and the Barmecides, not to mention many others? Under the circumstances it seems a much more "gross and startling inconsistency" that Daniel should seem to conform to heathen worship, than that an Oriental despot should be fickle.

This chapter is distinguished from the rest of the book by this unaccountable absence of Daniel. A closer study of the chapter reveals a polemic against idol worship complete in itself—the royal threat, its execution, the divine interposition, and the vindication of Israel's God, form a well-rounded whole. There can be little doubt that it originated in the year 168 B.C., when Antiochus was making the effort to force the Jews to worship idols.<sup>25</sup>

One is strongly tempted to believe that this little story originated independently of the Daniel stories, and formed part of a somewhat different cycle of tradition.

The evidence of the language of the chapter on this point, though not actually opposed, is, it must be confessed, not distinctly in favor of the view just expressed. All the Greek words which occur in Daniel—*κίθαρις*, *ψαλτήριον*, and *συμφωνία*—occur in ch. 3 and nowhere else. Of the sixteen<sup>26</sup> Persian words in Daniel, seven, or nearly one-half, occur in ch. 3—a far larger proportion than any other chapter can claim—while three of these—*אדרגור*, *רתבר* and *סרבבל*<sup>27</sup>

<sup>25</sup> Cf. I Macc. 1<sup>41-50</sup>.

<sup>26</sup> Driver, *Introduction*, p. 469 n., considers fifteen Persian words as certain.

<sup>27</sup> Driver, *ibid.*, regards *סרבבל* as most likely Persian, but as uncertain. I have



— are found nowhere else in Daniel. These facts would seem at first sight to support the theory of separate authorship, but some abatements have to be made for the fact that they are ἀπαξ λεγόμενα (and it may be only chance that they are not used elsewhere), and for the further fact that we are dealing not with the original but with a translation.

Another fact, however, which seems to tell squarely against our theory must be noted. The phrase “people, nations, and tongues,” as was pointed out above, occurs thrice in this narrative and is found four times outside of it. A mark of style like this would seem to point to one author for the sections in which it occurs. These conflicting indications leave our judgment of ch. 3 in suspense.

The fourth chapter (Aram. 3<sup>31</sup>—4<sup>34</sup>) contains Nebuchadnezzar’s dream of the tree cut down by divine decree, and Daniel’s interpretation of the dream.<sup>28</sup> As to literary form, the chapter professes to be a proclamation of Nebuchadnezzar; but the author forgets himself once (vs. 25-30, English 28-33) and lapses into the third person.

This chapter, though an episode tolerably complete in itself, bears the stamp of the same literary mint as ch. 2. The general features of the account are the same. It is a narrative containing an apocalypse. Nebuchadnezzar, as in ch. 2, had a dream. As in ch. 2, he appeals in vain to the magicians and soothsayers for an interpretation. As in ch. 2, the interpretation is finally accomplished by Daniel. It is true that the king calls upon the magicians first, in a way rather surprising after Daniel’s brilliant exploit in ch. 2, but that may be only the author’s way of keeping before the mind of the reader the superiority of Israel’s God to all forms of witchcraft. This chapter differs from ch. 2 in containing no Messianic conception: it simply tells how a foreign king was taught the supremacy of the God of Israel. The utter powerlessness of the mightiest monarch in the presence of the Almighty is here so pictured as to inspire the struggling Israelitish patriots with hope and confidence. History might repeat itself and another king be similarly humbled.

The chapter is entirely consonant with the times of Antiochus Epiphanes. The general literary conception and execution link it in authorship to ch. 2.

included it. There is one other which he considers as possibly Persian (מִדְּבָר), but it may have arisen from dittography.

<sup>28</sup> For a tradition concerning Nebuchadnezzar, which, as Bevan (*in loco* 87, 88) observes, has probably some points in common with our chapter, see Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* ix. 41 (Abydenus).

The fifth chapter describes Belshazzar's feast ; the hand-writing on the wall, which has been held to consist simply of five Babylonian words,<sup>29</sup> Daniel's interpretation, and the destruction of Belshazzar's kingdom.

This chapter presupposes ch. 4, as vs. 17-21 contain an extended reference to that narrative. It is in a general way a story of the same pattern as ch. 2 and 4 : a king is in distress for lack of an interpretation of an ominous sign, the wise men of his kingdom fail him, Daniel gives him the longed-for interpretation, and as in ch. 4 the interpretation is fulfilled.

The peculiar phrases noted above and the facts just pointed out identify the chapter with the writings of the author of ch. 2 and 4. Chapter 2 was, we may suppose, written when the onslaught of Antiochus was first made ; ch. 4, when some lull in the contest gave Israel hope that the heart of the persecutor might be humbled ; ch. 5, when the contest was renewed again, and it was evidently a fight to the death.

Chapter 6 transports us to the reign of Darius the Mede, and recounts the well-known story of Daniel and the lions' den. This chapter presents some striking differences from ch. 2, 4, and 5. Though a new king is introduced, Daniel is not, as in previous chapters, formally presented to him ; it is simply taken for granted that Daniel is trusted by him. There is lacking, too, the general literary method of ch. 2, 4, and 5. There is no dream or puzzle to interpret, by which the superiority of the God of Israel may be demonstrated. It is a plain, straightforward narrative, containing no apocalypse. With one exception the characteristic phrases of those chapters are lacking.<sup>30</sup> Daniel is not called Belteshazzar, and the chapter is designed to encourage the persecuted to endurance, rather than to predict as in 2, 4, and 5 the overthrow of the persecutor. The setting of the story is Median, and not as in those chapters Babylonian. There is reason to guess that the author of those chapters was not the author of this.

<sup>29</sup> Cf. Clermont-Ganneau in *Journal Asiatique*, Série VIII. i. 36 ff.; also *Hebraica* iii. 87-102; Nöldeke in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* i. 414 ff.; Haupt in *Johns Hopkins University Circular*, July, 1887, p. 104; Hoffmann in *Zeitschrift für Assyriologie* ii. 45-48; and Prince, *PAOS*. 1892, p. clxxxii. ff. For opposing views cf. Behrman, *Das Buch Daniel*, 36, 37, and Peters in this *JOURNAL*, xv. 114 ff.

<sup>30</sup> This exception is the phrase "peoples, nations, and tongues" (6<sup>20</sup>). The LXX reads τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ γλώσσαις καὶ χόραις. This variation from the Aramaic at this point indicates the presence of some uncertainty as to the reading, and leads me to suspect that the words "nations and tongues" are a gloss.

Chapter 6 has, however, some features in common with ch. 3<sup>1-29</sup>. In that chapter Israelites are cast into a fiery furnace for refusing to worship an idol : here an Israelite is cast into a den of lions for praying to God and not to a king. If we connect 2<sup>48</sup> with 3<sup>1-29</sup>, the parallelism becomes still more striking. Daniel is there ruler of a province over three deputy-rulers ; here, the ruler of an empire, like Joseph, next to the king in power, under whom are three presidents, who are in turn over numerous satraps.<sup>31</sup> In both strict adherence to the Jewish religion brings the heroes of the story into mortal danger from which they are miraculously delivered. The purpose of the two narratives is the same, to encourage resistance to idol worship.

The two chapters manifest also some striking differences. In ch. 3 the negative virtue of abstinence from idolatry is commended ; in ch. 6 the positive virtue of the maintenance of the Jewish religion, and especially of private prayer, is encouraged. In the former it is hinted that Antiochus is alone responsible for Israel's sufferings ; in the latter it is hinted that it is the fault of crafty advisers. In ch. 3 the setting is Babylonian, and the conduct of Nebuchadnezzar is in the main consistent with actual life ; in ch. 6 the setting is Median (a mistake for Persian), and the picture of Darius helplessly coerced by his nobles one day and royally executing them the next may indeed find its parallels in the history of weak Oriental despots, but savors rather of the work of an author untouched by the ways of courts.

I regard the two chapters, therefore, as independent parallel traditions, rather than as connected stories. The same germ is found in both — the story of mortal danger induced by the interdiction of Israel's religion, from which deliverance is effected by miracle. This germ developed differently in the different traditions until, when it assumed literary form under the impetus of the persecution of Antiochus, in one centre it was connected with Nebuchadnezzar and a fiery furnace, with Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego for heroes ;<sup>32</sup> and in another centre in the hands of a different writer it was connected with Darius the Mede and a lions' den, with Daniel as the hero. That such freedom in moulding the details of a tradition was

<sup>31</sup> We saw above that 2<sup>48</sup> might with plausibility be regarded as an editorial note linking ch. 2 to a narrative of different authorship. Is it too much to suppose that the parallelism to ch. 6 which such editorial note created escaped the editor? May the form of his note not have been suggested to him by ch. 6?

<sup>32</sup> Dr. Peters (JOURNAL, xv. 109 ff.) suggests that we have here a legendary account of Nebuchadnezzar's treatment of Ahab and Zedekiah (Jer. 29<sup>22</sup>), or some of their compeers. Bevan anticipated him in this. See Bevan, *op. cit.* p. 78.

possible may be inferred from the fact that in the story of "Bel and the Dragon" appended to Daniel in the LXX, the episode of the lions' den is transferred to the reign of Cyrus and made an important circumstance in quite a different series of events. This freedom was probably exercised after the form of the story in ch. 6 was well known.

Viewed in the light of the above observations, ch. 6 has no necessary literary connection with the preceding material except through the clause "And Darius the Mede received the kingdom," etc., which might well be regarded as an editorial note.

The seventh chapter takes us back to the reign of Belshazzar and recounts a dream of Daniel. It differs from the preceding portions of the book in that after the first verse Daniel speaks in the first person, as he does in the subsequent chapters. This is a literary difference which has proven to previous critics from Spinoza down an attractive but fruitless clue. It is really a surface difference. As our guides to authorship, we must look to the deeper elements of conception and kind of material employed.

The chapter makes Daniel tell us of a dream in which he sees beasts of composite character,<sup>33</sup> the last of which ravages the world till the "Ancient of Days" sits in judgment and the beast is slain.

In the heavens appears the form of a man<sup>34</sup> to whom the kingdom of the world is given. It is explained to Daniel that the beasts represent kingdoms, and the horns kings, that a certain horn is to prevail for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times, — generally interpreted as years, — that God would then intervene and give the kingdom to his saints.

Recent commentators agree that the fourth beast is the Greek empire, that the ten horns are ten Syrian kings, and that the little horn is Antiochus.

Chapter 7, like ch. 2, 4, and 5, takes us to a Babylonian environment, and as in ch. 2 and 4 employs the device of an apocalyptic dream. Again, like those chapters, it represents through weird imagery the unfolding of future events. Gunkel has shown that this imagery is based on such material as is found in the Babylonian Cosmogonic Epic.<sup>35</sup> The idea underlying this chapter and ch. 2

<sup>33</sup> Compare the composite creatures in the Babylonian Creation Epic, Col. i. 119–124. See Delitzsch's *Welterschöpfungsepos*, or Zimmern's *Beilagen* to Gunkel's *Schöpfung und Chaos*, pp. 403, 404.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Wellhausen's *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*, p. 312 n., and Bevan, *op. cit.* p. 118.

<sup>35</sup> *Schöpfung und Chaos in Urzeit und Endzeit*, Göttingen, 1895, pp. 235–398.

is the same. In both we read of four world empires, in both the fourth empire is dwelt upon at much greater length than the first three, in both the fourth empire is overcome by divine interposition in order that an everlasting kingdom may be set up. The two chapters differ in that ch. 2 dwells on the divisions of the last empire, while ch. 7 does not; in ch. 2 the four empires represented by the image are all destroyed, while in ch. 7 three of them are permitted to live on though deprived of their dominion. These differences are, however, easily accounted for by the differences of the traditional imagery employed in the two chapters. The author no doubt applied the imagery to such features of the history known to him as appeared to be analogous to the symbols in hand.

The similarities already mentioned would lead us to believe that it is the work of the same hand which produced ch. 2, 4, and 5.

Chapter 8 contains Daniel's vision of the ram who is overcome by the he-goat with the notable horn between his eyes. The time of the vision is the reign of Belshazzar, and the place the river Ulai in Susa. It is explained to Daniel by Gabriel that this vision means that the Medo-Persian empire is to be overcome by Alexander, that his empire is to break up into four, that from one of these a king is to come forth who will overthrow the worship of several gods, that he will endeavor to overthrow the worship of the supreme God Yahwe, and will cause His burnt offering to cease and profane His sanctuary.<sup>36</sup>

The explanation of the 2300 evenings and mornings (vs.<sup>14</sup>) is not so clear. Commentators seem to be pretty well agreed that they are equal to 1150 days.<sup>37</sup> The most probable explanation of this is that it is the author's estimate of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times. Cornill has shown that on the basis of the calendar then in use among the Jews 1150 days falls short of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  of the shortest years by more than a hundred days;<sup>38</sup> but the author may have regarded the half as meaning simply a fraction of a year.

Interesting in connection with the Babylonian material is the word *קָרָב*, 'war,' like the Bab.-Assyr. *karâbu*. It occurs nowhere else in Biblical Aramaic, though found a number of times in Hebrew (once in 2 Sam. 17<sup>11</sup> [J] and several times in exilic and post-exilic passages) and in the Targums.

<sup>36</sup> So Professor Moore in this JOURNAL, xv. 193 ff. It is a view which commends itself.

<sup>37</sup> The Hebrew is open to this construction. It reads *עַרְבַּת בְּקָרְ אֲלֵפִים* וַיִּשְׁלַח מֵאֹתָ וַיִּשְׁלַח מֵאֹתָ. The LXX, however, understood 2300 days: "Ἔως ἑσπέρας καὶ πρωί· ἡμέραι δισχιλίας καὶ τριακόσιαι. The reading of Theodotion is the same.

<sup>38</sup> *Die siebenzig Jahrwochen Daniels*, p. 22.

The vision of ch. 8, like those of 2, 4, and 7, is embodied in weird imagery unlike anything in Daniel outside of these chapters. The idea is similar to those chapters, though here the attention is centred upon the Greek kingdom. The Medo-Persian empire is mentioned because Alexander overcomes it. By implication (the scene of the vision is the Babylonian empire) we may, as in ch. 2 and 7, find four empires; as in those chapters, a great persecution arises and a promise of deliverance is given. This chapter differs from those in that there is here a more detailed treatment of the persecutor and his work, but no Messianic representation. It is intimated that the persecutor will be 'broken,' but no hint is given of the instrumentality by which this will be achieved.

The employment of grotesque imagery, the Babylonian setting, and the general correspondences just mentioned indicate that this vision is the work of the author of ch. 2, 4, 5, and 7. It would seem to have been written somewhat later than ch. 7 to give encouragement to the struggling Jews in a little different way, and to give the writer's explanation of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times.

The ninth chapter presents in vs.<sup>1-2</sup> what might well have been originally the title of an independent work, beginning with a very formal dating in the first year of Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes. The chapter then proceeds to tell us of Daniel's vision, in which Jeremiah's 70 years are interpreted as 70 weeks of years, and the events of the last half week are made known to him in some detail.

Recent commentators are pretty well agreed that this last half week corresponds to the profanation of the temple by Antiochus. This would make 168 B.C. the middle of the last week. But if we count from the destruction of Jerusalem in 586 B.C., the intervening period is but  $418\frac{1}{2}$  years, and not  $486\frac{1}{2}$ , as the author evidently supposed. Graf, Nöldeke, Schürer, Cornill, and Bevan are of the opinion that the author, who lived among a people very imperfectly acquainted with chronology, especially of times long passed, followed an incorrect computation. Schürer<sup>89</sup> points out that even Josephus may be caught tripping in a similar way. Such an explanation seems altogether probable. The correspondence of the half week with the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  times is too striking to lead us to suppose that the chapter originated in any other crisis than that which called forth ch. 7.

<sup>89</sup> *History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ*, Div. ii. Vol. iii. pp. 53, 54.

It should be noted that this chapter, like ch. 6, lays especial emphasis on prayer. It is not so much a vision as an answer to prayer. These chapters agree in dating their events in the reign of Darius the Mede, and in laying an emphasis on prayer unique in the book of Daniel. Chapter 10 represents Daniel as fasting and mourning; these chapters picture him as faithful in prayer, ch. 9 giving his prayer in detail.

This ninth chapter, too, is dependent upon other parts of the Old Testament in a way without parallel elsewhere in Daniel. We have already noted the fact that the kernel of the chapter is taken from Jeremiah; we have now to note the dependence of the prayer in vs. 4-19 on Nehemiah 1<sup>5ff.</sup> and 9<sup>1ff.</sup>. Von Gall<sup>40</sup> goes so far as to regard these verses alone, out of all the book, as a later insertion, like Azarias's prayer and the song of the three children in ch. 3 of the Greek version of Daniel. That is, however, not necessary. It is enough to suppose that such prayers as those of Nehemiah were the natural model for an author so steeped in the Scriptures as this one.<sup>41</sup>

Critics who argue for the unity of Daniel remark on the author's tendency to heap up synonyms,<sup>42</sup> examples of which occur in the enumeration of musical instruments in ch. 3, and in such phrases as "peoples, nations, and tongues" already referred to. This prayer in ch. 9 might at first sight seem to be an excellent example of the same tendency; but a closer examination reveals the fact that it makes no more use of synonymous expressions than the parallel passages in Nehemiah on which it is modelled, and the likeness in this respect to the Aramaic sections of the book may be purely accidental. The formal title at the beginning of this chapter, its Median setting, and its unique dependence upon and use of other parts of the Old Testament, lead me to believe that it originally came from an author different from the author of any other chapter except 6<sup>2-29</sup>. It has in common with that chapter the Median setting, the prominence given to prayer, and marked dependence on other parts of the Old Testament.<sup>43</sup> I therefore regard the two chapters as successive pamphlets by the same author. Of the two, ch. 9 was probably issued first, since it has the more formal title. The author when he issued 6<sup>2-29</sup> considered Darius sufficiently well known.

<sup>40</sup> *Die Einheitlichkeit des Buches Daniel*, Giessen, 1895, p. 123 ff.

<sup>41</sup> Vs. 4 is dependent on Ex. 20<sup>6</sup> and Deut. 7<sup>9</sup>. Vs. 12, 13, 14 are also full of references to the Pentateuchal law.

<sup>42</sup> Cf. Kamphausen's *Daniel in Hebrew*, p. 30.

<sup>43</sup> Cf. 6<sup>11</sup> with 1 Kings 8<sup>48</sup>, and Ps. 55<sup>17</sup>.

In 9<sup>21</sup> the words "whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning" I regard as an editor's note to harmonize the mention of Gabriel with 8<sup>16</sup>.

The last three chapters of the book (10-12<sup>4</sup>) form a continuous vision. Chapter 10 is its introduction. Daniel, fasting by the banks of the Tigris in the third year of Cyrus, is visited by a heavenly messenger, who unfolds to him the history of the future. The subsequent history of Persia is passed over in a sentence. The author evidently knew of but four Persian kings, probably those who happen to be mentioned in the Old Testament. He knows the Syro-Egyptian history quite thoroughly, and in ch. 11 gives this in great detail. Having stated in 11<sup>5</sup> the general relations between the two kingdoms, he describes in vs.<sup>6</sup> the relations of Ptolemy Philadelphus and his daughter Bernice with Antiochus Theos; in vs.<sup>7-9</sup> the times of Ptolemy Euergetes and Seleucus Callinicus; in vs.<sup>10-19</sup> the reign of Antiochus the Great; in v.<sup>20</sup> the reign of Seleucus Philopator the son of Antiochus; in vs.<sup>21-24</sup> the rise of Antiochus Epiphanes; in vs.<sup>25-28</sup> the war of Epiphanes with Ptolemy Philometor; in vs.<sup>29-31</sup> how Antiochus turned his attention to Jerusalem and destroyed the temple; in vs.<sup>32-35</sup> the sufferings of the Jews; in vs.<sup>36-39</sup> the impiety of Epiphanes; and in <sup>40-45</sup> the author describes what he expects the tyrant yet to do before the grand consummation of ch. 12. In that chapter (vs.<sup>1-4</sup>) he tells how Michael shall appear, many dead shall be raised, and the long expected time of blessedness begin. There are two postscripts which will be considered later.

The scene of this apocalypse is laid in the reign of Cyrus, and the idea of angels as guardians of nations is no doubt borrowed from Persian angelology.<sup>44</sup> The style of ch. 11, which treats of Syro-Egyptian history in such detail, differs from anything else in Daniel. It is obscure, difficult, and frequently un-Hebraic. Rabbi Szold<sup>45</sup> regards it as a poem, but to me both the parallelism and the poetic thought seem to be lacking. I rather suspect that the author's style was here influenced by some historical notes of which he made use, and which were already in a written form, perhaps in some language other than Hebrew. At all events, the author of this apocalypse has a knowledge of the history of the Greek kingdoms unique in the book of Daniel. This with the Persian elements mentioned above leads me to regard him as different from the author

<sup>44</sup> Cf. the idea that each nation has its guardian angel, ch. 10<sup>20, 21</sup> and 12<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>45</sup> *The Eleventh Chapter of the Book of Daniel*, in the Alex. Kohut Memorial volume.



of any other section of the book. In ch. 11<sup>1</sup> the LXX is probably right in reading "Cyrus" instead of "Darius the Mede."<sup>46</sup> The angel speaking in the third year of Cyrus refers back to the struggle which he had in Cyrus's first year when the heavenly powers opposed the movement which favored the Jews.

An editorial note I find in 10<sup>1</sup> in the words "whose name was called Belteshazzar." The phrase occurs so often in the Nebuchadnezzar-Belshazzar sections, that even in such hasty editing as the book received, it seems to have struck the editor that it should be inserted here. Another editorial note is to be seen in vs.<sup>9</sup> in the words וְאֲנִי הָיִיתִי פָּנֵי אֲרָצָה. The sentence probably read וְאֲנִי הָיִיתִי פָּנֵי אֲרָצָה וְפָנֵי אֲרָצָה. The sentence which now stands in the text is awkwardly tautological. It was no doubt introduced to harmonize with 8<sup>18</sup>.

The end of the vision (12<sup>4</sup>) is marked by a command similar to that at the end of ch. 8, to "shut up the words and seal the book." This, no doubt, originally formed the end of this Cyrus apocalypse.

In vs.<sup>5-10, 13</sup> a scene is introduced which is borrowed from ch. 7 and 8 and is probably editorial. The device of two figures standing by the river, one of whom asks the other how long it shall be to the end of these wonders, is based on ch. 8<sup>13-15</sup>. The answer, 3½ times, is based on ch. 7<sup>25</sup>. Then the statement "the words are shut up and sealed" is patterned on 12<sup>4</sup> and 8<sup>26</sup>, and the statement which follows (vs.<sup>10, 13</sup>) is designed to form a fitting conclusion to the book. How the book was, in my judgment, compiled, I will endeavor to make clear below. These verses (<sup>5-10, 13</sup>) are, I think, the compiler's own ending to the book.

Gunkel<sup>47</sup> first suggested that vs.<sup>11 and 12</sup> are two glosses added by different hands to explain the 3½ times of vs.<sup>7</sup>. This conclusion had

<sup>46</sup> The late W. R. Smith conjectured that דָּרְיוֹשׁ הַמֶּדֶי was a part of an independent heading wrongly introduced at this point by a scribe. Bevan follows him. Behrmann omits the verse and the first half of the following one altogether. Meinhold reads as I would בַּשָּׁנָה אֶחָת לְבוֹרְשׁ. Kamphausen, in *Daniel in Hebrew*, defends the Massoretic text on the ground that the "author sharply distinguishes in time between the overthrow of the Chaldean empire, coincident with the accession of the so-called Mede, Darius, and the favor shown to the Jews some years later, in the permission to return, which was first given by Cyrus," — an exegesis which seems exceedingly unnatural. Surely the time for such opposition as is here spoken of was in the first year of Cyrus, when he was about to publish his decree which gave permission for the return. The opposition to an arbitration treaty, a treaty of annexation, or a tariff bill, is exhibited when the act is in process of formation. Does our author attribute less wisdom to the heavenly powers?

<sup>47</sup> *Schöpfung und Chaos*, p. 269 n.

forced itself upon me before I noticed Gunkel's suggestion. The present ending of the book is, therefore, an expansion by these glossators.

### 3. The Results.

The preceding discussion renders unnecessary the task of explaining why neither the solution of Eichhorn and Meinhold nor that of Bertholdt is satisfactory. They do not meet the conditions which we have observed to exist. Our review of the book reveals nine distinct and complete episodes after the first chapter. Seven of these are apocalyptic in their nature, while two (2, 6) are stories for the times. Chapter 1 is but an introduction to this series of stories. It is clear that such a book can have little unity of plan.

Another fact which impresses even the most cursory reader of Daniel is the historical mixture which appears in it. Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, Belshazzar, Darius the Mede, and Cyrus make, when narratives concerning their reigns are placed in this order, as in the book of Daniel, what at first sight seems a historical patchwork, which is exceedingly unnatural in an original writer. Were a "higher critic" guilty of arranging the parts of a book in such an order, many would stoutly deny that it could be the right one. The conclusion which naturally suggests itself is that these separate and complete episodes, concerning so many reigns, were once, as Lagarde suggested, independent pamphlets. Several of them must, as we have seen, be successive efforts of the same author, though they cannot all be from the same pen.

This impression is somewhat strengthened when we reflect that of the important apocalypses known, every one is composite in structure, unless Daniel be an exception. The composite character of Enoch has been recognized since Lücke published his *Einleitung in die Offenbarung Johannes*, 2d ed., in 1852, and numerous scholars of eminence can be quoted in favor of this view.<sup>48</sup> Kabisch,<sup>49</sup> de Faye,<sup>50</sup> and Charles<sup>51</sup> have made the composite character of Baruch quite clear. As to Fourth Esdras, Kabisch in 1889<sup>52</sup> made out a strong case for its composite character, and now Charles<sup>53</sup> comes to his sup-

<sup>48</sup> See Charles's *The Book of Enoch*, p. 9 ff.

<sup>49</sup> *Jahrbücher f. Protest. Theol.*, 1891, pp. 66-107.

<sup>50</sup> *Les Apocalypses juives*, 1892.

<sup>51</sup> *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, 1896.

<sup>52</sup> *Das vierte Buch Ezra*, Göttingen, 1889.

<sup>53</sup> *Apoc. of Baruch*, p. lxvii.

port. When we come to the Apocalypse of John in the New Testament the case is more complicated. Several different schools of criticism have in the past fifteen years come to the fore, and while they differ in many details and contend about many points which are not clearly settled, they have at least demonstrated that the work is composite.<sup>54</sup> After two detailed examinations of the subject between which as many years intervened that is the writer's conviction.

If these apocalypses are matters of growth and were not struck off at one time, we return to the book of Daniel with the impression made by the facts already considered somewhat confirmed by the argument from analogy. The analogy, however, is not perfect. It applies only to the fact of composite character.

We must dismiss from our minds at once any expectation that it is possible in Daniel, as in other apocalypses, to find elements which originated in widely separated periods. The summary of the contents given above has made it clear that each episode of the book fits the great crisis through which the Jews were passing during the years 168-165 B.C.

But suppose the material of the book were written within the period of one short crisis, does it follow that there was only one writer who attempted to comfort and strengthen his brethren? It has been held that these stories were designed to be read one at a time and were made short and pointed so that each one might carry its lesson to the hearer without wearying him.<sup>55</sup> But grant this, need we then shut ourselves up to the conclusion that but one individual undertook such a task? There were different companies of refugees from the wrath of Antiochus in different places (1 Mac. 2<sup>40ff</sup>), and it is but reasonable to suppose that in more than one place some person arose to comfort and encourage the struggling patriots.

Working on this supposition and applying it to the facts which the review of the book has brought to light, we find in Daniel the work of three and possibly four authors besides an editor. One author conceives of Daniel as living in the reigns of Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar. We will call him A. He wrote the pamphlets now embodied in ch. 2, 4, 5, 7, and 8. Possibly, on the ground of style

<sup>54</sup> For an account of this criticism, its permanent and probable results, and its unsolved problems, see "The Apocalypse and Recent Criticism" in the *American Journal of Theology*, October 1898.

<sup>55</sup> Bevan, *op. cit.* p. 25. Bevan overworks the point in favor of unity of authorship. If books in these days became known by being read aloud as he claims, why are not all the Old Testament books as disconnected as Daniel?

and coloring, ch. 3 should be assigned to him also. Another writer (B) conceives of Daniel as living in the reign of Darius the Mede. He wrote the pamphlets now embodied in ch. 9 and 6. A third (C) conceives of Daniel as living under Cyrus. He produced the apocalypse, 10<sup>1</sup>-12<sup>4</sup>. It was noted above that ch. 3, which on grounds of style accords with the writings of A, is in subject matter quite incongruous with his work. Possibly this chapter ought to be assigned to a different writer. Lacking as we do the Hebrew original, the point is difficult to determine. We might provisionally call him A<sup>2</sup>. These writers produced their different pamphlets contemporaneously or nearly so in different centres for the comfort of their brethren. They were independent of one another, except as they drew from certain general ideas which were in the air, some of which will be noted below. Soon after the struggle was over, or more probably during its later stages, some editor gathered these pamphlets together, hastily wrote ch. 1 as a preface,<sup>56</sup> inserted a few editorial notes here and there, and appended 12<sup>5-10</sup>.<sup>13</sup> as a conclusion. The editor's plan seems to have been to group together the narratives about his heroes, and then the pamphlets which make Daniel speak in the first person. No doubt he arranged these two parts respectively in what he regarded as the chronological order.

The results here stated may be more clearly indicated in the table on facing page.

A comparison of the work of the different writers whom we have detected tends to strengthen the conviction that the analysis rests upon a basis of fact. A, who conceives of Daniel as living under Babylonian kings, delights in weird imagery, by which he shadows forth impending events. He revels in the interpretation of enigmas. Not only are his narratives connected with Babylonian kings, but he uses Babylonian names and words, such as Belteshazzar (*Balaṭ-su-uṣur*), Arioch (*Eri-Aku*)<sup>57</sup>, and MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN (*manū manū šiklu u parši*)<sup>58</sup>, and draws, as Gunkel has shown and as we have already noted in part above,<sup>59</sup> from the Babylonian cosmological material for a considerable portion of his imagery.

<sup>56</sup> The haste of the editor is indicated in many ways. One instance appears in 12<sup>1</sup>. The text of 11<sup>1</sup> probably read as the LXX does, "the first year of Cyrus," so that the last date in the pamphlets, as the editor arranged them, was Cyrus's first year. Glancing at this hastily, he wrote in 12<sup>1</sup>, "the first year of Cyrus," overlooking the fact that in 10<sup>1</sup> Daniel was still alive in the third year of Cyrus.

<sup>57</sup> Cf. Fried. Delitzsch's "Glossae Babylonicae," in Baer's *Libri Danielis Esrae et Nehemiae*.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. *supra*, note 29.

<sup>59</sup> p. 72.

ANALYSIS OF DANIEL.

A.	B.	C.	A <sup>2</sup> (?).	R.	LATER GLOSSES.
Ch. ii. 1-48.	Ch. ix.	Ch. x. 1-xii. 4.	Ch. iii. 1-30.	Ch. i., Introduction.	
" iii. 31-iv.*	" vi. 2-29 a.†			" ii. 49.	
" v.				" vi. 1. †	
" viii.				" vi. 29 b (אֲנִי פָּרַסְתִּיאַ וְכַמְלִיכֹת בִּרְשִׁי פִּרְסִיָּא).	Ch. vi. 26 (אֲנִיא וְלִשְׁנִיא).
" viii.				" ix. 21 (אֲשֶׁר רָאִיתִי בְּחֹזֶן בְּתַהֲלֵקָה).	" xi. 1 (רְרוּשׁ הַמֶּדִּי).
				" x. 1 (אֲשֶׁר נִקְרָא שְׁמוֹ בְּלִשְׁנֵי־עֵבֶר).	" xii. 11.
				" x. 9 (נִרְדָּם עַל פְּנֵי הַיָּם).	" xii. 12.
				" xii. 5-10, 13. Conclusion.	

\* English ch. iv.

† English v. 31.

‡ English vi. 1-29 a.

§ To harmonize with viii. 18.

|| English vi. 25.

This writer is therefore peculiarly Babylonian in his culture. With him we must class our questionable A<sup>2</sup>. His setting is also Babylonian, as well as his names.<sup>60</sup> As we have seen, his material is hard to reconcile with A's, and his vocabulary contains a larger proportion of foreign words than any other part of the book of Daniel. His style is the same as that of A; and it is this which makes us doubtful whether ch. 3 does not belong to the latter writer. These Babylonian sections bear striking marks of style. Those peculiar and recurring expressions, to which critics have pointed as the stylistic marks of the book, occur almost exclusively here. It is not fair to attribute them to the Aramaic translator, since we have found the parts in which they indubitably occur to be so largely the work of one author.

The writer C conceives of Daniel as living under Cyrus. He is in a way as characteristically Persian as A is Babylonian. It is true that he knows no more of Persian kings than the Old Testament tells; but his conception of angels shows that he had been exposed to Persian culture somewhat as A had been to Babylonian.<sup>61</sup> This writer, too, knows much more of the details of Syro-Egyptian history than either of the others. He does not vaguely refer to "ten kings," as ch. 7 does, but, as we have seen, follows with considerable detail the history of the Ptolemies and Seleucidae. He seems to have had access to some notes on the Ptolemaic-Seleucid history.<sup>62</sup> One may hazard the guess that they came to him from some friend resident at the Egyptian court.

The writer B is as Jewish in his culture as the others are Babylonian and Persian. One of his pamphlets is saturated with thought derived from other parts of the Old Testament, while the other teaches, by means of a powerful object lesson, the importance of

<sup>60</sup> Dura (*Duru*, 'wall'), Shadrach (*Šudur-Aku*, 'command of Aku'), Meshach (*Mi-ša-Aku*, 'who is what Aku is?' *i.e.* 'who is like Aku?') and Abednego (*Abad-Nabu* or *Arad-Nabu*, 'servant of Nabu'). Cf. Delitzsch in Baer, *op. cit.*

<sup>61</sup> Meinhold in Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Kommentar* viii. 281, seems inclined to admit a Persian origin for the 'watchers,' which appear in 4<sup>10</sup>. 14. 20 (English 4<sup>13</sup>. 17. 23). The term, which appears in those passages for the first time, and not again in Daniel, does not, as Bevan and Behrmann have perceived, refer to a class of angels, but seems rather to be a name for angels in general, as in the book of Enoch. In the latter work it sometimes means archangel, as in 20<sup>1</sup> 39<sup>12</sup>. 13 40<sup>2</sup> 61<sup>12</sup> 71<sup>7</sup>, but it is also applied to fallen angels in 1<sup>5</sup> 10<sup>9</sup>. 15 12<sup>2</sup> 4 13<sup>10</sup> 14<sup>1</sup>. 3 15<sup>2</sup> 16<sup>1</sup>. 2 91<sup>15</sup>. The Persian origin of the term, if Persian it be, is not so direct and palpable as are C's angelic conceptions.

<sup>62</sup> *Supra*, p. 76.

the maintenance on the part of the Jews of their private devotions as well as their public worship. He is innocent alike of historical culture and of the ways of courts. His chronology of the events in the history of the Hebrew nation is mistaken, and his Darius the Mede unknown to history. His picture of a king coerced to-day by his nobles, but boldly executing them to-morrow, is, to say the least, naïf. But though he knows little outside the Old Testament, he knows well the Scriptures of his people, and seeks with devout earnestness to contribute his mite of encouragement to the struggling patriots.

The editor welded into one the work of these three writers, prefixing an appropriate preface, that all the means of encouragement which had been employed might be preserved and become more effective ; hence our book of Daniel.

#### 4. Objections.

In closing we anticipate some objections which may be made to the analysis here presented.

1. It may be urged that our analysis ignores an obvious clue to literary difference, in refusing to make the difference of person exhibited in ch. 1-6 and 7-12 a means of detecting authorship. This objection has, perhaps, been met sufficiently already. A clue which, however obvious, has for two hundred years proved disappointing may safely be abandoned.

2. It will probably be said that such an analysis ought to be accompanied, as in the case of the Pentateuch, by lists of words which should prove differences of vocabulary in the different parts. This may, to a certain extent, be done, and the writer has partially prepared such lists ; but where the material is so slight, and even what there is exists in two languages, such lists could only represent, in the main, *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα*, and would form a precarious basis for argument.

3. Another objection which we anticipate is, that such a method of composition as is supposed is hardly conceivable except when differences of age can be demonstrated between the different documents. There are, however, in all probability different documents underlying our Synoptic Gospels ; and yet no one would hold that many years elapsed between the composition of the "Urmarcus" and the "Logia" of Matthew. The analogy between the composition of these writings and the composition of Daniel is not com-

plete, but is suggestive. In the case of Daniel, legends of the distant past are given form and sent out by different writers under the influence of a sharp crisis. In the case of the evangelic writings, comparatively recent events are put on record by different persons in obedience to a well-defined need of the infant church. In the latter case more than three years may have intervened between the dates of writing. The necessity for writing was produced, not by an acute crisis, but by a more gentle development.

4. It may be urged that there is an agreement of the narratives in certain points which indicates dependence of part upon part.

*a.* Chapter 8<sup>26</sup> and 12<sup>4</sup> agree in representing Daniel as receiving a command to "shut up the vision." The command is designed to explain why the visions, if received in the exile, were unknown till the Maccabæan period. Surely so simple a device to avoid a common and obvious difficulty may have occurred to two persons independently.

*b.* Again, **הַתְּמִיד**, as a technical name for the burnt offering, is common to ch. 8<sup>11-12</sup> and 11<sup>31</sup>. Is it not obvious that such an expression must have been on the lips of many at the time to have been used by a writer at all? Had it not been, no writer could hope to be understood by it.

*c.* In like manner we have in 9<sup>27</sup> **שְׁקוּצִים מְשׁוּמִים**, in 11<sup>31</sup> **הַשְּׁקוּץ** **מְשׁוּמִים**, and in 8<sup>13</sup> **הַפֶּשַׁע שִׁמֵּם**, expressions which are, no doubt, all based upon the same idea. Nestle<sup>63</sup>, who is followed by Bevan<sup>64</sup> and Behrmann,<sup>65</sup> made in 1883 a suggestion which is a most plausible explanation of these expressions. He regards them as an intentional disfigurement of **בעל שִׁמֵּם** of the Phœnician inscriptions — a title of the Semitic equivalent of the Greek (Olympian) Zeus, whose worship Antiochus was endeavoring to establish. Such a phrase originating in a grim jest at such a time would be exceedingly popular and would be in everybody's mouth. Its presence is rather a mark of date than of unity of authorship.

*d.* The coincidence of the 3½ times in ch. 7<sup>25</sup> with the half week of ch. 9<sup>27</sup> is a more serious stumbling-block. The idea is too unique and unusual to have sprung up spontaneously and independently in two minds. But if we grant this, it does not follow that B had ever seen A's work when he wrote his first pamphlet. In a time of mortal struggle like the Maccabæan crisis, a hint on prophetic authority that

<sup>63</sup> *Zeitschrift für alttest. Wissenschaft*, 1883, p. 248.

<sup>64</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 193.

<sup>65</sup> *Op. cit.* p. 78.



the painful episode would be short, would naturally spread with electrical swiftness all over the land. We have only to suppose that it reached the ears of B stripped as it very likely would be of the imagery in which A had embodied it, and we can easily imagine how it would set such a patriot to studying the Scriptures to find authority or a setting for it there. No closer dependence than this need be supposed.

*c.* The similar words in which a man of the captivity is described in 2<sup>25</sup> 5<sup>13</sup> and 6<sup>14</sup> may be urged as a stylistic similarity which militates against our theory. It is not difficult, though, to suppose that by the Maccabæan period the captivity had been so often referred to that stereotyped phrases for that purpose were in the air.

The references to fasting in 9<sup>3</sup> and 10<sup>2</sup> are urged by Schrader<sup>66</sup> in favor of unity of authorship, but the idea of fasting when one or one's nation is in trouble is not an idea for which any Jew during the Maccabæan period, or for some time before, could claim originality. It must under such circumstances have been a most common practice. Cf. Neh. 1<sup>4</sup>.

5. It may further be objected to the theory advocated above that, even if it be granted that the pamphlets of which Daniel is composed fall into three classes, with Babylonian, Hebrew, and Persian settings respectively, one writer with fertile imagination and dramatic power may easily have composed them all. Such a supposition is extremely unlikely, as it is contrary to all Old Testament analogy. The stories of the Pentateuch which, like Abraham's denial of his wife, receive different settings in Genesis 12 and 20, are assigned to different authors. Job, the most imaginative and dramatic book in the canon, has nothing in it approaching the consistent clothing of certain situations in different national cultures which we find here. The books of Tobit and Judith, which are largely works of the imagination, and which reveal much power to charmingly tell a tale, afford in this respect no parallel. Indeed, it is doubtful if any such parallel can be found in pre-Christian Jewish literature, and so far as I have observed none appears in any of the parts of an apocalypse which were produced by a single author. The supposition that a Hebrew writer could throw himself into his art in such a manner as to consistently keep up all these parts is contrary to the simplicity of the old Hebrew nature. It should be noted too that the phenomena to which attention has been called in this article are not all of a nature to be produced by an artistic writer such as the objection to our theory

<sup>66</sup> De Wette-Schrader, *Einleitung*, 1869, p. 506.

supposes. The coupling of Hebrew culture with the impossible Median setting is not art in the sense in which the union of Babylonian culture with a Babylonian setting or the union of Persian culture with a Persian setting, might be art. The thing has not the natural fitness which artistic work would require. It is the palpable product of an intensely pious but badly informed person. It is contrary to the nature of Jewish writers, as we know them in the Old Testament and Apocrypha, to suppose that one author wrote these various classes of pamphlets, and the nature of the pamphlets themselves is such that they cannot be regarded as the work of a literary artist.

For the most part, then, these objections disappear when we remember the stock of ideas and common expressions which were the common property of the time. The general notion that a wise and saintly man named Daniel had lived in Mesopotamia during the exile and that lessons for the time could best be conveyed to men's minds if represented as his experiences or visions — not a violent supposition — is all that the conditions of our theory require.<sup>67</sup>

<sup>67</sup> The angel Gabriel whose name appears in 8<sup>16</sup> and 9<sup>21</sup> seems also to have been a part of the common stock of religious ideas, like Raphael in the book of Tobit.