

THE
PULPIT COMMENTARY,

EDITED BY THE
VERY REV. H. D. M. SPENCE, D.D.,
DEAN OF GLOUCESTER;

AND BY THE
REV. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A.

WITH
INTRODUCTIONS

BY THE
VERY REV. F. W. FARRAR, D.D., F.R.S., DEAN OF CANTERBURY.
RIGHT REV. H. COTTERILL, D.D., F.R.S.E.
VERY REV. PRINCIPAL J. TULLOCH, D.D.
REV. CANON G. RAWLINSON, M.A.
REV. A. PLUMMER, M.A., D.D.

NEW EDITION.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
LONDON AND NEW YORK
1907

PRINTED BY WILLIAM CLOWES AND SONS, LIMITED,
LONDON AND BECCLES.

(The rights of translation and of reproduction are reserved.)

THE
PULPIT COMMENTARY,

EDITED BY THE
VERY REV. H. D. M. SPENCE, D.D.,
DEAN OF GLOUCESTER;

AND BY THE
REV. JOSEPH S. EXELL, M.A.

DANIEL.

Exposition
BY REV. J. E. H. THOMSON, D.D.

Homiletics
BY REV. PROFESSOR W. F. ADENEY, M.A.

Homilies by Various Authors.
REV. H. T. ROBJOHN, M.A. REV. J. D. DAVIES, M.A.

NEW EDITION.

FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY
LONDON AND NEW YORK

1907

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

INTRODUCTION.

THE subject of Biblical Introduction is one that has become growingly important. It is the study of the human side of the document of Divine revelation. The Scripture has been divinely inspired, but human instruments have been employed to record the Divine message. The Holy Spirit has not used them as mechanical instruments; the human authors have not been mere automata; their whole personality was used for the Divine purpose. The work of the Divine Spirit in inspiration has been compared to that of a musician with an instrument. Yet the music drawn from an organ by an organist is conditioned by the material, the shape, and length of the various pipes he brings into play; the reeds, the keys, the trackers, have all their effect, and colour the music. Introduction is laying down the elements that go to this colouring of the message. The contents of the book under consideration is of necessity the first subject to be taken up. The historical background, actual or assumed, is next. Then its relation as a book to other books.

I. THE CHARACTER AND CONTENTS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

In perusing a book, the first thing we master is the matters treated, and the succession of topics brought under review. Although the reader apprehends in a general way the literary form the work he is studying assumes, whether it is prose or poetry, narrative or reasoning, and also recognizes the language or languages in which it is written—studying these matters, as distinct from simply apprehending what they are, comes after the general contents of the book have thus been grasped. Next there may be an investigation of the literary form of the book. Only after that has been studied does the mind direct itself to linguistic peculiarities.

1. *The contents of the Book of Daniel.* In the first verse we have Nebuchadnezzar, the young conqueror, receiving the submission of the city of Jerusalem and of its king Jehoiakim. Among the hostages of noble and royal blood which he takes to be sent to Babylon, there are a number of youths. From these he wishes to select certain to be educated so as to be fit attendants on his court. These are committed to the care of Ashpenaz, or, to give him the name he has in the Septuagint Version, Abiesdri. These youths are divided off into messes of four. In one of these there is a youth

DANIEL.

b

that draws the tender love of this chief of the eunuchs. It is the youth who gives his name to the book. Soon Ashpenaz has to observe this youth and his three companions for another reason. They have scruples, and will not eat of the meat from the king's table. He does not consent to the request of this youth, favourite though he is with him. He fears lest they appear inferior to their companions when they are brought before the king; so he will not grant their request, but shuts his eyes when the steward under him, after an experiment of ten days' duration, permits these youths to live on pulse. The result fully justifies the experiment. When they are presented before the king, they distance all competitors. Such is the prologue of the story of Daniel.

The rest of the book is divided into two nearly equal sections. First, incidents detached from each other, but arranged in a chronological succession: this ends with the sixth chapter. Next visions: this section, beginning with the seventh chapter, continues to the end of the book, and is also arranged chronologically.

The section of incidents. The first of these relates to Daniel's telling the king his dream and its interpretation, when all other members of the sacred college had failed to do so. It is not absolutely certain, by the language used, whether the king had forgotten the dream or simply was obstinately determined to put the claims of the Babylonian soothsayers to the test. It is not impossible that this was the occasion when the four friends were brought before the king, narrated already compendiously in the preceding chapter. The second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar—the date of this incident—coinciding, according to Babylonian reckoning, to some extent, with the third year after his accession, and therefore coinciding with the end of the third year of the training of those youths. The result of this manifestation of power by Daniel, and ascribed by him to the God whom he worships, is that Nebuchadnezzar ordains that the God of Daniel be henceforth reckoned among the great gods, especially on account of his wisdom as Revealer of secrets.

The next incident, that related in the third chapter, refers only to Daniel's three friends, not to Daniel himself. The three friends who had, at Daniel's request, been promoted to places of trust in the province of Babylon, refuse to bow down in worship to the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up. In consequence of this act of insubordination and constructive treason—for so it seems to the Babylonian monarch—they are cast into a furnace of fire. God, whom they serve, for whose honour they have braved the wrath of the king, sends his angel and delivers them from the fiery furnace, and that angel, to the amazement of the king, is seen walking in the furnace with the three Hebrews. The king affirms his former decree with greater emphasis in regard to the God of Israel. His claims to be regarded as one of the great gods—a god of gods—rest not only on his wisdom, but also on his power. As it is recognized that a God so great to deliver would be also great to destroy, to prevent his vengeance being poured forth on Babylon, the severest punishment is to be inflicted on any one who says anything derogatory of the God of the Hebrews.

While the former incident is dated by the Septuagint in the eighteenth year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar—the year, according to the reckoning of Babylon, when he took Jerusalem—the incident of the fourth chapter must be placed much later in his reign. The Septuagint dates this incident the same year. Ewald would place it ten years later; probably the real date is the thirty-eighth year. The king, great and prosperous, has another dream. According to the Septuagint, he at once summons Daniel, and tells him the vision he has seen. Seeing what is revealed by the vision, and having a love for the splendid tyrant, Daniel is overwhelmed with sorrow. At last, adjured by the king he foretells his madness. A year elapses, the vision is

fulfilled. For seven months he is a maniac, and one of his own household acts as king. The king at length is restored to his senses, and decrees yet further honours to the God of heaven, without, however, declaring that the gods of Babylon were no gods—that is to say, without at all becoming a monotheist.

The next incident occurs during the time that Belshazzar, the son of Nabunahid is fulfilling the duties of the throne, while his father is living in enforced retirement in Tema. The young viceroy makes a feast at the consecration of his palace—so the Septuagint informs us—to inspirit his lords—the *rabbuti*, with whom, the annals of Nabunahid inform us, he always was during the illness of his father. He orders the vessels of the temple of Jehovah to be brought forth, along with trophies from the temples of other gods. It was a proof of the superiority of the gods of Babylon over all other deities, that these trophies had been brought from the very temples of these gods. It was thus a challenge to Jehovah. Over against the golden candlestick from Jerusalem, which by the royal orders was on the table, appeared on the fresh plaster a fiery inscription. No one could read it, notwithstanding that the greatest rewards were offered. At last, on the advice of the queen-mother, Daniel, who had retired from the court, probably on the murder of Evil-Merodach, is brought and reads the message of doom. The young viceroy bates not a jot of his promise. Daniel is made third in the kingdom. The Massoretic text has, "That night was Belshazzar King of the Chaldeans slain"—a most improbable statement, and one that is not found in the Septuagint.

The next incident occurs after the fall of the Babylonian power. Gobryas (Darius) is the governor of Babylon under Cyrus. Daniel occupies a prominent place in the court of the new viceroy. Possibly induced by fear of the riots liable to ensue when so many shrines are dismantled in order to send the idols of the cities plundered by the Babylonian monarch back to their original seats, Darius issues a decree that all religious worship is to cease for a month, on pain of being thrown to the lions. Daniel disregards this sentence, and is accordingly thrown to the lions, despite the governor's efforts. Daniel is delivered from the lions by his God, in whom he trusted. Gobryas then issues a decree, reaffirming the decrees of Nebuchadnezzar, but not establishing the sole worship of Jehovah.

Such are the contents of the first section of the Book of Daniel. These incidents clearly exhibit the supremacy of the God of Israel over the gods of Babylon—a supremacy which the overthrow of the Jewish kingdom and the destruction of Jehovah's temple might have seemed to have rendered not even doubtful. The monarchs of Assyria and Babylon were highly religious in their way, and regarded themselves as the instruments of their own gods; all their victories were victories of the gods they worshipped, and manifestations of their power. Hence the special point of these works of wonder narrated in the Book of Daniel.

The second section consists of visions revealed to Daniel. These, like the incidents of the first section, are arranged chronologically. To a certain extent the contents of the vision of Nebuchadnezzar in the second chapter might be regarded as belonging to this section, and has to be considered along with it.

The first vision is dated as given in the first year of Belshazzar. Daniel in vision sees the four winds of heaven striving for the mastery on the surface of the great sea, the Mediterranean; and four beasts, great and mystical, arose out of the sea. The first was a winged lion, whose wings were plucked, and a man's heart was given him. The second was a huge bear, that gnawed three ribs in its teeth. The third, a leopard having four wings. The fourth was a beast great and terrible, that had no likeness among the beasts of the earth. It had great iron teeth, and brake in pieces and stamped the residue with its feet. It had ten horns at first, but an eleventh horn sprang up in

the midst of the ten, and dispossessed three of these. Then the Ancient of Days sat for judgment, and one like a son of man appeared, and a new Divine kingdom was established. Not only is the vision narrated, but the interpretation is given also.

The next vision is dated the third year of the reign of Belshazzar. Daniel is in fact or in vision in Susa, the capital of Cyrus, whose conquests were perhaps not yet causing anxiety in Babylon. He sees a ram having two horns, standing before the gate of the city, and pushing in all directions, and prevailing over all the beasts that were round about it. From the region of the sunset came against it a goat, having one noticeable horn. It seemed to skim along the ground rather than to tread upon it. Before the onslaught of the goat the ram is powerless. After a little, Daniel sees the single horn in the forehead of the he-goat broken, and in its place four horns spring up. From the side of one of these four horns sprouts out a little horn, which mounts up to the stars of heaven. This vision is interpreted of the fall of the empire of Persia before the Greek power which Cyrus may even then have been coming in contact with in his struggle with Crœsus.

In the ninth chapter Daniel has been fasting and praying, as the seventieth year since he was carried away a hostage had come, and yet Israel was not saved. In answer to his prayer, Gabriel comes to him, and reveals to him the future of his people. Jeremiah had spoken of seventy years, but he is shown that seventy weeks of years are determined upon his people. A history of mingled disaster and glory, sun and shadow, is shown, but clearly revealed is the anointed Prince who is yet to be cut off. Strangely, the end of this vision of comfort is desolation.

The last three chapters contain the account mainly of one vision; but it appears to us that it has so suffered, alike from excisions and from interpolations, that the real vision is hardly to be recognized. In the tenth chapter we are told of the coming of Gabriel again to Daniel, and the curtain is faintly lifted, that we may discern a conflict among the powers in heavenly places—the angels of the different nations. It is probable that the vision, in its original condition, had much more of this, but there has been interpolated by some later hand an account of the conflicts between Syria and Egypt. At the end of the eleventh chapter there is a passage which seems to be a version of the history of Antiochus, earlier and more succinct than that in the preceding verses. The last chapter concludes the vision, and, though not of the nature of an epilogue, yet forms a fitting close to the whole book. "Go thy way till the end: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days."

2. *The literary form of the Book of Daniel.* The Book of Daniel represented a new departure in the sacred literature of the Hebrews. It is the earliest example, and the only one in the Old Testament canon, of apocalypse. It had a long line of imitators in the inter-Biblical period, and the series was continued, and in a manner terminated, in the Christian Apocalypse of St. John.

It is closely related at once to history and to prophecy. Apocalypse may be regarded as in a sense the philosophy of history. Students of Plato know that when a philosophic thought was shaping itself in the brain of the great sage, the first form the thought assumed was a myth. Apocalypse is the philosophy of history in the mythic stage. The history it takes to do with is not that of one nation—although one nation, the people of God, is central—but that of the whole world. It is no limited *terminus ad quem* to which its purpose tends, but to the end of all things. And this is regarded as an orderly termination to a succession of events fixed beforehand. But while it is philosophy, it is philosophy in picture—in symbols of the imagination, not in propositions of the understanding. The symbols used show it is Eastern philosophy that is

so adumbrated—a philosophy which drew its symbols from the grotesque combinations, human and bestial, which so liberally adorned the walls of the Assyrian and Babylonian palaces.

Like prophecy, apocalypse had to do with the future. The notion at present predominant, that whatever the prophet did, he did not prophesy, is one that certainly was not held among the Jews, among whom prophecy was an actually present phenomenon. Thus in Deut. xviii. 22 it is made the evidence that “a prophet hath spoken presumptuously,” and not “the thing which the Lord hath spoken,” when “the thing follow not nor come to pass.” The Deuteronomist evidently believed that the principal function of the prophet was to foretell. Micaiah the son of Imlah applied the same test to the words of Zedekiah the son of Chenaanah (2 Kings xxii. 28). When Hananiah broke the yoke on Jeremiah's shoulders, and prophesied the overthrow of Babylon, the falsity of his prophecy was shown by its non-fulfilment; and Jeremiah appeals to that test, “The prophet that prophesieth of peace, when the word of that prophet shall come to pass, then shall the prophet be known that the Lord hath truly sent him.” Of course, modern critics think they know better, but as they have not had under their observation the phenomenon of prophecy, reticence would more become them. It is part of a tendency to get rid of the supernatural altogether. Some men, whose real soundness we should be the last to impugn, failing, as we think, to grasp its real import, have yielded to it, and we think are doing great damage. It is difficult to see how they can avoid accusing our Lord and his apostles of being impostors, since they ground the claims of Christ so largely on the evidence of prophecy. We do not mean that the supporters of these views intend to maintain any such position, but this is its logical content. Certainly there was a time when the prophet was supposed to have to do only with the future, when every moral exhortation, every denunciation of wrong, was supposed to have a Messianic reference. From this the present critical view may be regarded as to a certain extent the reaction. We must, however, beware lest the reaction be allowed to go too far.

Like prophecy, apocalypse, we have said, had to do with the future. Yet there were marked distinctions between prophecy and apocalypse. The attitudes of the prophet and the apocalypticist to the future were different. The prophet regarded the future, whether of weal or woe, as the consequence of the moral condition of the time when he spoke. Because men had worshipped idols and abandoned the service of Jehovah, because they had wronged and oppressed their poorer brethren, therefore were the judgments of the Lord ready to be poured out on the land. It was because they repented—if they did so—that these judgments were arrested, and blessing came from the presence of the Lord instead of curse. The apocalypticist regarded the future simply as future, as the result of the general purpose of God totally apart from the actions of men. Certainly there would be evil in the time to come, and evil would be punished; but the apocalypticist spoke no words of exhortation or warning. The eye of the apocalypticist is a colourless medium, in which that which was coming on the earth was seen with all clearness. The eye of the prophet was now dimmed with tears, and now glowing with the refracted colours of a bliss which he rejoiced in, even while he saw it only afar off.

Closely connected with this is the fact that the prophet's message was largely lyric, while that of the apocalypticist was delivered in prose. In the case alike of the prophet and apocalypticist, vision was the means used to convey to him the truth to be declared. The prophet, however, never describes the vision he sees in distinct words; he gives a lyric accompaniment to it, and from this the reader may gather what the prophet sees. On the other hand, the apocalypticist is unmoved by what he sees. Certain of the

prophets that were Daniel's contemporaries, as Ezekiel, are largely impregnated with the apocalyptic manner. Along with the description of what they saw, it is to be noted that apocalyptists made a much larger use of symbol than did the prophets. The symbols of the apocalyptist are largely logical symbols built up by fancy rather than by that poetic imagination which takes what nature gives, and fills it full with a Divine meaning. Prophecy was, as might naturally be expected from what we have just said, individual, personal; it is the people, not the abstract power, it regards. It is the monarch as an individual that is brought before us, not merely as the accidental representative of a certain phase of the Divine government by world-powers.

Akin with this is the enlarged and more defined angelology of the apocalyptists. The Eastern mind is not abstract, and the only way in which such an abstraction as a power, a state, an empire, can be grasped in its continuity, was, by seeing behind the state with its armies, as seen on earth, an angelic ruler. We in these later days have no difficulty in thinking of a nation as an abstraction, and speaking of the spirit of the nation; but we cannot realize the angel of a nation. It may be that the Oriental was wiser than we. Certainly the functions Scripture assigns to angels are much more numerous and important than those popular theology ascribes to them. The Book of Daniel thus is an apocalypse.

There was certainly a reason for this form of sacred literature making its appearance at the time of Daniel, and not earlier. So long as Judah was an independent country, its interests were limited to a great extent by the contiguous principalities that, small like itself, had but small effect on the great world. By the capture of Jerusalem by the Babylonian world-power, and the deportation of so large a portion of the inhabitants, Judah was brought within the sweep of the great tide of history. Their view of events was extended to a vast degree, both as to time and space. They were thus enabled to grasp the world and its history as a whole in a very different way from what they could do while their thoughts were bounded by the Euphrates and the Nile. Inspiration does not supersede the effects of circumstances and education, but, assuming them, uses the person as he has become in consequence of them. Hence the prophet of a nation small geographically, even though inspired by the Divine Spirit, would have a limited outlook, and his prophecies, though referring to a remote future, would have the terms of their statements conditioned by the education and circumstances of him to whom they had been revealed. It was different when the Jews were removed to Babylon. The Persian Gulf, into which the Euphrates and Tigris poured their waters, opened into the Indian Ocean. Not only was Egypt subject to Nebuchadnezzar, but he had in his army Greeks from beyond the great sea. To the Jewish captives in Babylon the world became vaster, and prophecy now had a broader outlook; it became by this less impassioned—it became apocalypse. The very strange composite figures which adorned the walls of the temples and palaces of Babylon would help the imagination of the seer to symbols sufficiently comprehensive to convey the message entrusted to him for his hearers.

After the Jews had been restored to their own land, they were less likely to have devised any mode of composition so new and strange as apocalypse. The nation became more provincial than ever. The Persian rule does not seem to have been conducive to literary effort. The Jews inhabited a province in a great empire, ruled over by an alien race, their interests narrowed down to their flocks and herds, their vineyards and oliveyards. The events of their history were not the crash of empires and the fall of monarchs, but the invasion of locusts, the devastation of tempests, the exactions of tyrannical governors, and the incursions of predatory Arabs. Once devised, they might continue to produce apocalypse, but they could not have invented in these

circumstances such a mode of composition. The character of apocalypse, as a mode of writing, suits the date assigned to it by tradition.

When the species of prophetic composition to which Daniel belongs is determined, the further question of its unity emerges. Are we to regard it as one book, composed as such by its author; or is it a number of separate parts united by an editor?

While the fact that it has formed from an early date one book, and from the fact that the same leading character appears in each successive part of it, the reader assumes at first, without doubt, that Daniel is one book. Yet the question may be put—Is its unity so beyond doubt? To any one who begins reading the Book of Daniel in the original, the fact is soon patent that the reader has to do with two languages. The fourth verse of the second chapter introduces the reader to Aramaic—a language that differs as much from Hebrew as Italian does from French. Further reading reveals the additional fact that the use of Aramaic ceases without warning at the end of the seventh chapter. When, into a book written mainly in one tongue, a large section in another tongue is intruded, the reason frequently is obvious; as in the case where in histories the original documents on which the narrative is founded are quoted; or semi-concealment may be intended, as in the case of the Latin section in Darwin's 'The Doctrine of Selection in Relation to Sex;' or the interlocutors introduced in a drama speak their own tongue, as in Shakespeare's 'Henry V.' For none of these reasons, nor for any reason obvious on the surface, are these two languages used here. The further consideration of the two languages in which Daniel is written we must reserve, but the fact that there are two distinct portions, marked off from each other by difference in language, renders unwise any dogmatic assertion that the unity is certain. But, further, there are other tokens of want of unity. As already observed, after the prologue, the Book of Daniel divides itself into two nearly equal portions, the first containing incidents, the second visions, each arranged in a chronological series. Did this division coincide with the linguistic division, a plea might be made for asserting that there were two distinct works, each, however, a whole in itself. But the fact that the divisions do not coincide disposes of this, even if the independence of the relation in which each part—incident or vision—stands to the rest, did not. The natural explanation of the above phenomena would seem to be that our Book of Daniel originally floated about in separate little tractates, some relating incidents, others visions; some in Aramaic, some in Hebrew; and that in a somewhat later age an editor collected them together and added a prologue. Confirmatory of this are the phenomena presented by the Septuagint translation. In some of the sections the Septuagint Version seems more concise than the Massoretic text, while in regard to other sections there have been interpolations, expansions, and paraphrase. Meinhold thinks that there are indications of difference in the Aramaic. It seems, then, exceedingly unwise to maintain the necessary unity of Daniel, and still more so to build any further argument on this. Again, there is the possibility of interpolation—a thing to which apocalyptic books were specially liable, and from which Daniel also suffered. What it certainly suffered in the days of the later Seleucids it may have suffered earlier. For ourselves we admit the strongest suspicion as to the genuineness of the eleventh chapter. This possibility is an additional reason for caution.

The unity of Daniel is argued from its alleged unity of purpose. It is not a disproof of a unity of purpose to show, as we have done, that it has been compiled from several distinct documents. An editor may collect several separate tracts all bearing on one subject and exhibiting it in different lights. Separate tractates would not, however, be the natural mode in which one would compose a work of imagination. We do not recall any case where two series of disconnected fragments were composed by a writer

of a work of imagination, mechanically stuck together without any link of connection, and whose issue as one book became a powerful literary factor in the development of a people. One would have difficulty in deciding which would be the more unlikely—the mode of composition or the result.

It has, however, been maintained, and is persistently maintained still, that the purpose of this book is to sustain the spirits of the Jews under the persecution they endured under Antiochus. That view, taken alone, may quite well be held by the most orthodox of traditionalists, but along with this it is maintained that it was written in the very storm and stress of this persecution, and hence was an historical novel. Almost necessarily connected with this is the assertion that Nebuchadnezzar stands for Antiochus. It is somewhat awkward that this assertion has to be supplemented by the further statement that Belshazzar and Darius also represent Antiochus. No reason has been assigned why the novelist, anxious that his readers should recognize the portrait, should make their task thus more difficult by perpetually changing the name of the puppet whose *raison d'être* was to be the portrait of Antiochus.

If, however, we do not press this, but look rather at Nebuchadnezzar as represented to us in the Book of Daniel, are the deeds and character ascribed to him like the deeds of which Epiphanes was guilty, or the character we know he possessed? We must answer this in the negative. We shall take the incidents *seriatim*, for it is in the series of incidents that this portraiture is alleged to be presented to us. Nebuchadnezzar takes hostages from Jerusalem along with part of the treasures of the temple. We learn nothing of Antiochus taking hostages to bring them up in his court. That fact is the central portion of Nebuchadnezzar's share in the incident recorded in the first chapter; the removal of the treasures from the temples of captured cities was as little peculiar to Nebuchadnezzar as to Antiochus. A point of contrast, indeed, may be noted. Antiochus did not leave any portion of the treasures behind him when he robbed temples, and Nebuchadnezzar, in the first instance in regard to Jerusalem, did. The dream of the second chapter has no parallel event in the history of Antiochus. Certainly Antiochus erected idols as Nebuchadnezzar is related in Dan. iii. to have done, but the peculiar heinousness of the action of Epiphanes was that he erected the statue in the courts of Jehovah's temple and over his altar. Nothing of the kind is ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar. The peculiarities again of the idol of Nebuchadnezzar—its height, its position, its gilding—the statue of Antiochus did not possess. There is nothing in the history of Antiochus like the fiery furnace; the only point of resemblance is that Antiochus and Nebuchadnezzar alike (as did all heathen monarchs) demanded all officials to worship their gods. Antiochus further wished to compel a nation to abandon its religion; Nebuchadnezzar never had any such mad project in his mind. If the incident in the third chapter of Daniel is intended to be a representation of the setting up of "the abomination which maketh desolate" in the temple, it can scarcely be called a successful effort. Neither the dreams of Dan. iv. nor the madness of Nebuchadnezzar are paralleled by anything which is recorded of Antiochus. We are told, indeed, that Antiochus was called Epimanes "the Mad," instead of Epiphanes "the Illustrious," and that the madness ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar referred to this. Had we any evidence that this title was given to Antiochus by the mob, say of Antioch, there might be a bare possibility that this nickname might have reached Palestine. But the only occasion on which it was given him was by Polybius the historian, and our evidence for this is a passage in Athenæus, bk. v., in which it is said, "Polybius, in the six and twentieth (book) of the histories, calls him (Antiochus) Epimanes, and not Epiphanes, on account of his deeds." This is a totally different matter from his subjects giving him the title. The

symptoms of the madness, such as it was, of Antiochus were totally different from those of that of Nebuchadnezzar. There is little resemblance between the mad pranks of a Marquis of Waterford and the antics of a lunatic that imagines himself a beast. Belshazzar's feast, we are told, was intended to be a picture of the orgies of Antiochus in the grove in Daphne. Opinions may differ as to the resemblance between the sign and the thing signified. Belshazzar invites a thousand of his lords into his palace. Antiochus entertained the whole populace in the grove at Daphne. Antiochus's festival lasted thirty days, that of Belshazzar only one night. The point of Belshazzar's feast that specially brought the wrath of God was that he used the sacred vessels for his banquet; there is no reference in history to any such action on the part of Antiochus. Excessive pomp, excessive debauchery, characterized the feast in Daphne, characteristics which are not represented as being markedly present in the feast of Belshazzar. If reference should be made to the fact that wives and concubines were present, and that be regarded as a sign of debauchery, it must be remembered that these words are omitted from the Septuagint Version. There is nothing in the history of Antiochus that at all corresponds to the story of Darius and his decree and the condemnation of Daniel to the den of lions.

Not only are the events of the history in Daniel utterly unlike the events of the history of Antiochus, but the characters assigned to Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius are utterly unlike what we know to have been the character of Antiochus. Nebuchadnezzar, as presented to us in the Book of Daniel, is a typical Eastern conqueror, vigorous, clear-sighted, but capricious, and subject to fits of ungovernable rage. At the same time, there is a deep religiousness of feeling, ready, when he is convinced that he has been wrong, to go to the utmost extreme of honour to the persons he has wronged. Take him all in all, he is a stately, awe-inspiring personage. The writer of the eleventh chapter declares Antiochus to be a vile person. Such a person as that could never have been declared to be, as Nebuchadnezzar, the head of gold. Even Belshazzar cannot deserve the title of a vile person; he has promised to highly honour the interpreter of the fiery inscription, and when the tenor of the inscription becomes far other than he would, he does not, as most despots would have done, vent his rage on the messenger of evil;¹ no, he does not bate one jot of the glory and dignity he had promised. Still less could Darius deserve the title of a vile person. He certainly is represented as easily persuaded; but his eagerness to save Daniel, and his sorrow when all his efforts proved unavailing, show his character to be very different from that of Antiochus.

We may, however, estimate the character of Nebuchadnezzar by the effects that character is represented as having on Daniel, and comparing that with the effect on the Jews of the character of Antiochus. It is obvious that Daniel had a high personal esteem for the splendid tyrant, destroyer though he had been of all the glories of Jerusalem. When Daniel is the messenger of evil tidings, when in the king's dream he sees his coming madness, "he was astonished one hour," and had to be reassured by the king before he could tell the dread interpretation. Then the words burst from him, "My lord, the dream be to them that hate thee, and the interpretation to thine enemies;" and is anxious that by repentance the king may attain a lengthening of his tranquillity. Can any one, reading the Books of the Maccabees, imagine a zealous Jew picturing his model saint maintaining an attitude like that toward Epiphanes? The very idea can only be due to a defective historic sense on the part of those who have devised this theory, and on the part of those who support it.

It is further said, in connection with this theory of the purpose of Daniel, that the

¹ Compare the action of Ahab in regard to Micaiah (1 Kings xxii. 27).

character of Daniel is modelled on that of Joseph. Certainly there are not a few points of resemblance between the two careers. If Joseph goes down to Egypt a slave, Daniel goes to Babylon a hostage. If Joseph becomes governor of the land by interpreting the dream of Pharaoh, Daniel is admitted into the counsel of the King of Babylon by not only interpreting a dream which he had, but by telling him also the dream itself. Joseph is made the second person of the kingdom, and Daniel the third. Notwithstanding all these resemblances, the points of difference are too important to allow us to assume that the latter history was imitated from the former. One characteristic of all cases of such imitation is that in every point where a direct comparison is of necessity instituted between the original hero and the hero modelled upon him, the imitator endeavours to make his hero nobler than the original. If we apply this canon, the story of Joseph ought to have been written last. Joseph dropped down to a lower degradation than did Daniel, and from a higher elevation. Further, Daniel did not rise to such an elevation as Joseph; he is only third person in the kingdom, or perhaps one of a board of three, whereas Joseph becomes the second person in the kingdom. The events in Joseph's history which make most impression on the imagination of the reader have no place in the history of Daniel. Joseph's relation to his brethren and to Potiphar's wife are not paralleled in the history of Daniel. But more, some, at any rate, of the points of resemblance between the histories have not been pressed as they certainly would have been had "Daniel" been a work of fiction "written up" to Joseph. Like Joseph, Daniel precedes the mass of his countrymen in removal to a foreign land; like Joseph, Daniel has become prominent years before the coming of his kindred; but Daniel is not represented as doing anything to make the coming of his people to Babylon easier, or their residence there more pleasant. It cannot be answered that the *facts* of the Babylonian captivity hindered any such invention; for any one reading the Talmud or the Jewish commentaries would see that notorious facts are no barrier to Jewish imagination. Joseph kept alive in his brethren the hope of deliverance from Egypt, and "gave commandment concerning his bones." In the return of the children of Judah to Jerusalem, Daniel is not represented as taking any part.¹ If the Book of Daniel had been a novel modelled on the history of Joseph, the resemblance would have been closer in these critical points. We might go further. If a novel at all, and Daniel an ideal character, then certainly he would have been represented, if not as actually going to Jerusalem, helping his fellow-countrymen in their return, and aiding them in Babylon with money and influence. Explanations would, at least, have been offered to remove the seeming failure from the Jewish ideal. If, again, the Book of Daniel is an approximately contemporary record, the causes which prevented Daniel from accompanying his brethren might—probably would—be so obvious that it would be superfluous to narrate them.

Another explanation of the origin of the Book of Daniel is that it was written up to the name—either to the name as significant or as designating a person elsewhere referred to in Scripture. The name may mean either "God is my Judge," or "the judge of God." The only incident in the book that might seem to flow from the first meaning is that of the lions' den. Even this incident rather reveals God as the Help and Deliverer of his saints than as their avenging Judge. Had the name of the prophet been Azriel (Jer. xxxvi. 26), there might have been more plausibility in the assertion that the book was written to the name. Hitzig's contention is that the name

¹ It is an example of the strange confusion of intellect under which Dean Farrar labours that ('Daniel,' p. 11) he actually brings forward this as an argument *against* the authenticity of Daniel.

means "the Divine Judge," and such names as Gabriel support this view. On this supposition the book is still less like one written up to the name. In the story of Susanna and the elders we see what the imagination of the Jew produced when writing up to that idea; indeed, so well does the story suit the name, that M. Renan is sure that this represents the original form of the Daniel legend—an opinion that is a *reductio ad absurdum* of this view. The canonical Book of Daniel cannot be written up to the name.

Has the book been written up to the references to Daniel in Ezek. xiv. 14—20 and xxviii. 3? In the first of these references Daniel is put on a par in righteousness with Noah and Job. The ideas of righteousness prevalent at the time when, according to the critical school, Daniel was written can be learned from Ecclesiasticus, e.g. xvii. 22, "The alms of a man is as a signet with him, and he will keep the good deeds of man as the apple of the eye, and give repentance to his sons and daughters." That Daniel gave alms is probable, but not a word is said of this in the Book of Daniel. Zeal for the cause of Jehovah is, somewhat later than the days of the Maccabees, a token of righteousness, as we may see in 2 Macc. vi., vii. Daniel's three friends manifest that zeal much more than he; when they are threatened with the fiery furnace he is elsewhere, and no explanation of his absence is given. If he were the ideal righteous man, his absence would be explained. If we turn to the Book of Tobit, we see the Jewish ideal of a date, as it seems to us, somewhat earlier than that of the Maccabees. Tobit gives alms, buries the dead of his people, and what he does himself he urges on his son. Before he became a captive, he proclaims, as a special evidence of his righteousness, the fact that he went from Naphtali to Jerusalem to offer at the altar in Jerusalem. Daniel, on the other hand, makes no effort to go to Jerusalem, even when the people are permitted by the decree of Cyrus to return. So far, then, as righteousness is concerned, Daniel has not the obtrusive righteousness we should expect in a character written especially to illustrate this.

The other characteristic ascribed to Daniel in Ezekiel is wisdom. The wisdom of the period of the Maccabees, if we may judge by Ecclesiasticus, was largely gnomic and proverbial. There is no trace of that in Daniel. Another characteristic of the Jewish wise man was the solution of hard questions or riddles. This was one of the special proofs of Solomon's wisdom, that all the riddles of the Queen of Sheba he could solve. This is a character given to Daniel in the Massoretic text of ch. v. 12—a verse that is quite omitted from the Septuagint. In Job it is the solution of the moral problems of the universe. The only characteristic of Jewish wisdom that Daniel possesses is the interpretation of dreams, and in regard to this he expressly disclaims the credit of this power, attributing it to God. His apocalyptic visions, which occupy so large a space in the book, are in no sense connected with Hebrew wisdom. It seems impossible to imagine the Book of Daniel to be written up to the character of a wise man from whom no secret is hid, and yet only one of the special characteristics of the Hebrew wise man being attributed to its hero.

If we look at the purpose alleged a little more carefully, we think it will be seen that the Book of Daniel could not have been written merely to encourage the Jews in their struggle against Epiphanes. The incidents narrated are not such as would be naturally fitted to fire people to resist the behests of a tyrant with force of arms. For that purpose the stories of the Book of Judges were far better fitted. If anything may be supposed to be inculcated by the incidents in the Book of Daniel, it is passive resistance. We learn from 1 Macc. ii. 29—36 how certain Jews followed the lines of passive resistance, and were all destroyed. The course followed by Mattathias and his sons was in direct contrast with this, and they deprecated any such suicidal policy.

This event happened in the year B.C. 168, the date when, according to critics, Daniel was written. If it be granted that the same mistaken idea, as led to the disaster to which we have just referred, might be supposed to be dominant in the mind of the writer of Daniel, it is, on that supposition, impossible to explain the almost immediate popularity of the book. It inculcates passive resistance; and passive resistance, while the only mode of resistance open to those in the court of Nebuchadnezzar, was not the method fitted to be successful in regard to Antiochus Epiphanes. This alleged purpose must, we think, be abandoned.

As, however, no composition or compilation ever is made without some purpose, what is the probable purpose for which "Daniel" was compiled? The canon of the Old Testament is mainly the history of Divine dealings with a particular race, in order to fit them for the office assigned—that of being the race of which Christ was to come. Every crisis in their history is narrated to us under prophetic sanction. No greater crisis in the history of the Jewish people had occurred than that of the Babylonian captivity. The capture of Jerusalem, the desolation of the temple which God had promised to make his dwelling-place for ever, the overthrow of the Davidic monarchy which, like the temple, had been promised an unending duration,—all were fitted to sap their faith in God. Moreover, they had been led captive by one who ascribed all his victories to the favour of his own gods. To Nebuchadnezzar his conquest of Jerusalem and plunder of its temple was a demonstration that the God of the Jews was very inferior to Merodach (Marduk). Certainly the prophets of Jehovah had threatened the king and the people with vengeance, because they had forsaken the worship of Jehovah. In the reign of Manasseh the Jews had worshipped Baal and all the host of heaven; that worship had been abandoned for that of Jehovah under Josiah. The prophets of Baal would denounce the judgments of Baal on the people for abandoning that worship. Which set of prophets were right? Disaster had been foretold by both sets of prophets. Was the disaster due to the abrogation of the worship of Jehovah by Manasseh, or to the abrogation of that of Baal by Josiah? The miracles related in Daniel amply decided that question, and they alone must have settled it. The nation that went to Babylon were prone to idolatry, prone to abandon their national God Jehovah; they came back fanatical monotheists and fanatical worshippers of Jehovah. It could only be some special demonstrations of the supreme Godhead of Jehovah that could do this—deeds of wonder like those narrated in the first chapters of the Book of Daniel.

It would, however, have value for this end only if it were a record of facts, *not* a moral romance. Its popularity is explicable only on the ground that it was regarded as history. No such book as Daniel ever was popular unless on the idea that it was a series of accounts of real events. It is a series of disconnected accounts of events and visions written, some in one language, some in another. It has few graces of composition; the rhetorical passages we find in some parts being in so many cases suspicious, since they are not in all the versions, that the remaining instances are suspicious also. If it is a record of facts, and regarded to be such, this popularity is thoroughly intelligible. No novel of Covenanting times in Scotland ever had the popularity among the Scottish people that Howie's 'Scots Worthies' had, and that was because, simple and rough in its style as it is, it was looked upon as a statement of facts.

3. *The linguistic peculiarities of the Book of Daniel.* We have referred to the fact that there are in Daniel two languages used. There have been several different explanations of the two languages.

(1) Some of these explanations are logical, as that of Keil, which declares that the first, the Aramaic part, gives us the development of the world-power in relation to the

kingdom of God; and that the second, the Hebrew portion, represents the development of the kingdom of God in relation to the world-power. Against this view it may be effectively urged that the eighth chapter gives the development of the world-power of Macedonia over against the kingdom of God, as much as do the second and seventh, and as little gives the development of the kingdom of God. Indeed, the Messianic kingdom is more prominent in the two earlier visions.

(2) Another explanation is difference of audience contemplated. This is the theory of Merx. Where the contents were relatively simple and suited for ordinary Jewish society, the language used was Aramaic, the common language of business and social intercourse. Where the contents of the prophecy were more recondite, the sacred language, Hebrew, was used, which was known to few beyond the learned Jews. To this the answer of Lenormant is sufficient. The first chapter is simple narrative, yet it is in Hebrew. On the other hand, the seventh chapter, with its account of the four beasts, is as recondite as the account of the combat of the ram and the he-goat in the following chapter, yet the former is in Aramaic, and the latter in Hebrew.

(3) Another theory, that of Eichhorn, explains the two languages by difference of authorship. Meinhold has a view somewhat akin to this, only he makes the division between the authors at the end of the sixth chapter, because he thinks the seventh chapter indicates Aramaic of a different age. The connective on which he lays stress may be explained in a different way. Neither hypothesis explains why the writer of the first chapter, having written that whole chapter in Hebrew, and a few verses in the second, should suddenly break off into Aramaic. Meinhold's theory adds the difficulty—why the writer of the latter portion, having begun in Aramaic, should suddenly turn off into Hebrew. The problem is still there, only it now applies to two authors instead of one.¹

(4) Lenormant's theory is that the Aramaic portion is really a Targum or interpretation, and that during the Antiochean persecution the Hebrew of this portion was lost. This theory is, to some extent, adopted by Mr. Bevan. Certainly it is in favour of this view, that the Hebrew ceases in the middle of the fourth verse of the second chapter, in quite an accidental way, at a point that marks no change in the subject of the narrative. Against it is the fact that the Aramaic section concludes with the end of a chapter. Had any such disaster befallen any of the sacred books, some trace of the event would certainly have been found in the Talmud, terribly distorted, no doubt, but none the less recognizable. The Talmudists do not discuss the question at all; they certainly call the Aramaic portion of Daniel "Targum" in reference to the language, but assert it "to defile the hands." The task of the defenders of Daniel would, in some respects, be made easier if this theory could be maintained.

(5) Another theory is that the difference of language represents a difference in date in the delivery of the prophecies or narrative, those written under the Babylonian supremacy being in Aramaic, but those under the Persian rule in Hebrew. This, were it accurate, would be merely a statement of fact, not an assignment of a reason for that fact. The original framers of this view have failed to note that the eighth chapter is dated under Belshazzar, while the sixth is under Darius.

(6) Dr. Wright, the author of the *Donnellan Lectures on Ecclesiastes*, and of the *Bampton Lecture on Zechariah*, has a theory which he indicates in his 'Introduction to the Old Testament' (p. 193). His theory is that the Book of Daniel is compiled of

¹ This theory, held mainly by opponents of the authenticity of Daniel, is used by Dean Farrar to introduce a quotation from Professor Bevan, that "the defenders of Daniel" were employed in hacking Daniel to pieces. The confusion of thought is characteristic and obvious.

"excerpts from a larger work (partly preserved in the original language, and partly translated)."¹ While there is, in favour of this view, the fact that the canonical books of Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles seem to have resulted from a process analogous to this, against it is the fact that there are no links of connection in Daniel, as there are in the books in question. It also assigns no reason for the translator selecting certain portions of the book to be turned into Hebrew, and omitting others. There must have been at least two books from the twofold chronological arrangement. Further, it does not explain the peculiar phenomena presented to us by the Septuagint Version preserved to us in the Codex Chisianus.

(7) If we may venture to suggest another theory, it would be that, as Daniel was originally compiled from fly-leaves, some of these tracts were composed in Aramaic, others in Hebrew, and that the whole was edited by some one who wrote the prologue. It would be impossible to assign the reason why a writer, to whom two languages were equally familiar, should write one leaflet in one language, and another in another. After they had been so written, it would be natural that each tract, even though it may have been epitomized, should be kept in the canonical book in the language in which it was originally written. There may have been some reason of policy why certain prophecies that seemed to relate the overthrow of the Persian empire should be shrouded in Hebrew rather than published in Aramaic. The Persian police, who would certainly be able to read Aramaic, were probably ignorant of Hebrew.

Since we have now discussed the question of the two languages, we must next take them up successively.

(1) As it is the first language which the reader encounters in his study of the Book of Daniel, we must look at the *Hebrew*. When one investigates the age of a work, the circumstances of the book must be kept carefully before him. If the book is one that has been frequently transcribed, if there is not any check on the changes introduced that exist in the case of a book that is regularly read, then we may expect to find alterations in the direction of modernization. Thus in Urry's edition of Chaucer, published before the recent effort was made after extreme accuracy, many changes are introduced, all in the way of modernization. In such an edition, the occurrence of a recent word had little worth in settling the date of the book; on the other hand, every ancient word had full chronological value.² So it is with Daniel. The presence of relatively recent words means much less than many critics make out, while the presence of ancient words has all its probative force intact.

It has been said by Canon Driver that "the great turning-point in Hebrew style" between old and middle Hebrew "falls in the age of Nehemiah." The Jews, returning from Babylon to Palestine, found their own land filled with foreign settlers of different nationalities, to whom Aramaic was the only common tongue. The Jews were necessitated to carry on commerce with these intruders, and therefore obliged to use Aramaic. But more in Babylon and the cities of the Medes, in which they had dwelt as captives, they would be obliged to use Aramaic constantly; consequently, they soon ceased to speak Hebrew at all, and even when they wrote it, Aramaic words and idioms were prone to intrude. Even before the days of the Captivity, Aramaic had begun to infect Hebrew—not unnaturally, as Aramaic was the language of commerce

¹ From a private communication from him, we learn that he leans to the idea that the original language in question was Aramaic.

² Southey, in his preface to his 'Chronicle of the Cid,' says, "The Spanish Chronicles were all villainously printed, because the printers made use of the first manuscript they could find, and the correctors did their best to bring the language to that of their own times after the newest and most approved fashion."

and diplomacy. The change that had become marked in the days of Nehemiah may well have been exemplified in men like Daniel, though living in an earlier generation. Any one who, unaware of the history of the poets, passed from the study of the *Canterbury Tales* to peruse *'Piers the Ploughman,'* would be ready to assert the latter-named poem to be one of a very much earlier date than the other; yet we know they were contemporary poems. The reason was that Chaucer, living in the court, accustomed to foreign ways, wrote in the style that was on the way to become prevalent, whereas Langland (or Langley) had a homely muse, and retained the older forms of phrase and modes of versification that were fast disappearing. So too Spenser and Shakespeare present the same contrast—the old and disappearing as over against the new and rising characteristics of the language. Thus it is not a proof that Daniel is later than Haggai and Malachi that in some respects his language seems more akin to the later Hebrew than theirs. He is like Geoffrey Chaucer in the court, and engaged in diplomacies with foreign courts; they are more like Langland, with homelier wits and surroundings.

Although we thus can fix the date when old Hebrew passed into middle Hebrew, it is not so easy to fix when it passed from middle Hebrew to new Hebrew. There are no complete books in Hebrew extant, universally acknowledged to belong to the period of the Greek domination. Of course, from *a priori* grounds and internal evidence, several of the psalms are called Maccabean. To us the evidence seems utterly insufficient. But even if the critical decision were granted in regard to the Psalms, verse retains archaic forms that have been long disused by prose. The next mass of Hebrew is not reached till we come as far down as the age of the Mishna, that is to say, A.D. 200.

Although we have, as we have said, no complete Hebrew works from the period of Greek supremacy, we have, fortunately, considerable fragments of a very famous work written in Hebrew in the period in question. The Book of Ecclesiasticus was translated into Greek by the grandson of the author. There is certainly a doubt as to the date at which this translation was made, whether B.C. 130 or B.C. 230; although we think the balance of evidence is in favour rather of the earlier than of the later date, we will not contest the matter. The Hebrew from which it was translated was thus probably written B.C. 180, if not B.C. 280. This is a work which has disappeared as a whole, but there remains, as we have said, considerable quotations from it in various tracts of the Talmud, and in other Rabbinic writings. The fact that even when the treatises in question are in Aramaic, the quotations from Ecclesiasticus—or to give the book its Rabbinic name, Ben Sira—are in Hebrew, shows that Hebrew was the language in which the book was written. These quotations have been collected by various hands. We shall make use of two—that in Dukes' *'Blumenlese,'* and that in an article by Dr. Schechter, in the *Jewish Quarterly* (June, 1891). The number of these quotations is not very large, amounting in all to what would be equal to a somewhat long chapter. But for purposes of comparison we would lessen the number still further. We would take only those quotations which are not only attributed to Ben Sira, but which we are able to identify in one or other of the three versions, and those which, when quoted, are introduced by the formula, "It is written in the Book of Ben Sira," or some such phrase. When there is a variation in the quotation, we would prefer the more archaic forms, as any change towards modernization might be the result of a copyist's blunder. Even of those that remain we shall restrict ourselves to a few specimens.

The first of those we select is the fourth of the quotations brought together by Dr. Schechter, and the eighth in the collection of Dukes. It occurs in *'Hagigah,'* 13 (a).

This is the twelfth tractate of *Seder Moed*, the second division of the Talmud. It is also quoted in the Rabbinic treatise on Genesis, *Beresith Rabba*, and by Yalkut on Job. These vary from the Talmudic form of the quotation, but only to a very slight degree—

“במופלא ממך אל חרדו ובמכסה ממך אל תחקד כמה שהרשיה החבון אין לך עסק בנחמיו” “Into that which is too wonderful for thee, do not search; into that which is veiled from thee, do not inquire; upon that which is permitted, reflect: thou hast no business with secret things” (Ecclus. iii. 21, 22). The versions agree fairly well with this, and it is quoted as from “the Book of Ben Sira.”

When we compare this sentence with Biblical Hebrew, we at once feel how far we are removed from the Hebrew of the age of Nehemiah and Esther, not to say that of Daniel. There is a resemblance to the language of Ecclesiastes, which, with the similarity of subject, suggests that Ecclesiasticus is an imitation of Ecclesiastes—an idea that is confirmed by the name of the Greek translation. If we look at the Hebrew word by word, we find that in these two verses there are three words that are not in use in Biblical Hebrew. In the first verse we find מופלא, “a wonder.” The root פלא occurs frequently in Scripture, but the noun above never occurs at all. The cognate form, מופלא, occurs in Job; the common word is פלאה, “to permit;” in Ezra iii. 7 there is a derivation from it, רשיו, “permission.” In Biblical Hebrew מן would have been used. It is frequent in Rabbinic, and in the Aramaic form occurs in the Targum. עסק, “business,” is another word unknown to Biblical Hebrew, but frequent in Rabbinic. Buxtorf says the Biblical equivalent of this is רבר. Further, there is one construction used which only occurs in Ecclesiastes, קה ש. In Daniel there is no instance of the short relative; it is always the long, אשר, that is used. Here then, in the short space of two verses, we have three words not used in Biblical Hebrew, and one construction that is found only in Ecclesiastes. These words do not represent any rare thought or thing, but have common equivalents in the Bible, and so too with the construction.

To show that our conclusion is not based on merely one instance, we shall consider the seventh in Dr. Schechter's list, which is the next that suits our requirements. It is a quotation of Ecclus. xlii. 9, 10, and is found in *Sanhedrin* 100 (b), the fourth tractate in *Seder Nezeqeen*, the fourth division of the Talmud. This passage is all the more interesting because it is assigned as a reason why the Book of Ben Sira was not allowed to be read. It is (14) in Dukes. The passage is—

בן לאביה מסמנת שוא מפרדה לא יסן בלילה בקפנותה שמה תרפתה בעקרתה שמה חנה בורה שמה
בן לאביה מסמנת שוא מפרדה לא יסן בלילה בקפנותה שמה תרפתה בעקרתה שמה חנה בורה שמה
“A daughter is for her father a watchful care, and anxiety for her taketh away sleep—in her youth, lest she pass the flower of her age; and having been married, lest she be hated; in her virginity, lest she be shameless and become with child in her father's house; and having a husband, lest she transgress; and being married, lest she should be barren.” Both the Latin and the Syriac have been largely modified by the Greek, though several of the renderings seem to indicate that they had before them a text like the Hebrew above given. The Greek shows traces of confusion and repetition, which are wanting in the Talmudic quotation.

When we take this passage clause by clause, we find again how far removed we are

from the Hebrew of Daniel. The third word, *סִפְּתָא*, is not used in the Bible; the corresponding masculine noun does occur, but the feminine never, not even when it is in apposition to a noun feminine. The Latin Version, by using *abscondita*, shows that the translator must have had this word before him as in Biblical Hebrew, *סָתַן* means "to hide." The second clause presents nothing to be adverted on, but the third is full of late peculiarities. The first word, *סִפְּתָא*, is unknown in the Bible, though not infrequent in later Hebrew. The verb and adjective are common in Biblical Hebrew, but the abstract noun never occurs. Next we have *סִפְּתָא*, a connective meaning "lest," and thus equivalent to *כִּי* in Biblical Hebrew. It is a compound of *סִי*, the short relative, and *פְּתָא*, "what," in Aramaic and Rabbinic. Canon Driver translates *סִפְּתָא* (Dan. i. 10), "lest," as Theodotion. If this rendering be accepted, we have certainly a preparative for the Rabbinic connective. Yet the form in Daniel is obviously very much the earlier. Connectives are marks of the age of a book, that do not as a rule mislead, and this connective occurs five times in the space of these two verses. The last word, *סִפְּתָא*, certainly is part of a well-known verb, but it does not occur in Biblical Hebrew in this conjugation. In the next clause, besides the connective *שֵׁמֶעַ*, we have *נַעֲרָא*, "youth," a word unknown in Biblical Hebrew. The first word of the next clause, *בְּנִיָּהּ*, is the third feminine singular preterite of the verb *בָּנָה*, "to have reached a marriageable age"—a verb unknown in Biblical Hebrew, but not uncommon in Rabbinic writings; it is used in the Aramaic parts of the Talmud and in the Targums. In the same clause we find the word *נָשָׂא* in the niphāl, "to be married" (*nubere*)—a usage unknown in Biblical Hebrew, where we have *קָלַל* used in kal for the man, and niphāl of the woman. The nearest approach to this usage is 2 Chron. xxiv. 3 and Neh. xiii. 25, where a father takes a wife for his son, and 2 Chron. xiii. 21, where a man takes a wife to himself; but in no case is the passive found in this meaning. In the last clause the phrase, *מִן־הַמִּכְשָׁפִים*, "to practise witchcraft," is not Biblical; the Bible writers employ *מִן־הַכִּשְׁפִּים* in the piel. Here, in the space of two verses, rather long verses certainly, are four words that do not occur in Biblical Hebrew, and one of these is a connective repeated five times. One of the other verbs is not used in the Bible in the conjugation, and another neither in the sense nor conjugation. Further, there is a phrase not Biblical.

We might easily go on, and would only make our case stronger. It is certainly clear to every unbiassed mind that the Hebrew of Ben Sira is very much more recent than that of Daniel. As we have said, the Hebrew of Ben Sira is more akin to that of Ecclesiastes, of which work it seems an imitation. If Ben Sira was written even so late as B.C. 180, Ecclesiastes must have been considerably earlier, and Daniel must have been much earlier still.

It is clear that the line which divides new from middle Hebrew must pass between Daniel and Ecclesiasticus. As surely as the latter is on one side of the line, so surely is the former on the other. Canon Driver and Professor Bevan have amply proved the resemblance there is between the language of Chronicles, Nehemiah, Ezra, and Esther, and that of Daniel, a resemblance that is only what might readily be expected. It is the Hebrew natural to one who had become accustomed to Aramaic as the language of everyday life. The resemblances to Ezekiel have been pointed out by Delitzsch and Keil. It must further be borne in mind that the first chapter is probably from the pen of an editor, and is a condensation of an Aramaic original. That the language of Daniel should resemble that of a number of works, all of which claim to have been written in the Persian period, does not prove, as some critics think it does, that Daniel was written in the Greek period.

But it is urged that there are late words in Daniel. Professor Bevan has made out a list of *eight* words. We think any one will recognize the relatively small number of these words. In four verses from Ben Sira we found *seven*, and could easily have increased the number. Surely eight in six chapters, containing a hundred and fifty-seven verses, is no very extraordinary number. But when we examine these alleged "late" words, we are compelled to lessen their number as evidence of the late date of Daniel. Three of these, גַּל, "age," חַיִּיב, "guilty," and עֵשֶׂב, "herbs," occur in the first chapter, and therefore, though they might afford an evidence of the age of the editor, afford no evidence of the age of the original book. Further, the first two of these occur in the speech of Ashpenaz (Abiesdri), and are therefore really instances in which the Aramaic of the document, from which the prologus was condensed, shines through. The third case is probably a scribal blunder. Although עֵשֶׂב occurs in ch. i. 16, in ch. i. 12 we have עֵשֶׂב, which consonantly is a common word. Originally, both words would be the same, and it was more likely that a scribe would by a blunder write the more recent form to which he was accustomed, than the more ancient with which he had little acquaintance. Two others, מְקַנְנִים and אֶרֶץ, occur in the eleventh chapter, the authenticity of which we deny. Even if we take them as they stand, with regard to the first of these the reading seems to be corrupt. כֶּן in Aramaic, both Eastern and Western, means not "to lay up" as treasure, but "to lie in wait" (e.g. Exod. xxi. 13)—a meaning unsuitable here. The LXX. render *τόπος*. The latter is a technical word, and therefore might well be introduced in regard to the thing. It is Semitic, according to Fürst; it is certainly not Greek, although it is precisely a case where a Greek technical word would have been expected. There are still three words which remain, מְהִיטִים, "to be moved with anger" (ch. viii. 7), מְדַבֵּר, "to be decreed" (ch. ix. 24); וָשֵׁם, "to write" (ch. x. 21). In regard to the first of these the case is not a strong one; the verb מָדַד, "to be grieved," is not a very rare verb: it is used in kal, niph'al, piel, and hiph'il elsewhere, if not in hithpa'el. The second case is suspicious, for the LXX. seem to have had another reading. But even if we admit this and מְדַבֵּר, there is not much on which to build a theory. Two words in four chapters—for necessarily the first and eleventh chapters fall to be excluded—are much less than seven words in four verses. Professor Bevan adds מְלָכִים (ch. viii. 22), "kingdoms," but the LXX. read מְלָכִים, as they render *βασιλείς*. Theodotion had the same reading, as he has the same rendering. The Peshitta has מְלָכִים, showing that it too read מְלָכִים, not מְלָכִים.

But Professor Bevan has another list of eight words, which he says are used in Daniel in other than their classical Hebrew meaning. The first of these is מְדַבֵּר. The references he gives are chs. i. 4 and ii. 2. He says that while in all other parts of Scripture מְדַבֵּר is the name of a nation, in Daniel only it is the name of a caste. In the first of the references, "the tongue of the Chaldees," it is not necessarily any other than a national name; and, if we accept the reading of the Septuagint in the second case, it is so also. The next instance he brings is מְשֻׁמֵּן, which is "sad" in Gen. xi. 6, and "badly nourished" in Dan. i. 10, but the meaning in Daniel is more primitive. It is said that מְשֻׁמֵּן is believed to be of Egyptian origin, and in the Pentateuch is used only of the magicians of Egypt. In Daniel it means "magicians in general." Fürst declares the Egyptian derivation to be without foundation. Even if we granted the Egyptian origin of the word, the great intercourse between Egypt and Assyria, proved by the Tel-el-Amarna tablets being in Assyrian, would make it no impossible thing that the word might be transferred to Assyria. The fourth case, מְשֻׁלָּם, "in security" (ch. viii. 25), occurs in a notoriously corrupt passage, which it is impossible to interpret

satisfactorily. The next two cases occur only in ch. xi. There remain only two cases, קָדָר, "continual," for the daily sacrifice, and נָהָר, used for the Nile in most cases in the rest of Scripture, but for "a river" in general in ch. xii. 5, 6, 7. As to the first of these, it occurs in ch. viii. 11 and 13, and the versions indicate a great confusion in the text at these points. As for the last instance, the passage Professor Bevan quotes from Isaiah (xxxiii. 21) disproves his contention. "The glorious Lord will be to us a place of broad rivers and streams" can have no reference to the Nile or Egypt. As little can his reference to Job (xxviii. 10) apply to the Nile (Revised Version), "He cutteth out channels among the rocks." It would be somewhat violent to describe the small channels cut by the miner as "Niles."

The whole elaborate list of proofs of the relatively recent date of the Hebrew or Daniel has failed when carefully looked at, and the cases in point are reduced to two.

The argument from the unlikeness of the language of Daniel to that of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, even though that unlikeness were greater than it is, would be unsafe. The language of Spenser's 'Faëry Queene' is greatly more archaic than that of Shakespeare's 'Midsummer Night's Dream,' yet these two works were published nearly contemporaneously.¹ Along with a number of absurdly incorrect and rash statements, Dean Farrar is safe in saying, "Nothing certain can be inferred from the philological examination of the Hebrew" of Daniel. He is also safe in saying, "On this part of the subject there has been a great deal of rash, incompetent assertion." This is an admission that the case has broken down.

(2) *Aramaic.* The Aramaic portion of Daniel begins with the fourth verse of the second chapter, and continues to the end of the seventh. The dialect of Aramaic, in which this portion has come down to us, is what used to be called Chaldee. It is closely akin to the dialect in which the Targums were written, and is also very like that in which the paraphrase of the Samaritan Pentateuch has been preserved. Although no books have been preserved to us from any date approximately as old as the date ascribed to Daniel by tradition, or even as old as the late date ascribed to the book by critics, we still have a very considerable mass of inscriptions, which enable us in some way to estimate the character and history of the language. These inscriptions are spread over a very wide area—the banks of the Tigris on the east, the slopes of the Taurus Mountains on the north, and Egypt on the south. The stretch of time represented is also very great. The earliest inscriptions of any length we have date back to the reign of Tiglath-pileser, about B.C. 750, and in its Eastern form it is still a living tongue among the Nestorians.

The question as to the Aramaic of Daniel is complicated by the action of copyists in changing, by insensible degrees, the language of a document. Any one copyist might make but little alteration, but generations of them would necessarily make much change. And as the tendency was always to make alterations in one direction, in course of time the difference between the original text and that of some centuries later would of necessity be very considerable.

We must glance at the history of the Aramaic tongue among the Jews. The medium of ordinary business alike in Nineveh and Babylon was Aramaic, and this is proved by the fact that on the back of clay tablets which contain deeds of sale, the docquet—which gives a summary of the contents—is in Aramaic. The Jews were resident there for approximately fifty years, among a people who spoke a language differing but slightly from their own. They could learn Aramaic with as great ease and rapidity as Italians pick up French. At the same time, in the bosom of their families, the

¹ The fourth, fifth, and sixth books of the 'Faëry Queene' were published probably a year or so before the 'Midsummer Night's Dream.'

ancient tongue of Palestine would be spoken. When by the decree of Cyrus they were permitted to return to their own land, the Jews found that many settlers had pressed in upon the territory which they had previously occupied. All these settlers could speak Aramaic, whatever tongue they might use besides, and this would have compelled the Jews also to learn Aramaic. In all likelihood the Aramaizing process had gone on already in the territories of the northern tribes. When the Ninevite monarchs sent in colonists to inhabit the land that had been so laid waste by their campaigns, the only common language these colonists could have would be Aramaic. Moreover, the remnants of the people that were left in the land would also have to learn Aramaic in order to carry on intercourse with these incomers. The tendency to abandon Hebrew would gradually become irresistible; hence we find that the common people required to have the Law interpreted to them. In these circumstances it was but natural that the Hebrew that was still occasionally spoken should be very much Aramaized. But, on the other hand, it is almost necessary to hold that the Aramaic spoken by the Jews had a Hebrew colour given to it.

Although Hebrew may have fallen into disuse among the Jews and the Samaritans, it was still spoken among the Phœnicians till the Greek period was well advanced. Not impossibly it may have been spoken in Moab and Ammon, if not so late as it was in Phœnicia, at least far down in the Persian period. This would tend to preserve in force the tendency to modify Aramaic in a direction that would make it more like Hebrew. In some of the older inscriptions, as those in Sindschirli, Aramaic has many points in which it is liker Hebrew than, at all events in its Eastern dialects, it afterwards was.¹ In the East, Aramaic was developing in another direction and under other influences. It would be nearly impossible to say with certainty what were the distinctive characteristics of Eastern Aramaic in the days of the Babylonian supremacy, the modifications that the language has undergone are so great.

While the modifications which the spoken language underwent were great, to some extent, this would be liable to affect works that were repeatedly copied. The books that, like the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms, were used in the regular synagogue service, would be protected from any great change by the familiarity of the audience with the words. Daniel was not so protected, hence it would be greatly exposed to modification and interpolation. When we compare the Massoretic text with the translation which has come down to us in the Codex Chisianus, we find extraordinary differences. Not unfrequently have these differences been referred to, and the Septuagint version of Daniel has on account of them been denounced as unfaithful. It seems a somewhat hasty conclusion to come to, that this translation, which in regard to other books is fairly faithful, should in regard to this book and—with the exception of Ezra—this book alone, be so very unfaithful. Like Daniel, Ezra was not regularly read in the synagogue: there was, therefore, the possibility of variation. Do the phenomena before us fit this latter supposition? Were the differences between the Septuagint and the Massoretic due to variations in the text from which the latter ultimately sprang? It so happens that we can prove this by having other versions that date before the fixation of the Massoretic text, and we find that there is precisely the gradual variation exhibited that we might expect. Theodotion's, which appears to have been a revision of a translation made probably in Asia Minor, is, after the Septuagint, the earliest of these. The object Theodotion avowedly had was to make the Greek agree as nearly as possible with the Hebrew original as he had it. Hence his version may be held as accurately representing the Hebrew text current in his day. His date

¹ In the Sindschirli Inscriptions, the singular imperfect begins with *ʾ*, not *ʾ* or *ʾ*, as in the Syriac and Mandæan dialects respectively.

cannot be fixed with anything like absolute certainty, but it appears to have been about the middle of the second century. The Peshitta is nearly contemporary, but a shade later. Last of all comes the Vulgate in Jerome's revision. Of these the last is in closest agreement with the Massoretic text, the Peshitta next, Theodotion further removed, though none of them is nearly so wide of the Massoretic as is the Septuagint. With these evidences of variation, it is rash to rest any argument for the recency of the Book of Daniel on alleged traces of recency in the Aramaic.

There are, however, other evidences of this modernizing process being at work on the Aramaic portions of Daniel. The two words in ancient Aramaic inscriptions that from their frequency strike most readily the reader as different from more recent Aramaic, either Eastern or Western, are η for η and אָרַק for אַרְמָ . The line which divides the inscriptions which use the older form from those which use the more recent is about the beginning of the Christian era. The earliest inscription in the 'Corpus Inscriptionum Semiticarum,' which has η is one of Aretas, דַּרְיָ (A.D. 4), and the latest in which η occurs is in an Egyptian inscription dated by Comte de Vogüé, "the time of the Ptolemies."

If the differences were due simply to a change wrought by time, then we should have to take our choice between asserting that the Aramaic portion of Daniel was not written till at earliest the beginning of our era, or that the text was modified. The former hypothesis is impossible from the reference to the Aramaic portions of Daniel in the dying speech of Mattathias and in the Third Book of the Sibylline Oracles. Canon Driver thinks this peculiarity part of the official style of Egypt, Babylon, etc. It so happens that the geographical line between these styles coincides pretty nearly with the temporal. New inscriptions may, as Canon Driver has said, alter the complexion of the question very much. The ease with which η could be altered to η is obvious, and the fact that in Biblical Aramaic the contracted form η never occurs which could not arise from η , seems to confirm us in the belief that such an alteration has taken place. What we have said of η applies also to אָרַק , with this difference—that we have an example of what we think has taken place in Daniel and Ezra, in the Aramaic verse in Jeremiah (x. 11). There the word "earth" occurs twice in our English Version. In the first case the word represents אָרַק , in the second אַרְמָ ; but in none of the versions is there any indication that a different word was before the translator. The same may be said in regard to the Targum of Jonathan ben Uzziel on this passage. The probability is that here we have a change begun, but not completed. The change in the case alike of η and of אָרַק was an easy one.¹

Notwithstanding all the efforts at modernization, there is still a long distance between the Aramaic of Daniel and that of the Targums. The most obvious point of difference is the almost total absence of ר , the sign of the accusative, from Biblical Aramaic, and its frequency in all the Targums, not only Jewish, but Samaritan also. The only case in which it occurs in Biblical Aramaic is Dan. iii. 12, where it is used to give the oblique case of a pronoun. It is remarkable that in one of the inscriptions from Sindschirli we have ר = ר used in a similar way (רַחֲמֵי , Hadad Inscr., l. 28), and this is the only case in which it occurs. Another common word in the Targums is אִי , meaning "that," "in order that," or "because." This word does not occur in Biblical Aramaic at all: instead of it we have the cumbrous phrase כִּלְכַּלְדִּי —a phrase that does not occur in the Targums in this sense: כָּל קָל in Targumic means "over against" (Ruth iv. 4). Every reader of Hebrew knows how frequently the verbal

¹ The transition in the case of אָרַק is the easier that in Phœnician ק was ϕ and η Ω . According to 'Bereshith Rabba,' אָרַק meant "the earth at winter solstice."

particle אֲ occurs in Biblical Hebrew; as frequent in the Targums is אֲ . This does not occur in Biblical Aramaic; its place is taken by אֲ . In the Targums the negative of this is אֲ ; in Daniel and Ezra we have instead אֲ . In Biblical Aramaic אֲ is the word for "if," which does not occur in Targumic. On the other hand, אֲ is the word commonly used in the Targums, which again does not occur in the Bible. אֲ is a form occurring in inscriptions. Closely akin to this is אֲ , "therefore," which, occurring in Biblical Aramaic, does not occur in the Targums. These particles are, as every one knows, the most conclusive indications of the age of a document.

Almost as important are pronouns. We have already referred to the relative אֲ and its relation to the still older form אֲ . It is to be noted that in Biblical Aramaic אֲ is always written *plenum*, never in the contracted form אֲ , which, again, is the more common form in the Targums. It would be impossible, as we have said above, to regard the contracted form as resulting from a scribal modification of אֲ , which, however, may easily be the genesis of the Biblical אֲ . The first personal pronoun in Biblical Aramaic is אֲ , which does not occur in the Targums, where the regular form is אֲ , sometimes contracted אֲ . The form אֲ is also found in Sindschirli along with the Phœnician אֲ and the Hebrew אֲ , an intermingling which we find in all early Aramaic. Not improbably the two cases where אֲ occurs in Biblical Aramaic are due to the copyist having mistaken אֲ for אֲ , letters which are very like in the older Aramaic script. The Biblical Aramaic plural is אֲ , whereas the common Targumic is אֲ or אֲ , which do not occur in the Aramaic of the Bible. The pronoun of the second person singular is in Daniel and Ezra אֲ , in the Targums the most common form by far is אֲ , which does not occur in the Aramaic of the Bible. The pronoun of the second plural in Biblical Aramaic is אֲ , whereas in the Targums the invariable form is אֲ . The third person masculine, the only form that occurs in Biblical Aramaic, is the same as in the Targums; it seems to have been the same in Sindschirli. The plural of the demonstrative in Biblical Hebrew is sometimes אֲ , a form that occurs in inscriptions, but never in the Targums. The pronominal difference between Daniel and the Targums is thus very considerable.

Further, there are differences in verbal forms. In Biblical Aramaic all the verbs that in Targumic are אֲ are אֲ . The *aphel* of Targumic verbs appears in Biblical Aramaic as *haphel*, the characteristic אֲ being in some cases carried through the whole inflexion. The one *aphel* case is probably due to scribal change. Instead of the *ittaphal*, the Targumic passive of the *aphel*, we have a *huphal* form. Professor Bevan quotes an instance of what seems to be a *uphal* from the Palmyrene. He admits himself it may be *aphel*, and moreover it does not touch on the presence of the *h*-forms in Biblical Aramaic as distinct from that of the Targums. These אֲ -forms are characteristic of the oldest forms of Aramaic; e.g. they occur in the Sindschirli Inscriptions. Professor Bevan dismisses all these as merely cases of orthography. For our part, we thought that when a cockney dropped his *h*'s it was more than a question of orthography. Further, the older orthography thus preserved, despite every tendency to change, does not lose its evidential value. Another case which, though it may be dismissed on the same plea—incompetent, as we think it—yet has some cogence. The distinction is still preserved in Biblical Aramaic between אֲ and אֲ , a distinction which had disappeared in the Targumic. From their origin the Targums of necessity represented a form of Aramaic probably much more ancient than the date at which they were committed to writing would imply.

Formerly the efforts of critics were directed to show that the Aramaic of Ezra was more ancient than that of Daniel; that attempt is abandoned now, and the plan now is

either to assert Ezra late, or to assert that the language was stationary for something like three centuries. If the latter hypothesis is assumed, we might assert that it had been stationary for a couple of centuries before the days of Ezra.

The conclusion we come to with regard to the Aramaic of Daniel is that, taking all the facts into consideration, the Aramaic is early, but how early it is impossible to say.

But the date of the Aramaic is not the only question on which critics of Daniel are at issue. There are two dialects of Aramaic—a Western, formerly called Chaldee, now sometimes called Palestinian; and an Eastern, still called incorrectly Syriac. Although there is the Mandæan sub-dialect, which does not agree in all points with the dialect of the Peshitta, it is indubitable that Biblical Aramaic, as we see it now, has a predominant Western character. This, it is argued, militates against the author being the historic Daniel, who is alleged, when he wrote, to have been an inhabitant of Babylon. In the first place, as has already been pointed out in the older Aramaic, even of the East, the distinction between Eastern and Western forms is not so marked as it became later. In the next place, a process analogous to that we have just referred to, which obliterated indications of age, occurred, by which Eastern peculiarities were removed when it could be done, and their place supplied by those that were Western; just as Scotch songs, when published in London, become Anglicized. And it seems to us that there are evidences that the Book of Daniel has undergone this process. The most prominent trace of this which we see is the form of the imperfect in ܠ as ܠܗܝܬ for third person singular. This is certainly an Eastern form of the imperfect, and still is found in the Mandæan. Professor Bevan supplies an ingenious explanation. He maintains that it was to avoid a form which would be very like the sacred name ܡܠܟ, that the scribes, in the case of Daniel and Ezra, adopted this form of the imperfect third person. Like many other ingenious interpretations, it proves nothing, because it proves too much. If this explanation were true, we should find, on the one hand, no examples of the third person imperfect of ܡܠܟ beginning with ܠ; in the Targums, and should find instances of the third person imperfect beginning with ܠ; but in the Targum of Onkelos, Gen. xviii. 17, we find the third singular of the imperfect with ܠ used without any thought of the Divine name. Further, there are no instances of the third person in ܠ. A much more natural explanation is that these third persons are survivals. In Mandæan only some verbs have this form of the third imperfect, in other cases the ordinary Syriac form with ܢ occurs. While ܢ (*yod*) and ܢ (*nun*) have in the older Aramaic script a considerable resemblance, so that *nun* might be read *yod*, by one who was accustomed to *yod* not *nun* in a given case, *lamed* was very different from *yod*. Further, the resemblance to the sacred name which resulted from the change might act as a deterrent from change, though it could scarcely act as an incentive to it. Further, the K'thîb often represents a Syriac form, while the K'rî is pointed according to the Chaldee usage. Thus in the fifth verse of the second chapter we have ܟܠܝܐ instead of ܟܠܝܐ. There are further Mandæan forms still surviving, as ܡܠܟܝܢ (Dan. iv. 23).

If we turn from the text before us, and try to rediscover the text that must have been before the translator of the Septuagint when he made his version, we find further traces of Eastern forms. The most common preformative of the third person singular and plural imperfect in Eastern Aramaic is ܢ (*nun*). It seems to us that there are traces that the translator had a text of this kind before him. Thus the last clause of the fifth verse of the second chapter, "And your house shall be made a dunghill," is rendered by the Septuagint, Ἀναληφθήσεται ὁμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν, which may be paraphrased, "And your goods be escheat to the crown." This version is not due to

any shrinking from the meaning of the phrase, for when it occurs in the next chapter (ver. 29) it is correctly translated. It is clear the translator read *לָלוּ* instead of *לָלוּ*. The other changes would easily follow from this. So too in the seventh verse, "Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation," is rendered in the Septuagint, "O king, tell the dream, and his servants will decide [as to the interpretation]." Here the text is translated as if it were the third person instead of the first person plural—a translation only possible to one with a manuscript before him in which there was an admixture of Eastern forms. Naturally, the cases are few where any such is recognizable, but still even one or two cases render the probability considerable. When we bear in mind that the peculiarity of the Syriac imperfect is not impossibly a development of Aramaic that may in its fulness have been later than the Captivity, the rarity of traces of it becomes also the more intelligible. At all events, this is clear—no conclusion against the authenticity of Daniel can be based on the want of Eastern forms in the present Massoretic text. This may be due to the modification introduced by copyists, or may even be a proof of antiquity.

There are certain names and titles which are alleged to have a Persian origin. In the first place, the names may have been altered. This may be held to be as good as proved by Ashpenaz appearing as Abiesdri in the Septuagint. We know that the Jews had an objection to writing the names of heathen gods, and had an especial objection to representing any Israelite as having the name of a heathen god embedded in his name. The titles might be modified to something more intelligible, and, further, glosses and interpretations might get into the text. The lengthened list of officials in the third chapter suggests something of this sort. Further, if the tradition that Nebuchadnezzar married a Median princess had any truth in it, as the language of Media and Persia was the same, officials might, in some cases, receive Persian, that is, Median, designations; and yet again, not unfrequently designations that have been declared to be Persian have been found to be really of Assyrian origin. It is further alleged that there are words of Greek origin present. It can be proved that these words are either not Greek or have no right to be in the text. For a complete examination of this part of the subject, we must refer the reader to the excursus on that subject subjoined to the third chapter.

II. THE HISTORICAL BACKGROUND OF THE BOOK.

The historical background of the Book of Daniel must embrace a narrative of the events, actual or assumed, that form the setting of those related in the book itself. It must also contain the fulfilment of those portions which are, or at all events purport to be, prophecies. As these are connected with each other, there is necessitated a sketch of the history of the Eastern world from the fall of Nineveh till, if not the fall of Rome, at least the fall of Jerusalem. Part of this history has been long well known, but part of it has only recently emerged into history in any true sense. Few portions of history of which we previously knew anything at all have undergone such a revolution as the beginning of the period before us. The actual events were lost to us by contradictory romances which it would be misleading to call legends or traditions. We had certain fragments of truth in Berosus and Abydenus, but what was truth and what falsehood we had no means of determining. The discoveries of Botta, Layard, and Rawlinson, followed up by Smith, Oppert, Schrader, Delitzsch, Pinches, and others, have opened to us a new world.

Formerly it was imagined that Babylonia was the country of the Chaldeans, and Babylon their capital. Now we find that the Chaldeans were freebooting tribes that had intruded themselves from the desert into the fertile and cultivated territories of

Mesopotamia and Babylonia, mainly the latter. They were Semites, and therefore to a degree the kinsmen of the Babylonians, yet by habits and history they were quite distinct from them. When they penetrated into Babylonia, they gradually spread themselves through the land, erecting fortified strongholds in which to shelter their predatory bands. These were generally known by the name of the chief that had originally led them into the land, prefixed by the word *bit*, or "house of." From these centres they oppressed the unwarlike Babylonians, who were only preserved from annihilation by the walls that surrounded their cities.

The Chaldeans first come distinctly into history with the campaigns of Shalmaneser II. against Babylonia. In his eighth and ninth years (B.C. 851 and 850) he marched into that province to interfere in a question of succession in one of these small Chaldee states that had gained a position of supremacy over the others. State after state submitted to the conqueror. Although presents were brought from these states to after Ninevite monarchs, none of them for nearly a century seem to have made as great conquests in Babylonia as Shalmaneser till Tiglath-pileser III. This latter monarch came as the protector of the oppressed Babylonians. These little Chaldean *kinglets* were always endeavouring, in the first place, to secure a position of superiority over their fellows, and then, as the sign and result of this, to secure possession of Babylon. This city once in their hands, they could rule all Chaldea with a strong hand. Shalmaneser placed on the throne of Babylon a subject-king, Nabonassar. He was succeeded by others in the same capacity. A Chaldean monarch seized the throne. He was overthrown and taken prisoner. Thereafter Tiglath-pileser became King of Babylon in his own person, and reigned there by the name Pul.

During the reigns of Sargon and Sennacherib there was a constant struggle with another Chaldean prince, Merodach-Baladan, for the possession of the sacred city of Babylon. Esarhaddon, installed King of Babylon before his father's assassination, reigned a portion of every year in the southern city, and thus retained possession of Babylonia without much opposition. During the greater part of his reign Assurbanipal seems to have been free of serious difficulties with the Chaldees. His struggle was with Elam, which he claims to have completely subdued. For the latter years of his reign, and for the reigns of his successors, we have no monumental evidence. We simply know nothing for certain of the fall of Nineveh, save that it did fall, and that Nabopolassar, the Chaldean monarch of Babylon, had to do with the result.

The Assyrian Empire, under Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, had possession of Egypt. Necho, the grandfather of the Pharaoh-Necho of Scripture, was governor of a portion of Egypt under these monarchs. His grandson seems to have secured the supremacy over all Egypt, but probably was reckoned, as his father and grandfather had been, satraps of the King of Assyria. Nabopolassar, if we follow Abydenus and explain him, seems to have occupied a similar position in Babylon—nominal satrap of the great king, the King of Assyria, yet practically independent. When he gained possession of Nineveh, Nabopolassar seems to have claimed the empire of which that city had been the capital, and regarded Necho, and probably all the other monarchs who had made themselves independent, as his satraps. Possibly it might be the expression of this claim that led to the march of Necho to the Euphrates. This is described by Berosus as the rebellion of the satrap whom he, Nabopolassar, "had set over Egypt, Cælo-Syria, and Phœnicia." Not impossibly Nabopolassar may have given events this colour in his proclamations, that his people might imagine that Necho, with his connivance as his satrap, had seized Palestine and Syria in addition to Egypt. Then, when he felt strong enough, he sent his son Nebuchadnezzar against Necho. The Babylonian and the Egyptian armies encountered each other at Carchemish, the fortress

by which the Egyptians maintained their hold of Northern Syria. The Egyptians were utterly defeated, and Nebuchadnezzar pursued their flying forces through Syria and Palestine, receiving the submission of the various subject-kings, taking from them hostages. He advanced against Jerusalem, which submitted without much resistance. After taking hostages, he retained Jehoiakim on the throne. Among the hostages were Daniel and his three friends. Shortly after this the young conqueror was checked in his career by the news of his father's death. Fearing lest the opportunity might be seized to make an attempt at revolution, sending his heavy troops and hostages by the long but easier route northward to Carchemish and then southward, he himself dashed across the desert with his light-armed troops, and took possession of the throne. Unfortunately, we have no inscriptions to tell us what campaigns Nebuchadnezzar undertook after this. From the Prophet Jeremiah's mention of the Elamites and Medes as having to drink the cup of fury in consequence of the rise of Nebuchadnezzar, we may presume that he made campaigns to the east and north. Meantime Egypt began to intrigue with the newly submitted provinces. Jehoiakim revolted from Nebuchadnezzar three years after his submission to him. Nebuchadnezzar, probably engaged in other campaigns of more importance, did not immediately march against this rebel, who must have appeared to him a sufficiently insignificant one. He did not, however, overlook his fault. Bands of Chaldeans were sent against Judæa, and with these operated Syria, Moab, and Ammon, that seem to have remained faithful to their suzerain. Nothing like a siege of Jerusalem was undertaken till after the death of Jehoiakim and the accession of his son. Again the Babylonian monarch has only to appear before it for Jerusalem to submit, and Jeconiah is carried away captive to Babylon. Zedekiah, the uncle of the young captive, became king in his stead, as vassal of the King of Babylon.

Meantime a new Pharaoh had risen in Egypt. Pharaoh-Hophra (Uahabra-Apries) advanced into Philistia and Phœnicia, and received the submission of Zedekiah. This brought the Chaldeans back in force to Syria, and before them Pharaoh retired and Jerusalem was besieged. Pharaoh-Hophra made some attempt to relieve Jerusalem, and, indeed, the Chaldean army broke up from Jerusalem to go to encounter him. He retired, however, without having effected anything. Again the siege was renewed and Jerusalem was taken, and Zedekiah, deposed and blinded, was carried a captive to Babylon. We do not know the course of Nebuchadnezzar's campaigns, but during his reign he besieged and captured Tyre, and then invaded Egypt and reduced it to subjection. The real history of the overthrow of Pharaoh-Hophra we do not know, but in his thirty-seventh year Nebuchadnezzar seems to have conquered Egypt. The long reign of the great conqueror drew near a close. After forty-three years of the possession—if we except the period of his madness, probably short—the glorious possession of the throne of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar died.

He was succeeded by Evil-Merodach, who is accused of being tyrannous and vicious. It is a possible supposition that he had a favour for Judaism, which expressed itself in setting Jeconiah at his own table. After a reign of two years, his brother-in-law, Nergal-shar-ezar, conspired against him and slew him. It is by no means impossible that Daniel retired from the court after the murder of the son of his master. This would easily explain Belshazzar's ignorance of him. Nergal-shar-ezar reigned about four years, and was succeeded by his son Labashi-Marduk, who was murdered after a reign of a few months. His successor was Nabunahid, a Babylonian we are informed—that is to say, not a Chaldean. It is possible he might be the son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar. He ascended the throne in the year B.C. 556, and we can by the contract tables fix the date of his accession to within a few days; between the twelfth and eighteenth Sivan

(approximately our June) the murder and the accession must have taken place. For the reign of Nabunahid we have the advantage of a long inscription on a clay tablet, entitled "the annals of Nabunahid." Several other documents have come down to us also throwing light on his character. In several inscriptions he has named his eldest son along with himself, as if associating him on the throne. Although the name "king" is not given to him, he fulfils all the functions of the monarchy, and prayers are put up for him as for the monarch. For a number of the years of his reign Nabunahid took no part in the business of royalty, not even on the New Year's festival, where his presence as monarch was indispensable, did he come to Babylon. Certainly from his seventh to his eleventh year, it is told us of Nabunahid that he was in Tema. Where Tema was, and what it was that thus kept Nabunahid there, we do not know. It may have been sickness, bodily or mental; it may have been that he had vowed the life of a solitary. Though this is the hypothesis at which Winckler hints, it seems to us improbable. Meanwhile the crown prince was with the *Rabbuti* at the head of the army, and managing the affairs of the kingdom. It was probably when thus he assumed the regency that the feast occurred, narrated in Daniel, when the fiery inscription appeared on the wall.¹ During the reign of this monarch a Scythian horde, under the command of a king Istuvigu (Astyages), had overrun Media and Elam, had pressed into Babylonia, and had wrested Assyria from the empire. This horde had the general name of Manda, or Umman-Manda.² These nomads were pressing in upon Babylonia, and Nabunahid relates how he dreamed that Marduk appeared to him and foretold the destruction of these intruders. "Marduk said to me, 'The Umman-Manda of whom thou speakest, he himself and the kings his allies shall be no more. In the third year the gods will cause them to cease.' Cyrus, King of Ansan, his insignificant vassal, with his few troops scattered the numerous Umman-Manda. Astyages, the King of the Umman-Manda, he took and brought in fetters into his land." Nabunahid here regards Cyrus as his real ally sent by the gods to destroy his enemies the Manda.

In regard to no character in ancient history has the revolution to which we referred above been greater than in regard to Cyrus. We had several accounts of him, two fairly full, from Herodotus and Xenophon; besides, we had the fragments of Ctesias, Diodorus and Justin. Altogether we felt that if we combined the Greek sources with the notices of Scripture, we knew a great deal about Cyrus. We find now that all our knowledge from Greek sources is utterly misleading. We were told that he was the grandson of Astyages and the great-grandson of Cyaxares. He certainly was not related to Astyages, and most probably not to Cyaxares either. We were told he was King of the Persians, and threw off the Median rule. He was king of the small canton of Ansan, and was hailed by the Medes as their deliverer from the oppression of the Manda. Ansan seems to have been generally reckoned to Elam, but was not coincident with it. Persia (Parsua) seems to have been another canton contiguous to Ansan. For some reason, after he had overthrown Astyages, Cyrus took the title of King of the Persians.

We cannot, and even if we could, do not, require here to follow the course of Cyrus's conquests. It is sufficient that, after he had overthrown Astyages, he turned his eyes towards Babylonia. So long as Belshazzar commanded, he seems to have been unable to pierce into Babylonia proper. In the ninth year of the reign of Nabunahid we learn that Cyrus overran Mesopotamia, and made Gobryas governor of the whole province,

¹ The verse in the Massoretic which announces Belshazzar's death the night of the feast is spurious. It does not appear in the Septuagint.

² The resemblance of the name Manda to Madai has led Herodotus to regard Astyages as a Median king.

having given it the new name of Gutium. After this he seems to have directed his march against Cræsus, and subdued Lydia. Then in the year B.C. 538 he turned his arms towards Babylonia. Nabunahid now commanded the army in person, and sustained a defeat at Borsippa, and fled. Gobryas hurried forward to Babylon, the gates of the citadel Essakkil were thrown open to him, and when the morning broke the shields of Gutium were seen on the walls of Essakkil. On the third Marcheswan (approximately October) Cyrus entered Babylon in peace, and on the eleventh of the same month was Belshazzar slain by Gobryas. Gobryas, appointed Governor of Babylonia, appoints governors to all the petty kingships of Babylonia, and these, we already know, were numerous. We have elsewhere indicated our belief that Gobryas is Darius the Mede. We cannot tell how long his rule lasted.

Cyrus was succeeded by Cambyses, and he by the usurper Smerdis the Mede. Darius Hystaspis wrested the throne from him, and was succeeded by Xerxes, who appears to be the Persian monarch that stirs up all his wealth against the realm of Grecia. Then the record omits all mention of the successive Persian monarchs till Darius Codomannus, who had to bear the shock of the assault of Alexander the Great. Alexander assigned, as the reason of his invasion of Persia, the fact that Xerxes had invaded Greece. There are few parts of ancient history better known than the campaigns of Alexander the Great. Left by the murder of his father in possession of Macedon, this youth of twenty conquered in two years the whole Balkan Peninsula. In B.C. 334 he crossed the Hellespont, conquered South-Western Asia to beyond the Indus, Egypt, and Cyrene, and then at thirty-three died. No conqueror ever left, in so short a life, so deep an impress on the world. Wherever he had carried his arms, there for centuries after Greek influences flourished. The continuance of the Greek-Bactrian kingdom, for centuries after it was cut off to a great extent from intercourse with the West, is evidence of the impress made by Alexander on all with whom he came in contact. The narrative in Josephus of Alexander visiting Jerusalem is by no means incredible; its accuracy would never have been questioned had it not been conjoined with the statement that Jaddua the high priest showed Alexander the prophecy of Daniel concerning him. The synchronism of Jaddua, with Alexander is only proved by Josephus's statement, and that is used to prove the late date of Chronicles, but the rest of the narrative, which proves the early date of Daniel, is dismissed as unworthy of credit. This is an instance of the unconscious dishonesty of biassed intellects, who will admit anything rather than that a prophet ever foretold. Such a bias makes all the judgments of the critical school, where prophecy is involved, liable to suspicion. However, we would not press this narrative, as it is destitute of direct support. Alexander certainly gave privileges to the Jews, and the process of Hellenization began then that continued under the Lagids.

After the death of Alexander, his empire was scrambled for by his different generals. A division at last was made which was fairly permanent—the Balkan Peninsula, Asia Minor, Syria, and Egypt. Of these by far the largest was Syria, which on several occasions embraced the greater part of Asia Minor and a portion of the Balkan Peninsula. Egypt came next, which embraced, besides Egypt proper, Palestine, Cælo-Syria, Phœnicia, and Cyprus. Not only were these two last the most powerful, but they were most in contact with the Jews. Each was ruled by one dynasty from the days of Alexander—Egypt by the Lagids, and Syria by the Seleucids, and their wars and rivalries fill up very much the annals of the Diadochi. This is evidenced by the eleventh (interpolated) chapter of Daniel.

There is an additional interest for us in the history of the Seleucids, the monarchs of Syria, in the fact that from them sprang Antiochus Epiphanes, whose persecutions

and the revolt of the Jews against them left such a trace on Jewish history. Palestine and Coelo-Syria remained for a century in the power of the Lagids of Egypt, who seem on the whole to have been liked by the Jews. It was wrested from them by Antiochus the Great, the father of Epiphanes. Epiphanes, as a hostage in Rome, had imbibed a wholesome respect for the power of the great republic. With brilliant military talent, as manifested by his Egyptian campaigns, and with some genius for finesse in politics, he was incapable of estimating the power of religious fervour. His residence in Rome, and his licentious life, had made him incapable of real religious faith, so it seemed to him an easy matter to coerce the Jews into abandoning the faith of their fathers. Had he read their earlier history, he would have found what would have encouraged him in his belief. The people were, in the days before the Captivity, always prone to turn from the worship of Jehovah to the worship of idols. The persecution of the Jews by Antiochus is—if we except the efforts of Jezebel and Manasseh, of which we have no particulars—the earliest recorded persecution for religion, the first great experiment of compelling men by force to believe according to orders from their political superiors. It seems to us difficult to explain the different attitude of the Jewish people to the worship of Jehovah before and after the Captivity save as the result of miracles of a sort not unlike those related in Daniel.

The zeal of Mattathias and the valour of his sons at length wrung from the Seleucids the independence of Palestine. The Maccabean rulers fell finally under the all-conquering power of Rome. Then came the tragedy of Calvary, when the Messiah promised to the fathers was cut off, when the Jewish people threw away their hope and glory, and brought down on their own heads and on those of their children the curse of innocent blood. And in little more than a generation the curse did fall on them. Jerusalem was compassed with armies, the eagle standards of Rome were gathered together, and Jerusalem became heaps.

How far the history may stretch beyond this—to the division of the empire into East and West—to the rise of the European kingdoms, away even to the future date when these too will fall under the power of the Messianic empire, we do not intend to inquire. It was necessary to dwell at greater length on the background, actual or assumed, of the book, and next on the period of Epiphanes, as it is the time when critics have determined that Daniel was written.

III. EXTERNAL RELATIONS OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

1. *External references to the Book of Daniel.* Two things are to a certain extent regarded as proved by external references to a book—its date, and the extent of the effect it produced. In regard to both of these, there are various considerations which ought to modify our conclusions. We are not to look upon the earliest indisputable reference to a book as approximately the date at which it came into existence; it really only affords a limit determining the latest date we may ascribe to it, but decides nothing as to how early it may be. Quotation proves that the book quoted must have come into existence *before* the book in which it is quoted, but does not prove how long before. Of course, a book quoting must be later in date than that it quotes; how much it is impossible to say, save from other grounds. On the other hand, the popularity of a book may be greater or less than the number of quotations might seem to warrant. A striking phrase may be found on every lip taken from a poem but seldom read; while a book may be extremely potent in the hearts and thoughts of men, and yet be seldom quoted, because it does not lend itself to quotation. Few books have been so much read since it was first written as the 'Imitatio Christi,' and yet quotations from it are rare. From the traces of their influence in Scripture, we know that the Books of Enoch were largely

read in the period immediately preceding the days of our Lord, yet in the voluminous Talmud there are few traces that these books had ever been heard of. The character, then, of given writings has to be taken into consideration—the writings which we expect to find quoted, and those we expect to find quoting. Further, quotation is not the earliest way in which contact with an earlier writing is manifested. Direct word-for-word quotation, with due reference to the authors, is a result of literary advance and the idea of property in literary products. The ballad-writers freely borrowed from those that preceded them. The Hebrew prophets did so, as may be seen by the parallel passages in Micah and Isaiah, and in Isaiah and Jeremiah. It is enough if one can trace resemblances of diction. Stronger than these, are references of a sort that, without quotation or even resemblance of diction, yet imply the knowledge of the contents of the book, and take for granted that this knowledge is general. The nature of the effect produced on the writings of a period depends greatly on the habits of the time, and the character of the literature which has survived. We cannot verify the Vedas by quotations from contemporary literature.

The literature of the period most nearly contemporary with the traditional date of Daniel is by no means extensive, and is not of a character to lend itself to the act of quotation. The prophets may be regarded from the literary side of their works as poets. Poets do not make frequent references to contemporary poets. Tennyson and Browning have both left voluminous poetical remains behind them, yet we doubt if the one refers so much as once to the other. Yet Ezekiel mentions on two different occasions Daniel as a famous person, in terms that suit the Daniel of our book, though, as we have shown above, these references are not the origin of it. It has been objected that our Daniel would have been too young to be so mentioned;¹ but careful investigation shows this not to be a valid argument. If Daniel were carried away a hostage at the age Joseph was when sold into Egypt, namely, seventeen—and he might be more—at the end of the third year of his education he would be at least twenty. That, we think, probably coincided with the telling and interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's first dream, and thereafter he was admitted to the royal councils. Twenty was certainly an early age to attain such eminence, but the miraculous gifts he possessed might easily be supposed to elevate him to any position even at that early age. This had occurred five years before Ezekiel was carried captive to the river Chebar. We cannot tell exactly when the prophecy of Ezek. xiv. was delivered, but it must have been after the time of the prophecy of the eighth chapter, the sixth month of the sixth year—that is to say, later than some ten or eleven years after Daniel had been admitted to the royal council-chamber. Daniel would then be two years older than Joseph was when he was made governor of all Egypt. He would be four or five years older still when the prophecy against Tyre was pronounced. Remoteness of station, especially when connected with unity of blood, would tend to surround Daniel with a halo to the captives by the river Chebar, and equal him with the ancient worthies. Ben Sira glorifies his slightly older contemporary Simon, the son of Onias, in terms that put him not only on a par with the great men of old, but even make him the superior of most of them. We then see no reason to doubt that it is to the Daniel of the canonical book that Ezekiel refers, and not any older worthy carried away to Nineveh.

Some resemblances of diction have been seen by some commentators; e.g. Professor Fuller, between Daniel and Haggai and Malachi, but with the exception of Mal. iii. 16 and Dan. xii. 1 (comp. ch. vii. 10), these resemblances are not striking. The passage

¹ We cannot forbear referring to the arithmetical blunders of Dean Farrar on this subject (Farrar, 'Daniel,' p. 10); they form a curiosity in literature.

in Malachi seems to assume that the idea of a book of remembrance being kept before the Lord was one well known—as do also the passages in Daniel. The resemblance between the prayer in Neh. ix. and that in Dan. ix. is too great to be accidental. It is impossible to settle with any certainty which is the earlier, but the greater elaboration of the prayer in Nehemiah is a presumption against its being the earlier. It is more difficult to escape the reference to the four horns of the Grecian goat of Daniel in Zech. i. 18. Were it not that criticism forbids us to see a prophecy in any word of a prophet, we might be inclined to see a reference to the triumphant conflicts waged by Mattathias and his sons against the Greek monarchy. It is difficult to imagine four horns without imagining also some animal whose horns they are. To the reader of Daniel the reference would be plain.

The earliest of the apocalyptic books, the Book of Enoch, part of it dated, as we think, B.C. 210, is full of evidences of the influence of Daniel. Indeed, the whole apocalyptic series are the product of the visions of Daniel. In the Apocrypha the most noticeable reference is that which the author of the Maccabees represents the dying Mattathias as making. No one would claim that the *ipsissima verba* of the old man's dying advice are given, but the tenor of them can scarcely fail to be correct. One wishing to encourage those engaged in a life-and-death conflict, in which passive resistance had proved unavailing, would not readily, in cold blood, have preferred the preservation of Daniel's friends in the furnace, and Daniel himself in the lions' den, to the vigorous narratives of the Judges. Had the dying speech of Mattathias been invented, the inventor would have chosen more pat illustrations. The date of 1 Maccabees is approximately B.C. 100. The Book of Baruch is also dependent on Daniel, especially the first and older portion. Any one carefully comparing the two will be convinced that Baruch is dependent on Daniel; not, as Ewald thought, Daniel on Baruch. The date of this book is very doubtful. Ewald would place it in the Persian period. With regard to the first portion this seems a not improbable date. To place it after the destruction of Jerusalem by Titus, as do Schürer and Kneucker, is quite untenable. No one who had seen the destruction of Jerusalem under Titus would be under the mistaken idea that, after the Chaldeans had burnt it with fire (Baruch i. 2), there could be offered on the altar burnt offerings and sin offerings. It must have been written by one who had no conception of a time when there was neither sacrifice nor offering. It, therefore, must date so long after the days of Nebuchadnezzar that the results of his capture of Jerusalem were forgotten, and before Epiphanes. The Fourth Book of Esdras certainly does, at least in its present form, date from after the destruction of Jerusalem, and it acknowledges Daniel and refers to portions of it. In the Apocrypha there is another book, Ecclesiasticus, which is brought forward as evidence both for and against the early knowledge of the Book of Daniel. On the affirmative side we have Ecclus. xvii. 17, "For in the division of the nations of the whole earth he set a ruler over every people; but Israel is the Lord's portion." This is supposed to refer to the angelic rulers of each nation, and this we find referred to in Daniel. Although the view above is supported by the name of Fritzsche, we do not regard it as quite certain, in the first place, that there is a reference here to *angelic* rulers; it may be *kings* that are meant. In the early history there was no king in Israel; the Lord was their King. On the other hand, it is an absurdity to imagine that Ben Sira borrowed this idea from the Septuagint version of Deut. xxxii. 8, "He set the bounds of the nations according to the angels of God." The repeated references to Enoch seem to imply a greater prominence than the mention of him in Genesis would suggest—a prominence most easily explicable by an acquaintance with the earliest Book of Enoch, and it implies the existence of Daniel. We do not think that even this may be pressed. On the

other hand, the negative evidence is equally valueless. The evidence against the early existence of Daniel, as derived from Ecclesiasticus, is that Daniel is not mentioned in "the Hymn of the Fathers." But the *argumentum e silentio*, at all times an unsafe one, is strikingly so in regard to Ben Sira. We have three versions of this book, to some extent independent of each other—the Greek, made by a grandson of the author; the Latin; and the Syriac. In each there are verses that are in neither of the other two. Moreover, we have several quotations from the Book of Ben Sira in the Talmud and other rabbinic sources which we do not find in any of the versions. When we think of the number of verses that are left out by each authority, it seems by no means improbable that more sentences have been left out than those omitted from the versions and yet quoted by the Talmud. One or more of them may have referred to Daniel. Further, "the Hymn of the Fathers" is such an irregular production, meandering through the ages without any regard to chronological succession, that not only might verses drop out without observation, but subjects might be omitted without the writer, not to speak of copyists, being necessarily cognizant of any omission. The actual omissions besides that of Daniel are too numerous to give the omission of Daniel any probative force. If the omission of Job may be explained on the ground that Job was not an Israelite, that will not explain the omission of Ezra and Jehoshaphat. No deduction thus can be made from the silence of Siracides.

Outside the deuterocanonical books of the Apocrypha the earliest reference to Daniel, acknowledged practically by all to be indubitable, is to be found in the 'Oracula Sibyllina,' iii. 396—400—

"Having given forth one sucker, which the destroyer of men shall cut off,
From ten horns, he shall plant another sucker beside,
He shall cut off the warrior, father of the purple race,
And himself by sons whom [he shall receive into equal rule]¹ be slain, and then shall
the horn planted by, rule."

The reference here to Daniel and to Epiphanes is practically universally acknowledged; the only difficulty is to fix the date at which it was written. It is very difficult to fix the date of any part of the 'Oracula Sibyllina.' They are divided into books, but these books have not only no connection with each other, but even each book is in no sense a whole, but is really a cento made up of fragments of the most diverse ages and origins. The third book is, of the books which are at all lengthy, most nearly a unity, and the fragments of which it is composed most nearly synchronize with each other. We can fix the date of this book by the fact that the Jewish Messiah is expected during the reign of "the seventh king of Grecian race;" therefore, reckoning in Alexander, in the reign of Ptolemy Philometor. He is also called *βασιλεὺς νέος*—a term that would apply to him, but in no sense to his successor Physcon. Against any later date is the fact that, while there is thus a reference to Epiphanes, there is no reference to the victorious struggles of the Maccabees against him—a thing that would certainly be joyously chronicled by one who was not only a Jew, but also an Alexandrian, and therefore had a debt of hatred to pay to Epiphanes on both these grounds. It seems almost necessary to fix the date of this part of the Sibylline Oracles as not later than B.C. 170. Granting this to be the true date, we cannot fix the date of Daniel to that; it must have had a wide popularity many years before that, in order to have been carried down to Egypt, and there to be received into general reading among the Jewish community. Even though one should date the Sibylline Oracles as late as do Schürer and Hilgenfeld, and say it originated B.C. 140,

¹ Reading, with Alexandre, *δέξεται ἀρχήν* instead of *αἰσιον ἔρρηγ.*

still it is difficult to imagine so great a popularity to be attained, in the circumstances, in twenty-four or twenty-five years. This view seems to us to contradict the evidence.

Although Daniel is not referred to by Philo—a thing easily to be understood by the subjects treated and the methods employed by this writer—Daniel is largely quoted by Josephus, his later contemporary. Josephus has given a summary of the first six chapters. He omits the seventh, possibly because it seemed in its line of thought a repetition of the second chapter. He gives a summary of the eighth chapter, transferring to it a picturesque feature from the beginning of the tenth, and some features to complete the prophecy about Epiphanes from the same chapter.¹

We need not carry our account of the external references to Daniel further down. After this they become very frequent, especially when the argument from the "seventy weeks" became so relied on by Christian apologists in discussion with the Jews. Too much is made of the fact that the apostles did not use this argument. We have only a small number of the sermons of the apostles, and we do not know all the lines of argument adopted by them. Further, Daniel was not so generally known, as it was not so regularly read in the synagogues as were some of the technical prophets and the Megilloth. The apostles could not thus appeal to the words of Daniel, as they could to prophecies familiar to the ear of the audience. Again, the argument from "the seventy weeks" implied an accurate knowledge of history and a power of calculating that could scarcely be expected from an ordinary audience. But again the implied argument proves too much, and therefore it proves nothing. If it were worth anything, it should prove that Daniel was not known in the era of our Lord, but that may be easily demonstrated to be false.

2. *Relation of Daniel to the canon.* There are in regard to this, two questions—the relative date of Daniel in regard to the other books in the canon; and next, the age of the canon as a whole.

(1) In regard to the first question, it has been assumed that the Book of Daniel has been put among the K'thubim, and not among the prophets, because its date of composition was later than that of any of the prophetic books. Further, that it was placed late among the K'thubim, because even among these late books it was the latest. These statements, we need hardly say, apply only to the Massoretic arrangement. If the present Massoretic order were very ancient, this theory might be in a slight degree plausible, especially if there were no other orders to compete with it, and if the arrangements in the rest of the books of the canon followed an obviously chronological order. But not one of these suppositions is correct. So far as we are aware, there is at present no definite information as to when the present order was adopted in the Hebrew Bibles. Certainly it is not the order of the books in the passage usually referred to in the Talmudic treatise 'Baba Bathra.' The order in it is 'The Torah'—the books which belong to the prophets; Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Kings, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Isaiah, and the Twelve—the books which belong to the K'thubim, Ruth, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Solomon, Lamentations, Daniel, and the roll of Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles. No one can fail to notice that here the arrangement of the greater prophets does not follow that of chronology, as Isaiah is put after Jeremiah and Ezekiel. The order in our present Septuagint is totally different from the arrangement in the Hebrew Bible.

¹ It is difficult to understand how, in these circumstances, Professor Bevan can say that Josephus's "acquaintance with the book was very superficial;" that he wrote "from vague recollections." All the more is this singular when we find Professor Bevan quoting Josephus's authority in favour of a certain reading. One feels inclined to retort that Professor Bevan's knowledge of Josephus was "very superficial," and that he wrote "from vague recollections."

In the Septuagint the K'thubim are placed between the historical books and the later prophets.¹ Of course, the Canon of Alexandria was a more elastic thing than that of Jerusalem, still the former was as much Jewish as the latter; if the chronological order were important, and the K'thubim were supposed to be later than the other books, then in the Alexandrian Canon as well as in that of Jerusalem they would have been placed last. Further, the order of Alexandria in regard to the several books is not invariable; still, the three divisions follow the same order generally. This order is that followed by Melito. Nothing, then, can be deduced from the succession of the three parts of the Jewish canon. We do not find any evidence that in the rest of the books there is any attempt at a chronological order. In the Peshitta there is no distinction made between the classes, and the arrangement of the books is highly peculiar—Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Job, Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, 1 and 2 Kings, 1 and 2 Chronicles, Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Ruth, Song of Solomon, Esther, Ezra, Nehemiah, Isaiah, the minor prophets, Jeremiah, Lamentations, Ezekiel, Daniel.

If we take the K'thubim alone, we find one Massoretic order was—Chronicles, Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah. This is the order followed by Spanish manuscripts; the order in our Hebrew Bibles is derived from that followed in German manuscripts. It is Psalms, Proverbs, Job, the five Megilloth (the Song of Solomon, Ruth, Lamentations, Ecclesiastes, Esther), Daniel, Ezra, Nehemiah, Chronicles. It would only be a man very ignorant of chronology who would say that chronology had anything to do with the succession of the books here. In both of these Massoretic orders there is in reality an utter disregard of chronology.

(2) The next question—Why was the Book of Daniel not reckoned among the prophets? Why was it placed among the K'thubim? There is a prior question to be put—Was Daniel not originally placed among the prophets? It must be noted that in the Alexandrian Canon it was among the prophetic books. Such also is its position in the Peshitta. Further, in Josephus's account of the canon he reckons the books twenty-two, and he places only four among the K'thubim, and these he describes in terms that suit Proverbs, Job, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, and perhaps Song of Solomon, but not Daniel. The rest of the books, with the exception of the Law, he ascribes to the prophets. Melito also, whose catalogue of the canonical books seems to be that of the Jews of Asia Minor, places Daniel among the prophets. The question then really is—Why did the Jewish rabbins of the fifth century A.D. place Daniel among the K'thubim? By this time Daniel was being specially appealed to by Christians in their controversies with the Jews, and hence their dogmatic views might afford the reason. But other reasons are not far to seek. Daniel was not a professional prophet. David is called a prophet by Peter in Acts ii. 30, yet his Psalms are among the K'thubim. David was more than a prophet, and his works were not in the prophetic style. Moses was a prophet, yet his books are not included among the prophetic books. If it is said that the Law was more sacred than even the prophets, he was credited by the Rabbinic writers with being the author of Job, and it is placed among the K'thubim. Moses also was more than a prophet.² But even to be the work of a professional prophet was

¹ This is the case with the K'thubim generally, but some books are placed differently, as Ruth among the former, and the Lamentations among the latter prophets—places these books must have occupied in some Jewish catalogue, or the numbers would not have been correct.

² The attempt to rebut this by an appeal to Amos vii. 14 is beside the question; a glance at the original destroys the argument at once. There is no verb in the sentence; it is only

not enough. Lamentations was in ancient days ascribed to Jeremiah, yet the Book of Lamentations is placed among the K'thubim. It is evident there was some other reason why certain books were placed among the K'thubim. It was really the style of composition. We have already seen the difference between the prophetic and apocalyptic styles, and that certainly was enough to make the distinction.

It may be objected that the resemblance between Samuel and Kings on the one side, and Ezra, Nehemiah, and 1 and 2 Chronicles on the other, makes it difficult to understand why the first were reckoned prophetic writings, and the others were placed in the more miscellaneous division of K'thubim. The fact that Ezra, the reputed author of these four last-named books, was a scribe, not a prophet, and that these four books form really one book, may be the reason. If, however, Ezra and his school completed the canon, and this appendix to the canon was added by them, the position occupied by these books is even more easily explicable.

There were thus two reasons at work which might lead to placing any book among the Hagiographa. First, special literary style—that is to say, one differing from that of the prophets. Next, the office of the author, if he were something other than an official prophet. There is thus nothing to be deduced as to the date of Daniel from the position it occupies in the Massoretic canon.

(3) There now comes the second question—Is there any evidence as to the date of Daniel to be drawn from the fact that the book is in the canon? It is clear if we could fix the date at which the canon was closed; then, as Daniel is included in the canon, it must be dated before that event. But further, the date at which the Jews decided that certain books formed, and alone formed, their canon of sacred books, does not determine the latest date at which a book could be admitted to it. The Christian canon is by many regarded as fixed by the Council of Laodiceæ. No one would pretend that any books were admitted into the canon of the Fathers of Laodiceæ which they knew to have been composed but a few years before their own day. If we regard that as spurious, and look to the Third Council of Carthage, still the same thing holds. The books, while thus declared to be canonical, were regarded as having originated some three centuries before. To find the date at which the canon was fixed would only supply a lower limit. This date is very difficult to determine—difficult, that is to say, to any one who will not determine the date simply to suit his prejudices. The date assumed as the latest at which a book had been admitted into the canon is placed without any proof, by Professor Ryle, at B.C. 105—a date which is demonstrably false. The prologue of Siracides was written, at the latest, B.C. 132, not impossibly a century earlier, and at that time the canon was not only fixed, but all the books which composed it had been translated into Greek. Dr. Xavier Kœnig (*La Formation du Canon*) wishes to turn aside the force of the threefold mention of the tripartite division by laying stress on the indefinite and varying name given to the K'thubim. But it would be difficult to translate that term and not seem to assert that this class contained all the scriptural books. The word *K'thubim* was the technical term by which the canonical Scriptures were denoted; it also was the term by which those sacred books were denoted that were neither Law nor prophets. Hence the variation in the phrase by which the younger Siracides denotes them. It would be difficult to imagine this selection and translation

by the logical connection that one can fix the meaning, and that seems clearly to imply that, though Amos had not been of the sons of the prophets, and had received no previous training to fit him to be a prophet when God "took him from behind the flock," yet the Lord called him to prophesy, and to prophesy to Israel, therefore he would not go to prophesy elsewhere. He does not deny that he is a professional prophet; what he does deny is that he had either sought the office himself or had drifted into it from descent.

to have been completed in less than half a century. This would place the formation of the canon as early as a.d. 180; that is to say, fifteen years before the critical date of Daniel.

The other question to which we referred is much more important—What was the principle according to which this selection was made? Dr. König indicates the idea that perhaps these are all the Hebrew books that have survived the period of persecution ('Formation du Canon,' p. 55). This cannot be maintained, else why was Ecclesiasticus excluded from the canon? In his rhetorical fashion, Dean Farrar ('Daniel,' 109) explains the inclusion of Daniel in the canon, while Ecclesiasticus and Wisdom are excluded, "by its intrinsic superiority." He does not show that this would be observable to a Jew of the period of the Maccabees; the literary sense of Jews of that period, judged by their productions, was pretty low. One has only to read Judith to see this. If a person had only the books before him, and knew nothing more, he would be a singular critic who would say that Esther was *immeasurably* superior to even such a book as Tobit, not to speak of the Book of Wisdom, or that Ecclesiastes was *immeasurably* superior to Ecclesiasticus. Any such merely subjective test as this could never have been employed to settle the canon.

In a writer of the first century of our era we have a principle of canonicity laid down which is not liable to objection, and which, it seems to us, is proved to be true by the facts of the case. Josephus ('Contra Apionem') lays down the principle that those books alone were considered canonical which had originated before the end of the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Of course, this only supplies *one* principle of selection. He further asserts that the works included were by prophets. This would imply that the works attributed to David and Solomon were included in the canon because of the prophetic character assigned to their authors.

The first chronological principle explains, and seems to us alone to explain, the reason of the exclusion of the apocryphal books. Ecclesiasticus was often quoted by the Talmudists: why was it excluded? The traditional view—that of Josephus—explains it. If it is said that Ben Sira did not put a famous name at the head of his work, and therefore it was not reckoned canonical, this assertion really admits the principle, and only implies that the Jews were sometimes cheated into misapplying it. But further: on the one hand, the Wisdom of Solomon, and the Books of Enoch had famous names at their head, and Ruth and Esther had not. Why were the latter included in the canon and the former excluded from it? The principle laid down by Josephus would explain it, especially if it had been applied and the canon fixed before the composition of any of these former books. The exclusion of the Book of Tobit appears to us the most irrefragable proof of the truth of Josephus's assertion of the principles underlying the canonicity of the books of the Old Testament. It seems to us impossible to date Tobit later than the end of the Persian Empire, the date assigned to it by Ewald. If so, why was it not included? Simply because it was composed after the canon had been closed. It claimed a much higher antiquity than Daniel, but its claims were not admitted.

It seems, then, that somewhere about the end of the Persian rule, that is to say, about the time the Talmudists place the great synagogue, the canon was fixed. The principles on which they selected the books which were to form the canon seem to have been those laid down by Josephus—that the book must be reputed to have been composed before the death of Artaxerxes Longimanus, and to have been the work of a prophet. If this is granted—and, in the light of the evidence, it is impossible reasonably to resist it—the Book of Daniel must certainly date so much before the end of the Persian period, that its claim to belong to the Babylonian period could not be

challenged at the time. At all events, the date assumed by the critical school, viz. B.C. 165, is definitely to be put aside as clearly false.

3. *Versions of Daniel.* We have four translations, each of which was completed before the Massoretic text of the Hebrew Scriptures was fixed—the Septuagint, Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate in Jerome's edition. There are fragments of the other Greek versions preserved in Field, and fragments of the older Latin versions in the Latin Fathers, noticeably in Tertullian. Of the Latin Fathers, the Africans quote from a version made from the Septuagint.

(1) The *Septuagint*. The history of the Septuagint version of Daniel is very singular. It seems to have been excluded from the Septuagint, and its place filled by that of Theodotion, mainly through the overmastering influence of Origen. That Father found that the differences between the Septuagint version of Daniel and the Hebrew in the Palestinian Recension were very great, and came to the conclusion that the Septuagint Version was corrupt. He had, however, retained it in his Hexapla and Tetrapla, although he put Theodotion in the place of honour in his page which usually the Septuagint Version occupied. It had, however, by the time of the Reformation, utterly disappeared, only in some of the Greek and Latin Fathers there was evidence that they had used another Greek version in their quotations from Daniel than that preserved to us in Theodotion. Most noticeable among these is Justin Martyr, in his 'Dialogue with Trypho.' However, nothing was certain until a manuscript was discovered in the library of the Chigi Palace in Rome which contained this version of Daniel. Magistris the librarian discovered and edited it in 1772. Eight years afterwards a Syriac version of this same version was found in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, by Bagati the librarian. It was found to confirm the authenticity of the Codex Chisianus. This Syriac version had been made by Paulus Tellensis, Jacobite Bishop of Tella, in Mesopotamia, in the beginning of the seventh century. Further confirmation, if such were required, was found in the agreement between this new-found version and the passages quoted in Justin Martyr. The value of this version has been very differently estimated. The great mass of critics have assumed that all the differences between the Massoretic text of Daniel and the Septuagint Version have been caused by variation from his original on the part of the Septuagint translator. The only writer who has given, as it seems to us, this version even approximately the important place it deserves, is Graetz, in an article in the 'Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums,' 1871. We ought also to mention Lenormant, 'La Divination.' At the same time, we must notice a most elaborate assault on this version which has been made by Dr. Gwynn, in his article "Theodotion," in Smith's 'Dictionary of Christian Biography.' His theory is that the Chisian version is produced from the Palestinian text—practically, according to him, the Massoretic—by interpolation and paraphrase. From a coincidence in a single phrase it is concluded that the author of this version was also the author of the version of the latter part of 2 Chronicles and Ezra, which goes by the title of 3 Esdras in the Latin Vulgate (1 Esdras of our English Apocrypha). The main reason which seems to induce him to maintain this view is that he regards the apocryphal additions to Daniel as the product of the translator of this version. We think this, however, is demonstrably false. The apocryphal additions to Daniel, save the Song of the Three Hebrew Children, are in the Septuagint placed away at the end, as if appendices. To make this appear more clearly, there is a note at the end of the twelfth chapter of Daniel in the Chisian Codex before the addition which says, "Daniel, according to LXX., has been copied from an exemplar having the subscription, 'Copied from the Tetrapla, with which it has been collated.'" Then come 'Susanna' and 'Bel,' which is entitled "From the prophecy

of Ambakoum (Habakkuk), son of Jesus of the tribe of Levi." This would seem to indicate that these additions were not in the Tetrapla, but were placed there by the copyist. The same phenomenon is presented in Bugati's edition of 'Paulus Tellensis.' The Song of the Three Holy Children is on a different footing, as it is, or they are (for there are two distinct compositions united in it), translations from Hebrew or Aramaic. If, notwithstanding this, these additions were found only in the Septuagint Version, something might still be said for attributing these additions to it alone, but they are found in Theodotion and the Peshitta as much as in the Septuagint. They are not transferred from the Septuagint to Theodotion, for they occupy a different position, in regard to the canonical Daniel in Theodotion, from that they occupy in the Septuagint, and the text of the additions is different. It seems in the highest degree gratuitous to assert that the Septuagint Version is the source. Further, such a change as "Abiesdri" instead of "Ashpenaz" is not to be explained on the above hypothesis. But further, two reasons are assigned for this falsification—the author desired to make better Greek than what would result from a literal version, and to support the courage of his compatriots in their struggle against Epiphanes yet more than the canonical text did. Neither of these aims is at all obvious when one goes over the whole of the Septuagint and compares it with the Massoretic text. If the reader compares the fifth chapter of Daniel in the Septuagint Version with that in the Massoretic text, he will find the Septuagint is much the shorter; and further, while the additional sections in the Massoretic text have all the look of rhetorical amplifications, the omissions cannot be explained as the result of any bias on the part of the translator. In some cases the amplification is on the side of the Septuagint, though not so generally. There are, however, cases of "doublets"—where two different versions of the same Hebrew passage are placed together; these may at times seem amplifications, but in almost all cases they betray their real origin. In some cases the Septuagint gives a slavishly accurate rendering of the Massoretic Hebrew, and the next verse, it may be, is very wide of the Hebrew; in such cases the natural deduction is that the Hebrew from which the Septuagint was translated was not the Massoretic. In not a few cases the difference may be explained by the likeness of letters, especially in the script of Egypt, about B.C. 120. Near the beginning of the first century B.C. the square character was introduced, but the differences can be more easily explained by the earlier letters.

"It seems to us impossible to resist the conclusion that the Septuagint Version represents a text very different from that of the Massoretes. The frequency with which the differences may be explained from resemblances in the older mode of writing indicates that this translation was made at latest one hundred years B.C. The frequent occurrence of those double renderings referred to above indicates that the manuscript which Origen embodied in his Tetrapla had been copied from one which had been gone over either by a scholar, who supplied in the margin the renderings of the Hebrew which he thought preferable, or by one who had the loan of another version of Daniel, and transferred the renderings of this other version to the margin of his own copy when they seemed to him striking. The former supposition appears to us to be the simplest explanation of the phenomena. We need not stay to give instances of those differences to which we have referred, as we shall notice them as they occur in the text. We may say the same thing in regard to the "doublets" of which we spoke above. While we have said above that the mode of writing indicates that this translation had been made at least a century before our era, the prologue to Siracides renders it certain that at the latest by B.C. 132 it was established in use among the Greek-speaking population of Egypt.

(2) *Theodotion*. The writer of this version belonged, according to one account, to Ephesus; according to another, to Pontus, in Asia Minor. His object was not to make a completely new translation, but rather to amend the extant version so as to bring it into close agreement with the Hebrew text then prevalent. Dr. Gwynn, in his article in Smith and Wace's 'Dictionary of Christian Biography,' argues that the approximate date of Theodotion is A.D. 180. Fritzsche ("Bibelübersetzungen," Herzog's 'Real-Encyclopædia') declares for an earlier date, thinking that the points in which Justin Martyr differs from the LXX. are all those which agree with Theodotion (which is scarcely the case), and that Justin, therefore, must have known Theodotion. The change may, however, be explained by the efforts of copyists to conform Justin to the version received by the Church. From these resemblances in the quotations from Daniel in Justin Martyr to Theodotion's version, Dr. Gwynn would argue that there was another version of Daniel which had an equal claim with that placed by Origen in the Hexapla to be reckoned that of the Seventy. This is, we think, confirmed by quotations in Irenæus, Clement of Rome, etc. On the other hand, Justin Martyr and the Latin Fathers of Africa quote, with slight variations, from the Septuagint.¹ If Theodotion's version were formed on a translation of Daniel current in Asia Minor, the phenomena would be explicable. Tradition declares Theodotion to have belonged to Asia Minor, and to Asia Minor Irenæus also belonged. The version of Theodotion is much closer to the present Massoretic text than the Septuagint version of Daniel. Yet there are several cases of very considerable divergence. These divergences cannot be explained by the influence of the old Septuagint, for the fact that there was another Greek version of Daniel in use rendered it much less potent. The most natural supposition is that the Hebrew text to which Theodotion harmonized his Greek version was considerably removed from the present Massoretic. These divergences from the present received Hebrew text are noticed as they occur in the following commentary.

(3) *The Peshitta*. The date of this version is doubtful, but we think that it cannot be placed later than the last quarter of the second century. It is universally recognized that the claim Ephrem Syrus makes for the version as a whole, that it is taken directly from the Hebrew, is true. That this is true of Daniel appears, on careful examination, to be thoroughly confirmed. It is yet closer to the Massoretic text than Theodotion, though even it varies at times very considerably from the present received Hebrew text. We have endeavoured to make use of this version throughout the ensuing commentary, and in some cases have been led to a different reading by consideration of its rendering. The fact that, although the Peshitta is nearly contemporary with the version of Theodotion, it presupposes a Hebrew text nearer the Massoretic, implies that the Massoretic activity had already commenced in Babylon.

(4) *The Vulgate*. The Latin Version as revised by Jerome. As Jerome made his version under the guidance of Jewish rabbins, it is to be expected that his version would exhibit a close adherence to the Hebrew text as received among the Jews of the fifth century. While this is the case generally, he varies from the present Massoretic text in a few places. These we have taken notice of as they occur. This proves that, even so late as the days of Jerome, the Massoretic text had not quite reached fixity.

The other versions, the Coptic and the Arabic, we have not made use of, as they are too late to have any evidential value.

The Massoretic text, we thus see, has no claim to antiquity in its present form. Throughout the Old Testament the relationship between the Q'ri and K'thib—"that

¹ Clement of Alexandria quotes with such freedom that it is impossible to say from which version he quotes.

which is read" and "that which is written"—indicates in general the coalescence of two different schools of readings. In making this statement, we are putting on the one side those cases where the Q'ri is due to reasons of propriety or reverence. On the whole, the differences between Q'ri and K'thib, in regard to the Aramaic of Daniel, indicate, as we have noticed above, that the K'thib is the more Eastern of the two recensions. This variation between the Q'ri and the K'thib at once dissipates any superstitious reverence for the Massoretic text that might linger in the mind even after a consideration of the widely different text suggested by a study of the versions.

It is obvious that a necessary preliminary to a commentary on Daniel is the fixation of the text on which the commentary is to be based. In the subsequent work we have endeavoured to form a text of each successive verse before we have interpreted it. In doing this we have placed great weight on the reading that appeared to be behind the Septuagint. As the Massoretic text cannot date earlier than the end of the fifth century, the Septuagint represents a text fully six hundred years older. Certainly there have been interpolators at work in the Septuagint, but the Septuagint is not the only field of their operations. We find almost certain evidence of their misdirected activity in the Massoretic text.

IV. COMMENTARIES ON DANIEL.

The idea of commenting on the books of the Bible is one that sprang up early among Christians. Among those of the Old Testament none has had a larger share of attention, and few were earlier commented on, than the Book of Daniel. One of the earliest of the patristic commentaries is that of Hippolytus. He occupies himself entirely with the visions. It is to be noted that he regards the fourth empire as the Roman—a view earlier maintained in 4 Esdras. The next we may note is Ephrem Syrus, whose commentary forms part of the voluminous edition of his works published in Rome. He is singular among the Fathers and early Jewish writers in maintaining the fourth empire to be the Greek. It would almost necessarily be the case that before the Romans, under Pompey, conquered Jerusalem, the fourth empire would be looked upon as that of Epiphanes. Later Jewish commentators, smarting under Mohammedan oppression, made the Saracen empire the fourth, and regarded the Roman as a continuance of the Greek. Most important of all ancient commentators is Jerome. Chiefly through his refutation of Porphyry's views have we any knowledge of that early assault on Daniel, and on Christianity through Daniel; the positions of Porphyry have been taken up by writers who would be insulted did any one accuse them of wishing to assail Christianity. It is perfectly true Porphyry might be correct in his premisses, but mistaken in his conclusions; hence modern commentators may accept the former, while rejecting the latter. Throughout mediæval times there were many Christian commentaries on the Book of Daniel, but they are nearly utterly valueless to the modern commentator. Mediæval Jewish commentaries are not of much greater value. They were mainly engaged in the prophetic part in covert assaults on Christians and Mohammedans. The most important of these are Saadia the Gaon, Kimchi, Rashi, Aben Ezra, and Jephthah-ben-Ali.

At the time of the Reformation there were several commentaries on Daniel issued; of these the most important is that of Calvin. It has much of that writer's keen exegetic insight, but its usefulness is lessened by the fact that it is so largely hortatory, moreover of necessity Calvin knew nothing of the Septuagint Version, and therefore was without one of our main helps to the attainment of a true text of Daniel. After

his day commentaries on Daniel published by Protestants were mainly directed against the Papacy, and the commentators occupied themselves with calculations as to the time of its fall. Some later Romanist commentaries equally directed themselves against the Protestant powers; but others, as Cornelius à Lapide, maintain the fulfilment to be far in the future. Of the former a very favourable example is Sir Isaac Newton's 'Observations on the Prophecies of Daniel and the Apocalypse of St. John,' a little later is Bishop Newton's 'Dissertations.'

With the beginning of this century began the critical assault on Daniel. Bertholdt's commentary was the first assailant of a really thorough-going character. He maintained that there were *nine* authors. Eichhorn, De Wette, Bleek, and others followed on the same side. These, abandoning the manifoldness of authorship, maintained that our Book of Daniel was the product of a time when the voices of the prophets had become fainter (*matter*) and fainter, and at last had altogether ceased; that it was the product of the time of Epiphanes. These views were combated by Hengstenberg, Auberlen, Hävernick, in Germany. The discoveries of Layard and Botta in Nineveh made a vast change on the line of assault and defence. Every new discovery in Nineveh or Babylon was hailed by both parties as supporting its own view. Meantime the critical school have certainly secured the ear of the public. At the beginning of the more recent period in the history of the interpretation of Daniel, the critical school were denounced, especially in this country, as opponents of Christianity. In reaction against this unjustifiable assault on their Christianity, the critical school, now that they have got the advantage, will practically not give their opponents a hearing. Characteristic of the first period is Pusey's 'Lectures on Daniel,' very learned, but somewhat confused. The author is always very sure of his own correctness, though sometimes he is not to be trusted in his references to his opponents. One thing he seems to have done—demolished the attempt to prove a difference between the Aramaic of Daniel and that of Ezra. Characteristic of the latter period is Dean Farrar's 'Daniel,' in the Expositor's Bible Series, wonderful for its assumption of learning and for its marvellous blunders—for its contempt of all opponents and its self-contradictions.

Of the commentaries since the date of Babylonian discoveries on the conservative side, the most considerable have been Rose and Fuller, in the 'Speaker's Commentary;' Keil, in Keil and Delitzsch's 'Bibelwerk;' Zöckler, in Lange (especially under the American editor). Lenormant ('La Divination') gives an estimate of Daniel, and the historicity of the opening chapters. Dr. Charles H. H. Wright, in his introduction, and in various other writings, maintains the orthodox position with much skill and learning. Kliefoth and Kranichfeld and Caspari also maintain the orthodox standpoint. The most recent work on that side is Anderson's 'Coming Prince.' On the other side are Hitzig, who has a desire to find Persian elements in every name; Ewald, dogmatic but clear-sighted; Meinhold, who admits that the historic portion must date before the Maccabean period. The most recent contributors to the interpretation of Daniel from the critical side are Professor Bevan and Dr. Behrmann. Professor Bevan manifests at times a decided bias, but, apart from this, he is scholarly and fair-minded. Behrmann is very fair, although he maintains the critical position, and at the same time is accurate and scholarly. One of the most noteworthy books on the critical side in regard to this question, as in regard to all questions of Old Testament Introduction, is Canon Driver's 'Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament.'

To a great extent the two schools never meet, for the real reasons for belief in the authenticity of Daniel and disbelief of it never come into court. On the one side, in many minds the real reason for maintaining the authenticity of Daniel is that they

fear for Christianity itself. They have formulated their ideas of the truth; their notions are like Prince Rupert's drops—a scientific toy of old days. In their eyes, break off the smallest portion of them, and they sink into dust. In others it is the unwillingness that many minds have to research; they must follow some one, and for the time they are on the orthodox side; they are now drifting to the critical side.

On the other hand, in the case of many on the critical side, the historical and linguistic objections paraded forth hide what is the real and insoluble objection—the presence of miracle. Many of the critical school seem as if they were not conscious of this latent motive, yet in many ways it manifests itself. Closely connected with miracle is prophecy, and to that idea, too, they have an invincible repugnance. The fourth empire *must* be the Greek, for if it be not, then there is, even on the assumption of the latest date permissible, a prophecy, a foretelling. The Messiah cut off *must* be Onias III., who, as probably as not, died in his bed, because otherwise there might be a “foretelling” of Christ. The attitude thus taken up is eminently unscientific. To approach any problem with a determination to exclude all features that cause difficulty is the very reverse of scientific.

V. DIFFICULTIES IN REGARD TO DANIEL

We have already noticed the latent objection to the authenticity of Daniel, the ostensible objections we consider in regard to the passages on which they are founded. We shall, however, rapidly gather them together and look at them. For convenience we shall follow the order in which Dean Farrar has collected these alleged “difficulties” in his recent ‘Commentary on Daniel.’

(1) There is an alleged anachronism. In the first verse of Daniel it is asserted that Nebuchadnezzar received the submission of Jerusalem in the third year of Jehoiakim; and this is alleged to contradict Jer. xxv. 1, which synchronizes the first year of Nebuchadnezzar with the *fourth* of Jehoiakim. The members of the critical school who advance that objection forget to tell us that the clause in Jeremiah on which they base their objection is not found in the Septuagint. Further, the critics assume a siege and plunder of Jerusalem and of the temple, although the narrative says nothing of this, and then declare the narrative to be false, because of this plundering which they have imagined.

(2) Belteshazzar is said to be named “according to the name of my god” (ch. iv. 8), whereas the received interpretation of *Balatzu-utzur* does not contain any divine name. It never suggests itself to these critics, that as the LXX. and Theodotion call him always “Balthazar,” giving him the same name as they give King Belshazzar, the form in our Hebrew Bibles is due to the defacing instinct which led them to write “Manasseh” instead of “Moses” in Judg. xviii. 30.¹ We need not speak of the other names in this section; we speak of them in the places where they occur.

(3) “The second year of Nebuchadnezzar” (ch. ii. 1). This statement is assumed to contradict ch. i. 5, where “three years” is fixed as the duration of the period of training assigned to the Jewish youths. If this contradiction be maintained to be absolute, then Daniel cannot be “a religious novel,” as Dean Farrar maintains—the two conflicting notes of time are too close to each other in the narrative not to have

¹ The Vulgate here follows the Greek versions. The Peshitta denominates the prophet Belteshazzar and the king Beleeshazzar, but in ch. vii. 1 the name of the king is spelt in the same way as that of the prophet.

been observed by the author. Again, the date may have been altered through the blunder of a copyist, as Ewald thinks. This, however, is a difficulty only to those who deny the statement of Berosus that Nebuchadnezzar made the expedition to Syria before he became king, and forget that the years of a Babylonian king's reign dated from the new year after his accession. Moreover, the training of those hostages may have begun before the death of Nabopolassar. If these things are borne in mind, the second year of Nebuchadnezzar, when nearing its close, might coincide with the close of the third year of the training of the Hebrew youths.

(4) Chaldeans, as a class of magicians, "is an immense anachronism." But the reader may see under the verses where the words are alleged to occur, grave reason for doubting whether the word actually belongs to the text. It seems to a certain extent probable that it is an intrusion from the margin.

(5) The fifth objection, "Arioch," is not really an objection, even in Dean Farrar's eyes. The dean sees great difficulty in the fact that Arioch introduces Daniel to the king as if he had discovered him; while in the end of the previous chapter the king had found Daniel "ten times better than all the magicians," etc. The dean forgets that this want of unity is against the idea of a novel—which he advocates. It does not occur to him that the difficulty may be removed by regarding the incident related in the second chapter as the occasion when Nebuchadnezzar discovered the ability of Daniel and his companions.

(6, 7) The worship given to Daniel and accepted by him forms a greater difficulty to those who will have us believe Daniel is the ideal of a Jew in a heathen court, formed by "a pious Chasid" of the time of the Maccabees. Everything that makes his conduct inexplicable on the highest moral grounds is an argument *against* the book being a novel of such an origin, and *for* it being a true history. A contemporary historian often omits explanations which after-times desiderate, simply because the explanation is obvious to him.

(8) Dean Farrar is quite sure that the Babylonian priests formed a caste. We do not think there is evidence of this. But to be over "the wise men" was not to be head of the priests. Further, even to be "over the priests" did not necessarily imply being a priest. In France and Russia, the head of the government department that is over the priesthood is not himself a priest.

(9) The omission of Daniel from those who refused worship to the golden image is just one of the difficulties which it is incumbent on Dean Farrar to explain on the hypothesis that Daniel is a religious novel. The alleged Greek names of musical instruments are discussed more fully elsewhere, and shown either not to be Greek or not to have been in the original text.

(10) We shall notice here the alleged monotheistic decrees which Dean Farrar has taken up under different headings. All these form difficulties only to those who have not studied the phenomena of heathenism, or at all events have not apprehended its bearing on such proclamations as those before us. The heathen of one nation never had much difficulty in acknowledging that the god or gods of another nation were really divine beings, with power to hurt, and with the right to be worshipped. The policy pursued by Nabunahid, but reversed by Cyrus, of bringing the gods of all the subject cities into Babylon, proceeded on this idea. Punishment is decreed against any one who should speak disrespectfully of the God of the Jews. No order is issued for sacrifice and worship to be given to Jehovah alone.

(11) Dean Farrar says incorrectly that Belshazzar is somewhat emphatically called the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and quotes ch. v. 11, in which verse the word "son" does not at all occur. Certainly Nebuchadnezzar is called "his father." The emphasis

is wholly in Dean Farrar's imagination. He knows that Jehu is called "the son of Omri" in the inscription of Shalmaneser II., when he was simply his successor. Dr. Hugo Winckler ('Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte,' p. 53, note) tells us that "'son,' after the name of Chaldean princes, is only to be taken in the sense of belonging to the dynasty of —."

(12) "In that night was Belshazzar King of the Chaldeans slain." This verse is not in the Septuagint. The siege of Babylon and its capture by assault, imagined by Dr. Sayce and Dean Farrar to be related in Daniel, is neither narrated nor implied. The whole difficulty is due to the inveterate inaccuracy of the dean and to the hastiness of the doctor. Dean Farrar objects that Belshazzar was not king; but if he was not "king," he performed all the functions of king, and had prayers put up for him as if he were joint king with his father, although certainly the dates of the contract tables are reckoned by his father's reign, as they are even in some cases after Cyrus is on the throne.

(13) In the case of Darius the Mede we admit there are difficulties. We have elsewhere submitted the evidence which has led us to suppose that Gobryas is intended. Dean Farrar is quite sure "Gobryas" was a Persian. His son Mardonius is called a Mede by Nepos. The newly discovered history of Cyrus renders it very doubtful what constituted a Persian. *Parsua* seems to have been little more than a canton, like *Ansan*, belonging sometimes to Elam, sometimes to Media. All these cantons had "kings," and these kings retained their titles in after-life, although their kingship was merely honorary.

(14) He is called "the son of Ahasuerus." We do not know who the father of Gobryas was; he might have been called Ahasuerus. Surely Dean Farrar does not need to be told of the carelessness of the Jews in regard to proper names. Thus in Joseph ben Gorion "Epiphanes" appears as *עופאן*, a mode of writing "Vespasianus."

(15) This last historical objection is the assumption that as the writer only mentions "four kings of Persia," he only knew of "four." If we suppose that to the prophet only "four" kings were made known, that is nothing against the authenticity of that portion of the book. We know Alexander the Great defended his invasion of Persia on the ground that it was a reprisal for the invasion of Greece by Xerxes. In that case it was quite natural, in a sketch of history, to leap from Xerxes to Alexander.

We have followed the catalogue of difficulties presented to us by Dean Farrar, because it is the most recent, and also because from the reputation of the author it is likely to be very popular, not that we would do the critical school the injustice of regarding him as in any sense their representative. The brevity of our answers to these objections is to be explained and excused by the fact that each and all are considered again in the commentary which follows.

There are other alleged historical difficulties besides those mentioned above; but these also we consider in connection with passages involved. The only one of these we would notice here is the alleged reference to a formed canon in ch. ix. 2, "I Daniel understood by books." Critics forget to tell us that *hass'phareem* is rarely used for the books of the canon; it is generally *hakh'thoobeem*. They also forget to inform us that *hass'phareem* might mean simply "the letter," and refer to the letter of Jeremiah the prophet, to which references are made elsewhere in the chapter.

VI. CONCLUSION.

As our readers will have seen, the Introduction to Daniel is in the main a discussion of the question of its authenticity. Let us, in conclusion, sum up the results we have reached. There are two clearly marked parties—the traditional and the critical. The one, the traditional party, maintain that the Book of Daniel is a record of facts, in the main vouched for by Daniel himself, who, according to the traditional view, is an actual historic character. The other, the critical party, declare the Book of Daniel to be a religious novel, written in the days of the Maccabees. Its purpose is to encourage the Jews in their conflict against Epiphanes. For this object the writer exhibits Epiphanes under the names of Nebuchadnezzar, Belshazzar, and Darius the Mede, and in the person of Daniel presents us with the picture of the ideal Jew in the court of a heathen prince. Daniel is chosen because his name indicates the character, or because the characteristics assigned to Daniel in the prophecy of Ezekiel suit the position the author wishes to represent his ideal Jew occupying. Further, the history of Daniel is modelled on that of Joseph.

It is clear that the critical school have recognized that it is not enough merely to assail the traditional position; that it is necessary to supply some explanation of the origin of the book assailed. It is a supposable case that the negative part of the critical contention might be proved, while the positive remained doubtful. But a close inspection of the argument and position of the critical school at once shows us that the two sides of their case are intimately connected. Were "Daniel" not written in the Maccabean period, then that period was prophesied of, and one of the main reasons for critics taking up their present position in regard to the Book of Daniel would be gone. On the other hand, tradition has always some value. The critical school sometimes seem to assume that if a book is said by tradition to have been written by one person at one time, that is a reason for saying that it was written at another time and by a totally different person. A rigid application of this tacit principle would deprive us of all our classics, Greek and Roman. We, then, can claim that the critical school have failed if they do not establish both parts of their case, even though the traditional school be not able to advance any strong positive arguments on their own behalf. They have merely to maintain the defence.

With the facts before us which we have just presented to our readers, it seems impossible to resist the conclusion that the case against the authenticity of Daniel has broken down. If we take the first portion of the critical contention, that the Book of Daniel is a religious novel, we find that it presents none of the characteristics that are present in successful productions of this class. The fact that one portion of it is written in one language, while another portion is written in another, is strongly against this view. Further, the incidents narrated do not suit the alleged purpose of the book, viz. to encourage the Jews in their armed opposition to Epiphanes; they would prompt to passive, not active, resistance. It cannot be maintained that Nebuchadnezzar is a portrait of Epiphanes. The character ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar is utterly unlike that ascribed to Epiphanes in the book itself. The feelings caused by the character and conduct of Nebuchadnezzar are utterly unlike those occasioned by the deeds of Antiochus. The assertion that the madness ascribed to Nebuchadnezzar is due to the alleged nickname given to Epiphanes is disproved, as it is shown that there is no evidence that this nickname ever was given to Antiochus Epiphanes. As little are Belshazzar or Darius the Mede portraits of Antiochus. It cannot be intended to represent the ideal of a pious Jew in a heathen court, as many of the incidents do not

easily fit into this idea. We have an account of the hero's three friends being cast into the fiery furnace because they will not be guilty of idol-worship; but we have no explanation given us why Daniel was not beside his three friends. To mention no more, every pious Jew of the time of the Maccabees would regard the return of the captives to their own land as the greatest event of the reign of Cyrus. Daniel is represented neither as urging on Cyrus the advisability of permitting the Jews to return, nor of aiding them in availing themselves of this permission when granted. Far less is Daniel himself represented as returning. The story of an ideal Jew in the court of Cyrus would not have omitted some reference to this great event, or failed to exhibit the relation his hero bore to it. We have further seen this story cannot have been written to suit the meaning of the name, or to the character ascribed to the historic Daniel in Ezekiel. As little can the incidents here be modelled on those in the life of Joseph. We are thus obliged to decide Daniel not to be an historical religious novel. If not a novel, it would seem necessary to hold that it must be true.

If we now consider the date ascribed to this book by the critical school, we think their case has broken down here too. If we take the argument from language, we find that the Hebrew of the Book of Daniel, when compared with that of Siracides, is much older. We know that Ecclesiasticus was written at latest a dozen years earlier than the critical date of Daniel. We have seen that the words whose presence is regarded as proof of the recency of Daniel are either not recent or have no right to be in the text. We thus see that the critical case, so far as the argument from the Hebrew is concerned, has failed. As to the Aramaic, which is asserted to be recent and Western, whereas it should be ancient and Eastern, the probative force of the instances brought forward is weakened by the evidences of a process of modernization and Occidentalization having gone on. On the other hand, there seem to be survivals in the Massoretic of an earlier text, which had not the recent or Western characteristics we now find in it. The alleged presence of Greek words has not been proved. Hence we may claim that the linguistic case against Daniel has not been made good.

When we turn from internal to external evidence, the case for the relative antiquity of Daniel seems strong. The four horns of Zechariah and the prayer of Nehemiah would be acknowledged as due to the influence of Daniel, were none of the books involved Biblical. The middle portion of Enoch would not be placed later than B.C. 210, were it not needful to do so to avoid proving Daniel early. If the Book of Baruch is to be dated, with Ewald, in the Persian period, then Daniel must be as early, as Baruch is clearly borrowed from it. We may neglect the reference to the horns in the Sibylline Oracles. The weight of evidence seems to us strong in favour of an early date.

Any fair estimate of the fact that Daniel is in the canon, we have seen, points also to the early date of Daniel. On the criterion laid down by Josephus, the Book of Daniel must have been believed, by those who fixed the canon, to have been written before the days of Artaxerxes Longimanus. Nothing antagonistic to Daniel's claims can be deduced from the place it occupies in the canon. It is incumbent on critics—if they maintain that, while Daniel was a recent book, it was yet imagined to be ancient when the canon was formed—to show how that took place. If they could point to any tradition in First Maccabees, or even Second Maccabees, valueless as it is, or Josephus, though he is late, that the Book of Daniel had been discovered in the recesses of the temple, or in some cave beyond Jordan, then its reception into the canon would be explicable. The First Book of Maccabees was written about half a century after the heat of the Maccabean struggle. Daniel was so well known that the author felt it no anachronism to tell, as probably he had been told, that Mattathias

referred to the incidents in the Book of Daniel on his deathbed. Had there been any story of the discovery of the Book of Daniel, the dying scene of Mattathias would have been differently recorded. A case for the origin of Daniel being, at all events, earlier than the Maccabean period, might be made out, as shown above, from the mistakes of the Septuagint, as they are seen to be due to a mode of writing that ceased about that period.

The alleged contradictions of history in Daniel have all been shown to be due either to mistakes in regard to the meaning of Daniel or to the facts of history.

We therefore claim that the attempted disproof of the authenticity of Daniel has completely failed.

NOTE ON THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED FRAGMENT OF ECCLESIASTICUS.

Since the above Introduction was not only in type, but stereotyped, the question of the Hebrew of Daniel has entered into a new phase—Mrs. Gibson and Mrs. Lewis have added to the debt which Biblical science owes them by discovering a fragment of the Hebrew text of Ecclesiasticus. It is a portion of the thirty-ninth chapter of that book. This discovery, important in itself, has led to the further discovery at Oxford of nine more leaves of the same manuscript as that to which this fragment belongs, and almost continuous with it. The importance of the character of the Hebrew in which the Book of Ben Sira was written cannot be minimized, although the critics, who will have it that Daniel is late, have maintained a discreet silence on the question, notwithstanding the numerous quotations from it in rabbinic literature. The fragment adds a great deal to our knowledge of the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, and I would venture to add a few words on the bearing it has on the discussion above of the same question in the light only of the rabbinic quotations. In doing so, I hope my readers will consider my situation—in Palestine, away from public libraries, and liable always to have books, periodicals, and newspapers from Europe delayed, if not seized, by the Turkish postal authorities. I am thus very much handicapped in my study of this question. Through the kindness of Mrs. Gibson, I received a copy of the proof-sheets of Dr. Schechter's article in the *Expositor* of July, 1896, with his edition of the text and translation; she kindly also enclosed Canon Driver's article in the *Guardian*, July 1, 1896. I had also forwarded to me the August number of the *Expositor* for 1896, with the article of Professor Margoliouth. I understand Professor Neubauer will shortly publish the nine leaves which he discovered in Oxford; but, unfortunately, I cannot wait till it reaches me, and must draw my information from what Canon Driver has said in the *Guardian*. The date of the manuscript cannot, according to Dr. Schechter, be later than the beginning of the twelfth century. This was the time when Hebrew learning was most flourishing—the age of Rashi and Aben Ezra.

The first thing that strikes the reader is that many of the later peculiarities which are present in all the Talmudic quotations, are absent—a fact that is noted by Canon Driver. The Hebrew of the fragment is thus liker classical Hebrew than the Hebrew of the quotations. The question that must be decided, then, really is—Which is the better evidence? In considering this, we must bear in mind the late date of this manuscript, and the comparatively early date of the Talmudic quotations. Further, we must take account of the habits of the Talmudists in quotation. When they quote with the formula, "As it is written in the book of," they are usually scrupulously accurate, however flagrantly inaccurate they may be in other matters. Above, I restricted my study of the Hebrew of Ben Sira to such passages. It is perfectly true

that, as a rule, the evidence of a manuscript is to be preferred to that of a quotation; yet there are many exceptions to this rule. Thus, in regard to the doxology at the end of the Lord's Prayer, the uncial manuscript L, dated by Tregelles in the ninth century—i.e. three centuries earlier than the manuscript before us—has the doxology; but Tertullian, 'De Orations,' quotes each sentence of the prayer, but omits the doxology. Here the evidence of the quotation is clearly right, and the manuscript clearly wrong. Further, there is sometimes a tendency in a copyist to amend the language of the writer he is copying, and conform it to a classic standard; thus in 1 Cor. xv. 33 we have in the Receptus $\chi\eta\sigma\tau\alpha$ changed into $\chi\eta\sigma\theta$. It is at least a possibility that this manuscript represents a classically amended recension. There are a large number of various readings placed in the margin of the manuscript before us, which indicates an uncertainty as to the true reading—precisely the state of matters when the editorial copyist would feel himself free to exercise his skill. This suspicion is confirmed by the way that at times all the versions are united against the text of the manuscript before us. To take the second verse of the fragment—the first cited by Canon Driver—it begins $\text{מַעֲשֵׂה אֱלֹהִים בְּרַב מִכֹּחַ}$. In regard to this clause, all the versions unite in adding a qualifying adverb to the adjective, the Greek adds $\sigma\phi\delta\epsilon\rho\alpha$, the Syriac (ܠܚܕܝܐ) , and the Latin *valde*. The Latin is here independent of the Greek; the verse equivalent to this is not, as in the Greek and Syriac, the sixteenth, but the twenty-first, and, moreover, the Latin wants the latter half of the verse. The fact that the Syriac adverb here used means "together," led Professor Margoliouth to think that an Aramaic word—very like the Syriac one—which means "very," had stood there. For our part, the preponderance of evidence seems in favour of Professor Margoliouth's contention that there is a word omitted in the text of the manuscript, and that word was Aramaic. For further argument in this line we must refer the reader to Professor Margoliouth's article in the *Expositor* for August, 1896. Our contention may be supported by another argument. If the text of the recently discovered fragment accurately represents the original of Ben Sira, and if we can fix the date of a document by its language, then Ecclesiasticus must have been written a long while before Ecclesiastes. Canon Driver says of the language of this fragment, "Instead of being more debased than that of Ecclesiastes, it is considerably less so." If, then, debasement of language be a proof of late date, and the want of it of an early date, then Ecclesiastes must have been written considerably later than the Book of Ben Sira, not, as Canon Driver modestly says, "about the same time." But the Greek title given to the translation, presumably by the translator himself, the grandson of the author, implies that he regarded his grandfather's book as an imitation of Ecclesiastes. From this two things follow—first, that Ecclesiastes had been so long translated into Greek that its position was quite assured,—therefore that its Hebrew original must be very much older than that of Ben Sira; second, that the Hebrew of Ben Sira must have been like that of Ecclesiastes. Hence it follows that the difference of the language in the fragment before us from that of Ecclesiastes is due either to classical emendation of Ecclesiasticus or to corruption of Ecclesiastes. The first seems the simpler hypothesis in the light of the quotations from Ben Sira in the Talmud. If both texts are approximately in their primitive condition, then the absurd result follows that Ecclesiastes was at the same time very much earlier and very much later than Ecclesiasticus.

At the same time, Canon Driver does admit that there are three late non-Biblical words in this fragment. One of these is the frequent word in rabbinic, פֶּנַי , "business," another is הִתְחַנֵּן , "to supply," and הִתְחַנֵּן , "contention." As the reader of the above Introduction will see, the Hebrew words in Daniel, otherwise unexampled in

Scripture, are reduced to *two*. The Hebrew portion of Daniel is considerably longer than this fragment, yet it has fewer unexampled words. He mentions other two words as common to this fragment and the later parts of the Old Testament. Only one of these occurs in Daniel, and it also occurs in Ezekiel. If Canon Driver had extended over this fragment the line that some critics have extended over Daniel, he should have found several more, *e.g.* קקב in the singular; it appears only in the plural in the Bible. Canon Driver says, speaking of the nine Oxford leaves, that "the *waw* 'conversive' occurs several times." He does not notify his readers of the fact that the *waw* "conversive" is the regular usage in Daniel, save in ch. xi., which is spurious. He says there are no new Hebrew idioms. Against this Professor Margoliouth has shown several distinct Aramaisms, *e.g.* ריחשן, "beasts of teeth." Aramaisms have a very different meaning as evidence of age in Ben Sira from what they ought to have in Daniel. By hypothesis Daniel was a man to whom Aramaic was the every-day speech, but Siracides was resident in Jerusalem. Any person situated as Daniel was—living among foreigners, and using commonly their tongue, especially if that tongue was cognate to his own—would almost of necessity introduce foreign words into his own language when he used it. Siracides was not in these circumstances. Greek had probably, to a large extent, dispossessed Aramaic as a business language. Hebrew had become a sacred literary tongue, and in that case the Aramaisms in it had already got embedded there before the advent of the Greek supremacy. Canon Driver adverts to the fact that the longer form of the relative is used in the Oxford leaves; in the quotations it is always the short form that appears. Canon Driver does not, however, notify his readers that the short form of the relative *never* appears in Daniel. One point which Canon Driver minimizes is the fact that in the fragment we have evidence that the distinction between ם and ם had been lost by the time Ben Sira was writing—a distinction maintained in full force in Daniel.

I do not feel myself competent to give a judgment on the metrical question which has been introduced into this discussion by Professor Margoliouth. My acquaintance with Arabic versification is too rudimentary. While Dr. Driver is quite sure that this fragment confirms Professor Nöldeke's condemnation of Professor Margoliouth's theory, in the *Expositor* for August 1896 Professor Margoliouth maintains that this fragment confirms his theory. To one with only a superficial knowledge of his metrical scheme, he seems to make out a very fair case. He says, "A great many verses suit the metrical scheme exactly," some of those cases being instances where the versions could not have helped the student to make the discovery. He admits that in many cases the lines do not suit, but these he maintains with great show of reason—arguing from the versions—are corrupt. There are others where he admits that neither the text of the fragment nor that of the versions gives a metrical line, but in these cases he maintains both are corrupt.

Thus, even in the light of this new fragment of the text of Ben Sira, I do not feel compelled to alter my former decision.

SAFED, PALESTINE,
August, 1896.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER I

VERS. 1—7.—OCCASION OF DANIEL BEING IN BABYLON.

VER. 1.—In the third year of the reign of Jehoiakim King of Judah. After the defeat and death of Josiah, the people of the land put on the throne Jehoahaz, or Shallum (Jer. xxii. 11), one of the sons of their late monarch (2 Kings xxiii. 30). We see, by comparing 2 Kings xxiii. 31 with ver. 36, that in taking Jehoahaz to be their king they had passed over the law of primogeniture. The reason of this would not unlikely be that he represented the policy of his father Josiah, which may have meant the preference of a Babylonian to an Egyptian alliance. Dean Farrar thinks his warlike prowess might be the reason of the popular preference (Ezek. xix. 3). Whatever was the reason of popular preference, Pharaoh-Necho, on his return from his victorious campaign against the Hittites and the Babylonians, deposed him, and carried him down to Egypt. Necho placed on the throne in his stead, Eliakim, whom he named Jehoiakim. The change of name is not very significant: in the first case, it is "God raises up;" in the second, the adopted name, it is "Jehovah raises up." The assumption was that he claimed specially to be raised up by the covenant God of Israel. It might have been expected that he would be very zealous for the Lord of hosts, instead of which we find that "he did that which was evil in the sight of the Lord, according to all that his fathers had done." As he is presented to us in the prophecies of Jeremiah, he appears a cruel, regardless man. Necho did not mean the subjection of Jerusalem to be merely nominal, so he laid a heavy tribute on the new-made king. With all his defects, Jehoiakim seems to have been faithful to Egypt, to whose power he owed his crown. It should be noted, as one of the dif-

ferences between the Septuagint Version and the text of the Massoretes, which is followed in our Authorized Version, that there is no word representing *reign* in the Septuagint. Came Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon unto Jerusalem, and besieged it. Nebuchadnezzar is one of the greatest names in all history. Only here in Daniel is Nebuchadnezzar spelled in the Hebrew with *n* in the penultimate syllable. In Jeremiah and Ezekiel the name is generally transliterated differently and more accurately Nebuchadnezzar. This more accurately represents *Nabu-kudurri-utzur* of the monuments, but alike in Kings and Chronicles the *u* is changed into a *i*. When it passed into Greek it became *Ναβυχοδονόσορ*, even in Jeremiah. This is the form it assumed in Berosus. Abydenus is more accurate. The name, which means "Nebo protects the crown," had been borne by a predecessor, who reigned some five centuries earlier. The two forms of the name represent two processes that take place in regard to foreign names. Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xxi. 2) is a transliteration of the Babylonian name *Nebu-kudduri-utzur*. Nebuchadnezzar, as here, is the name modified into elements, each of which is intelligible. *Nebu* was the god Nebo, *chad* meant "a vessel," and *nezzar*, "one who watches." He succeeded his father Nabopolassar, the founder of the more recent kingdom of Babylon, in the year B.C. 606. Few historical inscriptions of any length have come to hand dating from the reign of either father or son. We have the fragments of Berosus, and epitomes of portions of his works; and further, fragments of Megasthenes and Abydenus preserved chiefly in the Fathers. It may be observed that Herodotus does not so much as mention Nebuchadnezzar. Nabopolassar ascended the throne of Babylon in the year B.C. 625, so far as can be made out at present, on the overthrow of the Assyrians of Nineveh. Taking occasion of

this event, Egypt, which had been conquered by Esarhaddon and Assurbanipal, reasserted itself. The Assyrians had broken up Egypt into several principalities, over each of which they had set vassal kings. Psammetik, one of these vassal kings, rebelled, and united all Egypt under his rule. About sixteen years after the fall of Nineveh, his son Pharaoh-Necho—determined to rival his predecessors, Thothmes and Rameses—invaded the territory of Babylon. He maintained his conquest only a little while, for Nebuchadnezzar, the young heroic son of the peaceful Nabopolassar, marched against the Egyptians. A great battle was fought at Carhemish, and the Egyptians were totally defeated. After this victory Nebuchadnezzar pursued his flying enemy toward Egypt, and probably visited Jerusalem and laid siege to it. He was not yet king, but it is not to be reckoned an anachronism that the writer here calls him king. We speak of the Duke of Wellington gaining his first victory at Assaye, although his ducal title was not attained till long after. If we follow Berosus, as quoted by Josephus ('Contra Apionem,' 119), while Nebuchadnezzar was engaged on the campaign of Palestine and Syria, he was summoned back to Babylon by the death of his father Nabopolassar. "Leaving the heavy-armed troops and baggage, he hurried, accompanied by a few troops, across the desert to Babylon." Josephus professes to be quoting the very words of Berosus, and no doubts have been thrown on his accuracy or good faith in such cases. Berosus was in a position to be well informed, and had no motive to speak other than the truth. The evidence of Berosus establishes that before his accession to the throne, Nebuchadnezzar had made an expedition into Syria. If we take the statement in the verse before us along with that of Jer. xxvi. 1 (where the text is, however, doubtful, as the clause is omitted in the LXX.), that the fourth year of Jehoiakim was the first of Nebuchadnezzar, and look at them in the light of the account given by Berosus of the accession of Nebuchadnezzar, we come to the conclusion that he ascended the throne the year after he visited Jerusalem. Moreover, we must remember that the first year of Nebuchadnezzar was not the year of his accession, but was the year following the next new year after that event. If a monarch ascended the throne actually in the month Iyyar of one year, that year would be reckoned as "the beginning of his reign;" not till the first of the month Nisan in the following year did his first year begin. In Jerusalem the calculation of the years of a monarch began from his accession, and was independent of the calendar. Hence,

if the Babylonian method of reckoning was applied to Jehoiakim's reign, what was reckoned his fourth year in Jerusalem would be only his third. Against both these texts and 2 Kings xxv. 8, and, moreover, against Berosus, is the statement in Jer. xli. 2, which asserts the battle of Carhemish to have been fought in the fourth year of Jehoiakim. This contradicts the other statement, unless the battle were fought in the very beginning of the fourth year of Jehoiakim, of which we have no evidence. It has been noted by Dr. Sayce ('Higher Criticism,' 419), as a characteristic instance of the carefulness with which the materials have been treated in Kings, that while Shalmaneser is said to have besieged Samaria, it is not said that he (Shalmaneser) took it. It is to be noted that there is an equal carefulness in the verse before us. Nebuchadnezzar, we are told, came unto Jerusalem, and "besieged it." The usual and natural conclusion to such a statement would be "and took it;" the fact that this phrase is not added proves that the writer does not wish to assert that Nebuchadnezzar required to push the siege to extremities.

Excursus on the alleged anachronism of vers. 1 and 2.

Many strong statements have been made in regard to the alleged conflict between the chronology of the verse before us and that of Jeremiah and, it is said, other parts of Scripture. Even Lenormant ('La Divination,' 179) declares the Book of Daniel to begin with a gross error, "L'erreur grossière du premier verset du chapitre i. mettant en l'an 3 de Joïakim la première prise de Jérusalem par Nebuchodossor." A great deal is made of this by all assailants of the authenticity of Daniel. Thus Hitzig says, "The opening of the book is encumbered by an absurd date and a statement of fact which is *prima facie* doubtful."

What is the extent of this error, or rather of these errors? They are: (1) The statement that Nebuchadnezzar visited Jerusalem in the *third* year of Jehoiakim King of Judah. (2) The further statement that Nebuchadnezzar was king at that date. (3) The statement that he besieged the city and plundered the temple. All which, it is alleged, contradict other parts of Scripture, mainly various passages in Jeremiah.

Against the second of these statements is placed Jer. xxv. 1, "In the fourth year of Jehoiakim son of Josiah King of Judah, that was the first year of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon." Further, it is proclaimed that in this prophecy thus dated, the coming of the Babylonian king is

threatened, and therefore it is concluded that he had not yet invaded Palestine. This is again set over against the third statement, and is supposed to prove it untrue. These two passages together are alleged to prove the first statement to be untrue.

To take the second statement first, as really the less important. If there is truth in Berosus's statement that Nebuchadnezzar made his expedition into Syria while his father was yet living, he probably was not yet king; but as he became so immediately after, only a pedant in accuracy would find fault with the words as they stand. If we found it stated that the Duke of Wellington was at Eton in 1782, it would be the height of absurdity to declare this prolepsis an error. Little stress has been laid on this in the assault on Daniel; as little need be laid on it in the defence.

The other two statements are supposed to be erroneous in a more serious way. Even if we get over the above difficulty, Professor Bevan says, "The difficulty remains—a siege of Jerusalem in Jehoiakim's third year, of which Jeremiah, a contemporary, says nothing." Confirmatory of this is supposed to be Jer. xlv. 2, "Against Egypt, against the army of Pharaoh-Necho King of Egypt, which was by the river Euphrates, . . . which Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon smote in the fourth year of Jehoiakim son of Josiah King of Judah." If he fought and won the battle of Carchemish in the fourth year of Jehoiakim, he could not in the third year of that monarch be in Palestine. Hitzig refers rather to Jer. xxxvi. 1-3, "It came to pass in the fourth year of Jehoiakim . . . this word came unto Jeremiah from the Lord, saying, Take thee a roll of a book, and write therein all the words that I have spoken unto thee against Israel, and against Judah, and against all the nations, from the day I spake unto thee, from the days of Josiah, even unto this day. It may be that the house of Judah will hear all the evil that I purpose to do unto them;" compared with ver. 29, "The King of Babylon shall certainly come and destroy this land, and shall cause to cease from thence man and beast." He refers also to ver. 9, "And it came to pass in the fifth year of Jehoiakim the son of Josiah King of Judah, in the fifth month, that they proclaimed a fast before the Lord," in consequence of the reading of the contents of the roll.

As it is clear that the whole case against the chronology of the verse rests on these statements in Jeremiah, it will be advantageous to examine them. As it is the weakest, we will consider Professor Hitzig's ground of objection first. Any one reading the thirty-sixth chapter of Jeremiah with-

out allowing himself to be run away with by a prejudice, will see that there is nothing in the chapter which prevents such an expedition as that mentioned in this verse having taken place. The circumstances are, as it seems to us, the following: Jehoiakim had submitted to the Babylonian conqueror, but had begun to plot against his new suzerain, and to hanker after Egypt. The Egyptian alliance would, he hoped, deliver him from the oppression of Nebuchadnezzar, hence his rage at Jeremiah's prophecies of disaster, and hence his burning of the roll. There is nothing in the twenty-ninth verse that implies that Nebuchadnezzar had not been before in Palestine. The prophecy now is "that he shall come and cause to cease" from Judah "man and beast"—a thing that was not even approximately fulfilled till the fall of Jerusalem in the reign of Zedekiah. Yet Nebuchadnezzar had been in Palestine, and had carried away Jehoiachin. This chapter of Jeremiah, therefore, gives no evidence on the question at issue. Professor Bevan has been well advised not to drag it in as part of his proof.

The passages Professor Bevan has brought forward are relatively stronger. If we have in them the veritable words of Jeremiah, and if their evidence is confirmed by other parts of Scripture, they have some cogency. If we now turn to Jer. xxv. 1, and compare the Massoretic text with the Septuagint, we find very considerable omissions, and omissions of great importance. In order that Professor Bevan may not politely impugn our honesty, as he does that of Hengstenberg, we shall translate the whole thirteen verses as they stand in the Greek text: "(1) The word which was to Jeremiah concerning all the people of Judah [in the fourth year of Jehoiakim son of Josiah King of Judah, (2) which he spake to all the people of Judah¹] and to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem, saying, (3) In the thirteenth year of Josiah son of Amon ('Amós) King of Judah, even until this day, twenty and three years I have even spoken to you, rising early and saying, (4) I was even sending to you my servants the prophets, sending early, and ye heard not and inclined not your ears, (5) saying, Turn each one of you from his evil way, and from your evil works, and dwell in the land which I gave to you and to your fathers for ever and ever; (6) Go not after other gods, to serve them and to worship them, in order that ye provoke me not to anger with the work of your hands to your own hurt.

¹ The words within [] are not in the Codex Frederico-Augustanus (Codex Sinaiticus).

(7) And ye did not hearken unto me. (8) Therefore thus saith the Lord, because ye have not believed my words, (9) behold, I am sending, and I will take a race (*παρὰς*) from the north, and I will bring them against this land, and against the inhabitants thereof, and against all the nations round about it, and I will make them desolate, and I will give them for an astonishment (a vanishing away, *ἀφανισμόν*), and an hissing, and for perpetual reproach. (10) And I will destroy from them voice of joy, and voice of gladness, voice of bridegroom, and voice of bride, scent of myrrh, and light of lamp. (11) And all the land shall be for astonishment (*ἀφανισμόν*); and they shall be slaves among the nations seventy years. (12) And when the seventy years are fulfilled, I will judge that nation, and set them for an everlasting astonishment (*ἀφανισμόν*). (13) And I will bring upon that land all the words which I spake concerning it, all the things written in this book."

The reader will observe that the clause declaring the synchronism between the first year of Nebuchadnezzar and the fourth of Jehoiakim, is not given. Had the clause in question been in any way one that supported the authenticity of Daniel, we are sure such a diligent student as Professor Bevan would not have failed to observe the fact that it was not in the Septuagint, and declare that it made it of doubtful authenticity. He, no doubt, recalls that this is the argument by which the last clause of 1 Sam. ii. 22 is ruled out of court, when any one would bring it forward to prove the existence of the tabernacle during the youth of Samuel and the pontificate of Eli. We will not impeach his honesty, nor say that he fails to notify his readers of the fact of the non-occurrence of the clause in the Septuagint "to conceal its untrustworthiness." If there were not a suspicion that the omission of the words within square brackets is due to *homoioteleuton*, which somewhat invalidates the testimony of the Frederico-Augustan Codex, we might be inclined to maintain that not even was the year of Jehoiakim given in this prophecy. The reader will further observe that in the whole section there is not a word of Babylonians, or Chaldeans, or Nebuchadnezzar. Moreover, the passage purports to give a summary of the messages of all the prophets that for twenty-three years had been warning Judah and Jerusalem. That being the case, it is not wonderful that there is no reference to the appearance of the Babylonians and Nebuchadnezzar the previous year. So far from the publication of this summary implying that the Babylonians had not yet appeared in

Syria and Palestine, the last verse we have quoted rather implies that they had. The argument is this: The prophets foretold this desolation of Judah which had just occurred, and now Jeremiah foretells that seventy years from this date would be the overthrow of Babylon. As the former had proved true, so they might be confident this new prophecy would prove true also.

There remains now Jer. xvi. 2. There is nothing in the Septuagint corresponding to Jer. xvi. 1. The opening verse of the twenty-sixth chapter, which corresponds to the forty-sixth of the Massoretic, really belongs to the end of the previous chapter. The prophecy here begins abruptly, as that in the forty-eighth chapter, "against Egypt," and the date at the end of the verse does not apply to the battle, but to the time when the prophecy was given. It is not necessarily a prophecy in the sense of foretelling what was yet to take place. Jeremiah was against the Egyptian alliance, and this shout of exultation over the overthrow of Pharaoh-Necho, who had slain Josiah, the darling of the prophets, was recorded to prevent any further coquetting with Egypt. We would observe, too, that the clause containing the date might be omitted without spoiling the sense of the passage, and as all critics know this is a canon applied to such passages in Amos and Hosea as imply a recognition that worship in the Israelitish high places was not considered true worship, we will not press this canon, but we will rather investigate the chronology from other authorities.

First let us look at the prophecy of Jeremiah, that seventy years after the Captivity the Lord would judge Babylon (Jer. xxv. 12). The capture of Jerusalem took place, according to M. Oppert ('Solomon et ses Successeurs,' p. 98), in the year B.C. 587. The same authority (*Zeitschrift für Assyriologie*, Mai, 1893) places the capture of Babylon B.C. 539, that is to say, forty-eight years after. This difference between seventy years and forty-eight years is too great to be put down merely to the use of round numbers, and it certainly would have been liable to be modified had there not been an earlier date from which to start. Professor Bevan takes the captivity of Jehoiachin, placed by Oppert at B.C. 598, and by himself at B.C. 599, as the starting-point, without assigning any reason. According to the one date it was only sixty, according to the other only fifty-nine, not seventy years after, that Babylon was taken. The difference is still too great. If we take the date given by Daniel to be correct, that Nebuchadnezzar came to Jerusalem one year before his accession—the third year of Jehoiakim—and then received the sub-

mission of Jehoiakim, and that the seventy years of Jeremiah reckon from then, we have a closer approximation. Nebuchadnezzar's first year was B.C. 604, the year of his accession was B.C. 605. If either in this year or the year before (Berosus, in Josephus, 'Contra Apionem') he conquered Syria, in B.C. 605 or 606, he would receive the submission of Jehoiakim. We have thus an interval of sixty-six or sixty-seven years between this date and the entrance of Cyrus into Babylon, and sixty-seven or sixty-eight years to the issue of the decree of Cyrus in B.C. 538, which is a much closer approximation to seventy years than any other starting-point gives.

We have another synchronism of the kings of Judah and the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. We are told (2 Kings xxv. 2) that Jerusalem "was besieged into the eleventh year of King Zedekiah." In ver. 8 we are told that "in the fifth month, on the seventh day of the month, which is the nineteenth year of King Nebuchadnezzar, . . . he entered Jerusalem." In Jer. xxxix. 2 we are told, "In the eleventh year of Zedekiah, in the fourth month, and the ninth day of the month, the city was broken up." We see, then, that the seventh of the fifth month of the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar coincided with the ninth day of the fourth month of the eleventh year of Zedekiah. We see further that, notwithstanding that Zedekiah is said to have reigned *eleven* years (2 Kings xxiv. 18), he only reigned ten years and little more than three months. His nephew reigned three months (2 Kings xxiv. 8), or three months and ten days (2 Chron. xxxvi. 9). We cannot assume that Jehoiakim reigned eleven complete years; the probability is that it was only ten years and some months. If we take—*pace* the critics—2 Chron. xxxvi. 10 as relating a fact, then we may regard the reign of Jehoiachin as completing the eleventh year, reckoning from his father's accession. In that case the length of time from the accession of Jehoiakim to the capture of Jerusalem was twenty-one years and three months; from that subtract the eighteen years and four months of Nebuchadnezzar, and we have two years and eleven months.¹

If this was the Babylonian reckoning of his reign, then Nebuchadnezzar had really ascended the throne during the previous year. Professor Bevan asserts the passage from Berosus, which is twice quoted in

ezteno by Josephus, once avowedly *verbatim*, to be "altogether untrustworthy." Dr. Hugo Winckler, to whom he refers with respect (*Critical Review*, iv. 126), follows this incriminated passage in making Nebuchadnezzar command at Carohemish while his father yet lived. Indeed, when he has not to assail Daniel, Professor Bevan follows Berosus as quoted by Josephus. If Nebuchadnezzar defeated Necho before his accession to the throne, then Jer. xlv. 2 is further at variance with Kings and Chronicles than we have made it out to be.

Another synchronism is pointed out by Kranichfeld. In 2 Kings xxv. 27 (Jer. lii. 31) it is said, "In the seven and thirtieth year of the captivity of Jehoiachin King of Judah, in the twelfth month, on the seven and twentieth day of the month, Evil-Merodach . . . in the year that he began to reign did lift up the head of Jehoiachin King of Judah out of prison." Berosus informs us that Nebuchadnezzar reigned forty-three years. If we may count the years of Nebuchadnezzar's reign according to the Babylonian mode of reckoning, we may neglect the fragments on either side, and reckon his reign forty-three years complete. We may subtract the thirty-seven years from the forty-three, and find that it was in the sixth year of Nebuchadnezzar that Jehoiachin was carried away captive, contradicting 2 Kings xxiv. 12, and making it clear that, if this is the case, it was not the fourth but the fifth year of Jehoiakim that synchronized with the first of Nebuchadnezzar. This is not an insuperable difficulty to a student of Daniel, as Nebuchadnezzar would merely be called king by prolepsis in the verse before us. It is significant that Professor Bevan does not refer to any other possible basis of chronology. When any other is guilty of such an omission, he is severe in his criticism. It certainly would be interesting to see Professor Bevan attempting to harmonize Jer. lii. 31 with Jer. xxv. 1.

When we turn to 2 Kings xxiv. 1—7, we find nothing at variance with what we find in Daniel, or in what we have deduced of the progress of events. Professor Bevan says, "That Jehoiakim was the vassal of Babylon during the *latter* part of his reign is certain." We should very much like to know the ground of his certainty that the *latter* part of Jehoiakim's reign was passed in a state of vassalage to Babylon. The Book of Kings in the passage before us distinctly says that after three years he rebelled. We do not know when the three years began, nor when they ended. We should like much to know what ground of certainty Professor Bevan has. If we take his words as they stand, they ought to mean

¹ Confirmatory of this is 2 Kings xxiv. 12, "And the King of Babylon took him [Jehoiachin] in the *eighth* year of his reign." If eight is subtracted from eleven, the result is three.

that these three years ended with Jehoiakim's life, and that he never rebelled against the King of Babylon. Dr. Hugo Winckler, 'Geschichte Bab. und Assyrl.,' 310, speaking of the struggle between Necho and Nebuchadnezzar, says, "The conflict took place at Carchemish, where Necho apparently intended to cross the Euphrates. Nebuchadnezzar was victorious, and compelled the Egyptians to evacuate Syria and Palestine. He himself pursued them and took possession of the provinces that were formerly Assyrian, and made the vassal princes, one of whom was Jehoiakim of Judah, to do homage to himself." Dr. H. Winckler is under no such misapprehension as that which led Professor Bevan to assert that it was in the *latter part* only of Jehoiakim's reign that he submitted to Nebuchadnezzar. It was either the same year as the battle of Carchemish, or at most the year following, that Nebuchadnezzar reached Syria and Palestine. Even on the date in Jeremiah, that could not be later than the fifth year of Jehoiakim. We have seen that there is probably no date given in Jeremiah for the battle of Carchemish; it may as likely have been the second or third year of Jehoiakim as the fourth.

If we may take the passage from Berosus as authoritative, and compare it with the passages in Kings, we reach the probability that it was in the second year of Jehoiakim that the battle of Carchemish took place. We know that Professor Bevan has declared this passage from Berosus "altogether untrustworthy." Had there not been some support for the authenticity of Daniel in this passage, it never could have been distrusted. When an author, writing seriously, refers to an authority, gives references, and writes down a long passage which he alleges to be quoted *verbatim*, we generally credit him with fair accuracy. If the passage in question is twice transcribed by him, we are yet more confirmed in our view. If other authors, acquainted alike with the author quoting and the author quoted, refer to this quotation without any sign that there was any bad faith, we have a chain of evidence of which only one recklessly prejudiced could venture to deny the cogency. Such is the case with the passage before us. Josephus quotes the passage twice ('Antiquities,' x. 11. 2, and 'Contra Apionem,' i. 19); he gives the reference to the second book of Berosus's 'Chaldean History'; in the second of these cases he professes to be carefully quoting *verbatim*, in the former he practically does so, the differences are such as might easily be due to copyists. Eusebius also quotes Berosus, and knows Josephus, and refers to this quotation, and makes no note that he found

it incorrect. The words of Professor Bevan may indicate that it is Berosus he suspects. It seems hazardous for any one to do so in the face of the numerous confirmations that Berosus is receiving as to the succession of the monarchs within the historic period. We shall quote from Professor Bevan the beginning of the passage: "When Nebuchadnezzar's father heard that the satrap who had been set over Egypt and the regions of Coele-Syria and Phœnicia had rebelled against him, he sent forth his son Nebuchadnezzar," etc. Professor Bevan comments on the passage thus: "Berosus here assumes that Egypt as well as Coele-Syria had already been conquered by the Chaldeans before the death of Nabopolassar and the battle of Carchemish—a notion contrary to all evidence." Is this conclusion warranted? Is the interpretation Professor Bevan puts on the passage correct? The interpretation we put on it is a different one. Berosus regarded Necho as a satrap of the Babylonian monarch. This is advanced by Keil, and, therefore, Professor Bevan must have known this answer as possible; why did he not endeavour to show it insufficient? There seems every probability that Necho himself or his immediate predecessors were the vassals of Assurbanipal. Nabopolassar, who succeeded Assurbanipal as King of Babylon, may well have claimed the submission of Pharaoh-Necho as the vassal of his predecessor, as Sargon did the submission of the vassals of Shalmaneser. It is quite after the manner of Babylonian and Assyrian monarchs to call resistance against their authority rebellion whenever there was any plausible historical excuse for doing so. We have really, then, in this passage from Berosus, a compendious account of the campaign which began with the victory of Carchemish. It is easy to impose a false interpretation on a passage, and then, on the ground of that interpretation, reject it. On the interpretation we have given above, the account given by Berosus exactly fits in with the statements of Scripture.

Berosus, however, goes on to tell how Nebuchadnezzar was stopped in his career of conquest by the news of his father's death, and how he proceeded with only his light-armed troops across the desert, and arrived in Babylon to assume the reins of government. All this suits very well the statements of Scripture, Daniel included. Professor Bevan does not end here; he further denies the possibility of a siege of Jerusalem and of a plundering of the temple in the reign of Jehoiakim, on the ground of the silence of Jeremiah and Kings. But in 2 Kings xxiv. 11 we are told that Nebuchadnezzar besieged the city

in the reign of Jehoiachin; but in 2 Chron. xxxvi. there is no reference to a siege. As the critical decision is that Chronicles is derived from Kings, this silence is a thing to be noted; and we might thus deduce that the notice of such a siege was no part of the genuine text of Kings. We might, indeed, proceed to say, "In such a case the argument from silence is very strong, if not absolutely conclusive," as does Professor Bevan in another connection. In Jer. xxxvi. 30 we have the death of Jehoiakim prophesied. If the prophecy had been falsified by the result, the temptation would have been immense to omit or modify the prophecy; yet there is no account of his death, either in Kings or Chronicles, that fits the prophecy. The account Josephus gives of the event suits the prophecy, and is not incredible in itself. The argument from silence is always hazardous, and doubly so in the present case.

Professor Bevan asserts that, according to Daniel, Nebuchadnezzar "plundered the temple." This is the third of the alleged contradictions of fact and Scripture which critics have found in Dan. i. 1. There is nothing about "plundering" in the passage; it is not even said that he took the city. It is said that Jehoiakim was taken, which might be without the city being captured, as was the case with Hoshea and Samaria. The fact that Nebuchadnezzar took "a portion of the vessels of the house of God" is decisive against there being any plundering. If the temple had been plundered after a successful siege, the portion of the vessels which escaped the hands of the Babylonians would have been inconsiderable. If the city had been taken, a fact of such importance would have been mentioned. In this case certainly "the argument from silence is very strong." The capture of the city was the natural termination of the process begun, and when that termination is not mentioned, the conclusion is inevitable that it was never reached.

Let us look at the probabilities of the case. Nebuchadnezzar pursues the broken Egyptian army, demanding the homage of all the recent vassals of Egypt, formerly, of course, vassals of Assyria. Jehoiakim had been placed on the throne by Egyptian power, superseding his younger brother, who had been crowned by the Babylonian party, and, probably, passing over also his elder brother Johanan. All his interests were bound up in Egypt; he would not believe the defeat of Egypt was so utter and irretrievable; he was always hoping that the King of Egypt would venture again beyond the river of Egypt, and hence, even after his submission to Nebuchadnezzar, he rebelled against him. He would certainly

shut his gates against the conquerors. That he should be made prisoner without the city being captured or plundered, might, we have said, easily happen. That its surrender should follow was also natural; that the conqueror should demand numerous hostages and a huge ransom, and that this ransom should have been supplied from the vessels of the house of the Lord, was simply what had happened time and again before. Fairly interpreted, the words before us mean no more.

We see, then, that not later than the fifth year of Jehoiakim—even on the supposition that the date in Jer. xli. 2 applies to the battle of Carchemish—Nebuchadnezzar must have received the submission of Jehoiakim. In the verses before us this is said to have taken place in the third year of Jehoiakim; the difference, then, is simply the matter of one year, or at most two. No student of Scripture can be ignorant of the hopeless confusion of the chronology of the Books of Kings, and how completely they are at variance with the Assyrian Canon. Much can be done to get over these difficulties by showing that there were different modes of reckoning. Sometimes a king associated his son with him, and the son's reign might be reckoned from his father's death or his association with his father. Even in matters much more recent there may be statements as to dates differing by as much as the date given in Daniel differs from that deduced from Jeremiah. Professor Rawson Gardiner, in his 'History of the Great Civil War,' under date January 30, 1649, tells us of the execution of Charles I. In the appendix he gives the text of the warrant, and it is dated January 29, 1648, and commands the execution to take place "on the morrowe." When we turn to Clarendon's 'History of the Great Rebellion,' bk. xi., we find him saying, "This unparalleled murder and parricide was committed upon the thirtieth January in the year, according to the account used in England, 1648." Critics of the type of Professor Bevan ought necessarily to declare Professor Gardiner's history altogether unworthy of credit, because of this difference. The only thing that might hinder them would be the fact that they, as do all intelligent people, know that, according to "the account used in England," at that time the year began, not with January 1, but with March 25. Did they not feel that they held a brief against the authenticity of Daniel, they would realize how weak the argument was which depended merely on the difference of one year. There was, according to some, a difference of nearly six months between the Jewish calendar and the Babylonian. We know, further, that there were two

ways of reckoning the years of a king's reign—the Babylonian and Assyrian, which did not begin to reckon till the new year after the king's accession; and the Jewish, which dated the king's years from his accession. It might easily be that Daniel used the one mode of reckoning, and Jeremiah the other. We will not press the fact that the whole critical argument assumes the statements in Jeremiah to be accurate, although it is notorious that the text of that book is in a woeful condition. The assertions of critics who ground so much on so little ought to be received with the same reserve as we receive the statements of the counsel for one side or the other in a case before a court of law. The critics, however, wish to be regarded as judges summing up evidence.

We must, however, notice the method by which Hengstenberg gets over this alleged chronological difficulty, in which he is followed by Kranichfeld and Keil. He says that *למחר* means "to set out for," as well as "to come," and brings an instance, Jonah i. 3, "a ship going (*למחר*) to Tarshish." Keil alleges numerous other instances which, however, must be considered of doubtful validity. Although we do not agree with this interpretation, the instance from Jonah prevents us endorsing the reckless statement of Professor Bevan, that Hengstenberg's interpretation is "no less contrary to Hebrew than English usage." A person standing on the landing-stage at Liverpool, seeing a Cunarder getting up steam to depart, would not say, "That is a ship *coming* to New York;" but a Jew could use *למחר* in such a case. Professor Bevan, as we have already said, holds a brief against the authenticity of Daniel, and he will spare no device to gain his case. We admit that the meaning which Hengstenberg and those who follow him attach to the word is not the common or natural one in the connection. If a person asked permission of a landowner to visit his demesne, and was answered, "If you wish to enter my grounds, I will *let* you," he would be surprised were his entrance opposed, and would think he was mocked if it were pointed out to him that "let" meant at times "to hinder."

Another attempt at getting over the difficulty here is that of Michaelis, Hashi, and other older commentators, Jewish and Christian. It is that the third year of Jehoiakim is, in the verse before us, reckoned from the time when he became vassal to the King of Babylon. This is the view which, in some sort, Professor Bevan adopts, not with the intention of getting over the difficulty, but, as Bertholdt, of explaining how the alleged blunder came to be committed. Although such a mode of reckon-

ing the reign of a vassal king *may* have been used in Babylon, we know nothing of it; certainly there is no instance in Scripture of anything parallel. Moreover, it implies that for three or four years Nebuchadnezzar allowed Pharaoh-Necho to preserve, in the hands of his vassal Jehoiakim, a frontier fortress in Jerusalem. Yet again the state of matters, as implied in the narrative of 2 Kings xxix., is that time elapsed during which bands of Chaldeans and Moabites ravaged Judea. We feel this explanation is to be abandoned, as giving a non-natural sense to the words.

We would wish a further word with Professor Bevan and other critics of his school. Professor Bevan recognizes that it is not only necessary to point out a blunder, but also to show how it arose. As we have already said, Professor Bevan would explain this alleged blunder by a confusion of the three years of submission to Nebuchadnezzar with the years of Jehoiakim's reign. "The author of Daniel follows the account in Chronicles, at the same time assuming that 'the three years' in Kings date from the beginning of Jehoiakim's reign, and that the bands of the Chaldeans were a regular army commanded by Nebuchadnezzar." By the above hypothesis the author of Daniel was well acquainted with Kings and Chronicles; elsewhere Professor Bevan assumes that he was intimately acquainted with the prophecies of Jeremiah. Let us look at this alleged blunder in the light of this knowledge.

The natural conclusion from 2 Chron. xxxvi. 7, 8, compared with Jer. xxxvi. 30, is that Jehoiakim was bound in order to be carried to Babylon, but was put to death by Nebuchadnezzar instead. This is very much the idea of what happened according to Josephus. How was it that the author of Daniel started with the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim? In the light of Chronicles this made his reign really only three years, but Chronicles and Kings make his reign eleven years. He knew the Book of Jeremiah intimately; how did he not know that the fourth year of Jehoiakim coincided with the first of Nebuchadnezzar? He knew the Book of Kings, he knew the various chronological notes in it; how could he conceivably be ignorant, to the extent Professor Bevan imagines him to be, of what naturally follows from these notes? There are only two suppositions—that he knew a solution of the apparent contradiction, and took it for granted that everybody else knew it also—a mood of mind more natural to a contemporary of the events he is narrating, than to a *fastidius* writing centuries after; or these chronological notes were not in the text of these books when he wrote, in which

case they are late interpolations, and therefore valueless. Professor Bevan cannot be permitted to invalidate proofs of the authenticity of Daniel drawn from the accuracy of the statements concerning Babylonian habits, by asserting that these statements might have been deduced from Jeremiah and Kings, and then assail the authenticity of Daniel, because some of its statements differ from Jeremiah. If he had shown Daniel ignorant of one or other of these documents, and, from this, convicted him of incorrectness, the argument would have had weight, but, as it is, his arguments are mutually destructive.

We have thus endeavoured to show that there is no chronological blunder in the verses before us, that the basis on which the assertion is made is in the highest degree doubtful, and that the arguments depend on such minute points, that to lay stress on them proves such an animus as deprives the decision of all the weight that otherwise would be due to the learning of the writer.

Ver. 2.—And the Lord gave Jehoiakim King of Judah into his hand, with part of the vessels of the house of God: which he carried into the land of Shinar to the house of his god; and he brought the vessels into the treasure-house of his god. The Greek versions of this verse agree with each other and with the Massoretic text, save that the Septuagint has *Kuplov* instead of *Θεού* in the end of the first clause, and omits *οίκου*. The Syriac Version omits the statement that it was "part" of the vessels of the house of God that was taken. It is to be observed that our translators have not printed the word "Lord" in capitals, but in ordinary type, to indicate that the word in the original is not the sacred covenant name usually written in English "Jehovah," but *Adonai*. That the Lord gave Jehoiakim into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar does not prove that Jerusalem was captured by him. Far from it, the natural deduction is rather that he did not capture the city, although he captured the king. Thus in 2 Kings xvii. 4 we are told that Shalmaneser shut up Hoshea "and bound him in prison;" in the following verse we are informed that the King of Assyria "besieged Samaria three years." That is to say, after Shalmaneser had captured Hoshea the king, he had still to besiege the city. A similar event occurred earlier in the history of Judah and Israel. When Joash of Israel defeated Amaziah and took him prisoner, he proceeded then to Jerusalem. The city opened its gates to the conqueror, and he carried off all the treasures of the house of the Lord, and of the king's house, and all the vessels of the

house of the Lord, and a large number of hostages, and then returned north. Something like this seems to have occurred now. The king was taken by the Babylonians, and the city submitted and ransomed the king by handing over a portion of the vessels of the house of the Lord. The city, however, was not taken by assault. *Migtzath*, "part of," occurs also in Neh. vii. 70 in this sense: we have it three times later in this chapter—vers. 5, 15, and 18; but in these cases it means "end." A word consonantly the same occurs in the sense before us in Judg. xviii. 2, translated "coasts." Gesenius would write the word *migtzath*, and regard *mi* as representing the partitive preposition *min*. He would therefore translate, "He took some from the number of the vessels." Kranichfeld objects to Hitzig's assertion that *nxp* means "a part," and is followed by Keil and Zöckler in regarding it, as a short form of the phrase, "from end to end," equivalent to the whole, thus making *migtzath* mean "a portion from the whole." The omission from the Syriac of the words which indicate that the vessels taken were only a portion of those in the house of the Lord, shows how natural it was to imagine that the deportation was total, and therefore we may lay the more emphasis on its presence as proving that the temple was not plundered, but these vessels were the ransom paid for the freedom of the king. Several times had the treasures of the house of God been taken away. In the days of Rehoboam (1 Kings xiv. 26) Shishak, acting probably as the ally of Jeroboam, took away all the treasures of the house of the Lord, and of the king's house, "he even took away all." It may be doubted whether Jerusalem was captured (2 Chron. xii. 7); certainly the name of Jerusalem has not been identified in the list of captured towns on the wall of the temple at Karnak. We have referred to the case of Joash and Amaziah. The succession of the phrases, "Jehoiakim King of Judah," and "part of the vessels of the house of God," is remarked by Ewald as being abrupt, and he would insert, "together with the noblest of the land." There is, however, no trace of any such omission to be found in the versions. It is possible that this chapter may be the work of the early collector and editor, and that he condensed this portion as well as, not unlikely, translated it from Aramaic into Hebrew. Captives certainly were taken as well as booty, as is implied by the rest of the narrative. Which he carried into the land of Shinar to the house of his god. There is no word in the Hebrew corresponding to "which." The literal rendering is, "And he carried them," etc. It has been the subject of discussion whether we are to maintain that it is

asserted here that Jehoiakim, along with the vessels and unmentioned captives, were carried to Babylon. Professor Bevan admits that it is doubtful. Were we dependent merely on grammar, certainly the probability, though not the certainty, would be that the plural suffix was intended to cover Jehoiakim, but the conclusion forced on us by logic is different. He "carried them (םָּ) to the house of his god." This seems to imply that only the vessels are spoken of. So strongly is this felt by Hitzig ('Das Buch Daniel,' 5) that he would regard the phrase, "the house of his god," as in apposition to "the land of Shinar," and refers to two passages in Hosea (viii. 1; ix. 15) in which "house" is, he alleges, used for "land." Irrespective of the fact that these two instances occur in highly wrought poetical passages, and that to argue from the sense of a word in poetry to its sense in plain prose is unsafe, there is no great plausibility in his interpretation of these passages. He regards the last clause as contrasted with the earlier: while the captives were brought "into the land of Shinar," the vessels were brought into "the treasure-house of his god"—an argument in which there is plausibility were there not the extreme awkwardness of using מֶּ, "house," first in the extended sense of "country," and then in the restricted sense of "temple." The last clause is rather to be looked upon as rhetorical climax. *The land of Shinar* is used for Babylonia four times in the Book of Genesis, twice in the portion set apart as Jehovist by Canon Driver; the remaining instances are in ch. xiv., both as the kingdom of Amraphel, which Canon Driver relegates to a special source. In the first instance (Gen. x. 10) it is the land in which Babel, Erech, Accad, and Calneh were. In the next instance (ch. xi.) it is the place in which the Tower of Babel is built. The name is applied to Babylonia in Isa. xl. and Zech. v. 11. One of the titles which the kings of Babylon assumed regularly was "King of Sumir and Accad." From the connection of Shinar and Accad in Gen. x. 20 we may deduce that "Shinar" is the Hebrew equivalent for "Sumir." It is not further removed from its original than is "Florence" from "Firenze," or "Leghorn" from "Livorno," or, to take a French instance, "Londres" from "London." The ingenious derivation of "Shinar" from שָׁנַי, "two," and נָהָר, "a river," which, however, implies the identification of שָׁ and נָ, may have occasioned the modification, the more so as it was descriptive of Babylonia; hence the name "Aram-Naharaim," and its translation "Mesopotamia," applied to the tract between the Euphrates and the Tigris, north of Babylonia. In the Greek versions it becomes

Xevadp. It is omitted by Paulus Tellensis. *The treasure-house of his god*. The word rendered "god" here is the plural form, which is usually restricted to the true God, otherwise it is usually translated as "gods." To quote a few from many instances, Jephtha uses the word in the plural form of Chomosh (Judg. xi. 24), Elijah applies it to Baal (1 Kings xviii. 27), it is used of Nisroch (2 Kings xix. 37). In Ezra i. 7 we have this same word translated plural in regard to the place in which Nebuchadnezzar had deposited the vessels of the house of God. In translating the verso before us, the Peshitta renders *path-coroh*, "his idol." This suits the translation of the LXX. εἰδωλεῖα. Paulus Tellensis renders it in the plural, "idols." The god in whose treasure-house the vessels of the house of God in Jerusalem were placed would necessarily be Merodach, whom Nebuchadnezzar worshipped, almost to the exclusion of any other. *The treasure-house of his god*. Temples had not many precious gifts bestowed upon them by their worshippers which were not taken by needy monarchs; nevertheless, the treasures of kingdoms were often deposited in a temple, to be under the protection of its god. The temple of Bel-Merodach in Babylon was a structure of great magnificence. Herodotus (i. 181) gives a description, which is in the main confirmed by Strabo (xvi. 5): "In the midst of the sacred area is a strong tower built a stadium in length and breadth; upon this tower is another raised, and another upon it, till there are eight towers. There is a winding ascent made about all the towers. In the middle of the ascent there is a resting-place, where are seats on which those ascending may sit and rest. In the last tower is a spacious shrine, and in it a huge couch beautifully bespread, and by its side is placed a table of gold. No statue has been set up here, nor does any mortal pass the night here." There are still remains of a structure which suits to some extent the description here given, but investigators are divided whether to regard Birs Nimroud or Babil as most properly representing this famous temple of Bel-Merodach. In the "Standard Inscription" Nebuchadnezzar appears to refer to this temple, which he calls E-temen-ana-ki, "the house of heaven and earth." He says, among other matters concerning it, that he "stored up inside it silver and gold and precious stones, and placed there the treasure-house of his kingdom." This amply explains why the vessels of the house of God were taken to the temple of Bel-Merodach. The fact is mentioned that the vessels of the house of God were carried to Babylon, and, as a climax, "and he placed them in the treasure-house of his god." We know what befell

the statue of Dagon when the ark of God was placed in its presence, and the Jew, remembering this, relates awestruck the fact that these sacred vessels were placed in the temple of Bel. If no such disaster befell Bel-Merodach as befell Dagon, yet still the handwriting on the wall which appeared when these vessels were used to add to the splendour of the royal banquet, and which told the doom of the Chaldean monarchy, may be looked upon as the sequel to this act of what would necessarily appear to a Jew supreme sacrilege.

Vers. 3, 4.—And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs, that he should bring certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes; children in whom was no blemish, but well favoured, and skilful in all wisdom, and cunning in knowledge, and understanding sciences, and such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace, and whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans. The version of the LXX. here becomes important: "And the king spake to Abiesdri, his own chief eunuch (τῷ ἐαυτοῦ ἀρχιευννοχῷ), to lead to him from the sons of the nobles of Israel, and from the seed royal, and from the choice ones, four young men, without blemish, of goodly appearance, and understanding in all wisdom, and educated, and prudent, and wise, and strong, so that they may be in the house of the king, and may be taught the letters and tongue of the Chaldeans." The version of Theodotion is in closer accordance with the Massoretic text, only it inserts "captivity" where the LXX. had "nobles," and reads, "from the sons of the captivity of Israel." In this version the name of the chief of the eunuchs is the same as the Massoretic; the word rendered "princes" in the Authorized Version is transliterated *φορβομυλν*. The rendering, "the seed of the kingdom," is more literal than that of the Authorized, "the king's seed." The Peshitta is in close agreement with the Massoretic text, save that, instead of "Ashpenaz," the name of the chief of the eunuchs is written "Aspaz," and the word translated "princes" (*partimim*) is transliterated *Parthouia*, which means literally "Parthians." Symmachus reads Παθών. The king spake unto Ashpenaz. There is assumed here that there were a large number of Israelitish hostages who would be reckoned captives whenever the conquered state gave cause of suspicion to the regnant power in whose hands the hostages were, and they were possibly eunuchized. It is possible that Nebuchadnezzar wished to use these hostages about the court, in order that, having tasted the pleasure and dignities of the magnificent court of Baby-

lon, their influence would be exercised on their relatives to maintain them in fidelity. The phrase, "spake unto," has, in later Hebrew, the force of "command," especially when followed by an infinitive, as Esth. i. 17. As translated in the Authorized Version, the impression conveyed is that of consultation. The name "Ashpenaz" has caused much discussion. As it stands, it is not Assyrian or Babylonian. The form it has suggests a Persian etymology, and on this fact, along with other similar alleged facts, an argument against the authenticity of Daniel has been based. One derivation would make it *ashpa*, "a horse;" *nasa*, "a nose," "horse nose"—by no means an impossible personal name for a Persian or Median. In one or two cuneiform inscriptions of the Persian period the name occurs. Nothing can be built on this, as in the Septuagint the name is given as Ἀβιεσδρί: in the Peshitta it becomes "Ashpaz," as we have mentioned above. It would be easily possible to derive "Ashpaz" from "Ashpenaz," or *vice versa*; but there seems no relation between *Abiesdri* and either. By some, as Hitzig, the name has been identified with "Ashkenaz" (Gen. x. 3), and that again derived from תַּשְׁקַּנַּז, "the cord of the testicle," and *naz*, a Sanskrit root, "to destroy," and therefore the name would simply be "eunuch." Over and above the general improbability that is always present in regard to etymologies which imply the word in question to be a hybrid word, there is the improbability that one eunuch would receive a name applicable to the whole class of which he was a member. The name, as it appears in the Septuagint, is, as we have said, totally unconnected with that in the Massoretic text, but both may have sprung from some common source. Thus the French word *évêque* has not a single letter in common with "bishop," yet both words are derived from *ἐπίσκοπος*. The changes that a name might undergo in passing from any language, even a cognate one, into Hebrew were very great; thus *Assur-bani-pal* became "Asnapper." Lenormant has endeavoured to recover the name in the present case. The process he has followed is the somewhat mechanical one of combining the two names, as if we were to strive to reach *Asshur-bani-pal* from a combination of "Asnapper" and "Sardanapalus." He arrives at the name *Ash-ben-azur*, which is a possible Babylonian name. Professor Fuller has suggested *Aba-(z)-istar*, "the astronomer of the goddess Ishtar." The main objection to this is that it is drawn solely from the Septuagint Version. If we look at the tendency exhibited by the Hebrew equivalents of Babylonian names, we find that shortening was

one that was nearly invariably present, as *Ashur-akhi-iddin-na* became *Esharhaddon*, and *Sin-akhi-irba* became *Sankirib*. The only exception to this shortening process which occurs to us is *Brodach* for *Marduk*, and even it is scarcely an exception. Next there is a tendency, which Hebrew shares with other languages, of suiting a foreign word to the genius of the language. Hence we find "Ashpenaz" has such a close resemblance to "Ashkenaz" of Gen. x. 3, and that "Abiesdri" is identical with the form "Abiezer"—the name of the father of Gideon—assumes in the Septuagint. Judging from "Asnapper," the name might even begin with *Ashur*, only that, as *Ashur* was the national god of the Ninevites, names which contained the name of that divinity are rare in Babylon. The first element in the word might not impossibly be *abu*, "son." The final element seems certainly to have been *ezer* or *utsur*. As to the office he filled in the court of Nebuchadnezzar, "the master of eunuchs," the name of the office in the text is *Rab-Sarisim*, which occurs in a slightly different form in 2 Kings xviii. 17, along with *Rab-Slakeh*, as if it were a proper name. From the fact that persons thus mutilated were employed in Eastern courts, the word became equivalent to "officer;" hence we find Potiphar is called *saris*, or "eunuch;" yet he had a wife. It therefore may be doubted whether Daniel and his companions are to be understood as placed in that condition. The title here given—*Rab-Sarisim*—becomes *Sar-Sarisim* in vers. 7 and 10, *Sar* being the Hebrew equivalent of the more Babylonian *Rab*. It is also Aramaic. *That he should bring certain of the children of Israel, and of the king's seed, and of the princes.* It may be doubted at first sight whether these may not be separate classes—a view that seems to have been taken by most of the old translators, or whether the first class, "the children of Israel," does not include the two classes that follow. The rendering *part'mim*, as "Parthians," adopted by Symmachus and the Peshitta, would make a contrast between "the children of Israel" and "the Parthians." That, however, is utterly unlikely. Were that translation the true one, a strong argument could be advanced for the late origin of Daniel. The fact that the text before Symmachus and the Peshitta translator admitted of that translation shows how far the tendency to modify the text into suitability with the knowledge of the scribe had gone, and therefore how little weight ought to be given to lateness of individual words. According to the LXX. and Theodotion, there is a word wanting in the first clause; the Septuagint translator would supply "nobles" (*μεγαλοδυνάμεις*)

"from the nobles of Israel." Theodotion renders, "from the sons of the Captivity of Israel." If the sentence ran בני ישראל בני שבי ישראל; the natural phrase for this is בני גלות ישראל, but that would not explain the LXX. rendering. The name "Israel" is the covenant name of the whole nation, equally applicable to the southern and to the northern kingdoms. All the more so that the captivity of Judah contained members of three other tribes besides that of Judah, namely, those of Benjamin and Simeon and Levi. Further, Josiah seems to have extended the bounds of the Davidic kingdom to embrace the remnant of the ten tribes (2 Chron. xxxiv. 6, 9), therefore his sons would claim the same boundaries, and therefore hostages might be taken by Nebuchadnezzar from them to Babylon. *And of the king's seed and of the princes.* The two "ands" might be rendered "both . . . and," or "alike . . . and." The king's seed means, literally, "the seed of the kingdom," as it is translated by Theodotion. The phrase, "children of the kingdom," is applied by our Lord (Matt. viii. 12) to all the Jews, and in Matt. xiii. 38 to the members of the true Israel—perhaps with a latent reference to the children of the true King thus in captivity to the beggarly elements of this world, compelled to stand as servants in the court of Mammon, of which Nebuchadnezzar may well be the type. The word *part'mim* is one which has caused difficulty; it only occurs here, and twice in Esther (i. 3; vi. 9). In these passages it is rendered by the Peshitta as here, *Parthouia*, "Parthians." It would seem that the Septuagint translator had before him, not *part'mim*, but *bahureem*, connecting it with *yladeem*, "children" (youths), the opening word of the succeeding verse. In Esther the word *part'mim* is applied to a special class of nobles among the Persians, and certainly was not applied to the princes of Judah. Theodotion does not understand what it means, and so transliterates it *φορθουμιν*. Symmachus and the Peshitta make it "Parthians;" the Targum on Esther makes the same blunder. The LXX. Version of Esther renders it *ἐνδοκοί*, as if it were connected with *נָדָב* and *נָדָב*. It certainly has Zend (*frathema*) and Pehlevi (*pardun*) congeners, so it may have come over from Aryan sources into the Babylonian. Equally certainly it has disappeared from Aramaic Eastern and Western. If *part'mim* is to be held as part of the original text, it must belong to a period before the Greek domination, as the meaning of the word had disappeared by that time. It might, on the other hand, have been a word in the Baby-

lonian court, or, again, a copyist might have inserted it as a more known word than that originally in the text. This latter, we think, is the probable solution. If the division of the verses had in the Massoretic become deranged, then *bahureem* would be unintelligible, standing, as it would, at the end of the verse. In Egypt this derangement did not take place, and hence *bahureem* was retained. *Children in whom was no blemish.* There is no limit to the age implied in *yeled*, the word the plural of which is translated "children;" thus the young counsellors who had been brought up with Rehoboam are called *yladeem*. As they had been brought up with Rehoboam, they were of the same age with him, yet he was forty-one years old when he ascended the throne. Joseph is called *yeled* when he was at least seventeen, and Ishmael when he was probably sixteen. Benjamin is called *yeled* when he was nearly, if not quite, thirty years old; it is said of him immediately before he went down to Egypt, and then he was the father of ten sons. It is used also of newborn infants (Exod. i. 17). When we look at the various qualifications they were to possess—*skilful in all wisdom, cunning in knowledge, understanding science*—sixteen to eighteen seems the lowest limit we can set. Aben Ezra comes to the conclusion that they were fourteen when they came to Babylon; that, however, even when all allowance is made for the precocity of warm climates, seems too low. On the whole, we may say that Daniel, when he was taken to Babylon, was the same age as Joseph when he went down into Egypt. The Septuagint rendering (*νεανίσκους*) supports our view. We may note that this command to Ashpenaz was in all likelihood given at Jerusalem. *In whom was no blemish, but well favoured.* If we may judge of the taste of the Babylonians and Assyrians from the sculptures that have come down to us, they had a high standard of personal appearance—especially fine in appearance are the eunuchs that stand before the king. The word *moon*, "blemish," is used of the priesthood; presence of a "blemish" excluded from the priesthood (Lev. xxi. 17). It is used of Absalom (2 Sam. xiv. 25); it is equivalent in meaning to *μαῦρος*, which not impossibly was derived from some early form of this word; *toṃay mar'eh*, "goodly in appearance," almost identical with our colloquial "good-looking." *Skilful in all wisdom.* The word "wisdom" has, in general, a somewhat technical meaning in Hebrew, "skill in interpreting riddles and framing proverbs." It became widened in meaning in certain cases, as we see in the description of wisdom in the beginning of Proverbs and Job xxviii. Yet wider is the sphere given to it in

Ecclesiasticus and the Book of Wisdom. The word translated "skilful," *maskileem*, means, in the first instance, "attending to;" then, the result of this attention, especially when followed by the preposition *in*, "in." The LXX. suits this, "skilled in all wisdom." Theodotion renders, "understanding (*συνέτη*) in all wisdom." Professor Bevan would render *maskil*, "intelligent;" Hitzig adopts Luther's *einsichtig in allerlei Wissenschaft*, "intelligent in every kind of science," adding, "that is, they would be were they placed in suitable circumstances." He objects to De Wette rendering "experienced," as unsuitable to boys. *Cunning in knowledge*; literally, *knowing knowledge*. The distinction is here between the faculty of intelligence and the actual acquirements. It might be rendered "intelligent and well-educated"—a view that is supported by the Septuagint rendering (*γρηγοριώδης*). *Understanding science*; "discriminating knowledge," as it is rendered in Theodotion. The Septuagint translator had another text before him; instead of reading *m'bine madda'*, he had before him *m'binim yod'eem*, that is to say, he divided the letters differently, so that he read *m* along with *m'bine*, and had a *yod* inserted after *m*, not as connected, but as separate. The word *madda'* is late, found in Chronicles and Ecclesiastes, and as Aramaic well known; the change in the Septuagint must have been due to a different reading. The fact that *madda'* is late, and was not in the Septuagint text, throws a suspicion on all the late words in Daniel, as all of them may be due to the same modernizing tendency. The phrase, according to the Septuagint reading, may be rendered, "having good powers of discrimination and acquisition." *And such as had ability in them to stand in the king's palace.* The word used for "ability" (*koḥ*) usually means "physical strength," as of Samson (Judg. xvi. 6), applied to animals as of the unicorn (wild ox) (Job xxxix. 11). Here, however, it refers rather to mental capacity. The idea is that those should be chosen who showed signs of future ability, and therefore afforded a probability that they would be of use in the royal council-chamber. The translator of the Septuagint Version puts a point after *ισχυόρας*, and unites the two following clauses under it. *And whom they might teach the learning and the tongue of the Chaldeans.* The LXX. renders, "to teach them letters and the Chaldean dialect." There were three tongues used in Babylon. There was the Aramaic of ordinary business and diplomacy, called in 2 Kings xviii. 26 "the Syrian language," and in this book (ch. ii. 4) "Syriack." This was commonly understood, as is shown by the fact that

tablets have been found inscribed in Assyrian, but having a docket behind in Aramaic, telling the contents. Next there was the Assyrian, a Semitic tongue, cognate with Hebrew, though further removed from it than Aramaic is. This is the language of historic and legal documents, much as Norman-French was for long the language of our Acts of Parliament, while the people spoke a tongue not far removed from our modern English. The system of writing used was cumbersome in the highest degree, the same sign standing for several different words, and the same word represented by several different signs. As a spoken language—if it ever were a spoken tongue—it was cumbersome also. It was eminently a monumental tongue. Lastly, there was Accadian, the sacred tongue, a language belonging to a different class from the Aramaic and Assyrian. In it the great bulk of the magical formulæ and ritual directions of Babylon and Nineveh were written. In the huge library of Ashurbanipal, now in the British Museum, a large portion is composed of translations of those Accadian texts. A number of syllabaries have also been found, which enable scholars to investigate this antique tongue. It seems not impossible that Accadian was meant by the learning (כִּסְפָּה, *sepher*, "book") and tongue of the Chaldeans. Their learning involved some astronomy, a great deal of astrology, and not a little magic, incantations, interpretations of dreams and omens. We ourselves, though so far removed both geographically and chronologically from them, feel the effects of their ideas, and enjoy some of the results of their knowledge. We cannot tell whether the Babylonians were the earliest to fix the course of the sun, moon, and planets. At all events, they made observations on the basis of these discoveries; and our week, with its Sunday and Monday, conveys to us still the fact that the Babylonians believed the planets to be seven; the planets strictly so called were associated with deities similar in attributes to those associated with them by the Latin and Teutonic peoples, and the same days were sacred to them in Babylonia and Germany. The Chaldeans, כַּשְׁדִּים, *Kasdeem*, of the Bible, do not seem to have been originally inhabitants of Babylon. They formed a cluster of clans to the south-west of Babylon, who invaded Babylonia, and occasionally secured the supremacy in the city. The Assyrians had frequent encounters with them, and carried on against them many prolonged wars. The name in the Assyrian monuments is most frequently *Kaldu*, from which the Greek Χαλδαῖοι comes. It is doubtful whether there is a form *Kassatu* to explain

the Hebrew term. In the days of Nabopolassar, the Chaldeans being supreme in Babylonia, all the inhabitants of that province may have been called Chaldeans. Later there was a restricted use of the term, due to the great attention paid in Babylonia to astrology. It is doubtful whether this restricted use of the word occurred in the genuine Daniel, from which our canonical Daniel has sprung. Certainly Daniel, and those hostages selected with him, were to be educated so as to become members of this sacred college of augurs and astrologers.

Ver. 5.—And the king appointed them a daily provision of the king's meat, and of the wine which he drank: so nourishing them three years, that at the end thereof they might stand before the king. The only thing to be noticed in the LXX. Version of this verse is the fact that נָתַן is taken to mean "give a portion"—a meaning which seems to be implied in נָתַן (Neh. viii. 10), hence the translation διδοῦσθαι . . . ἐκθέσειν. Further, the translator must have had נָתַן "נָתַן", as in 2 Kings xxv. 29. The mysterious נָתַן (*path-bag*), translated "meat," has caused differences of rendering. The Syriac Peshitta transfers it. Professor Bevan speaks as if it were common in Syriac, but Castell gives no reference beyond Daniel. (Brockelmann adds, Ephrem Syrus, Isaac Antiochenus, Bar Hebraeus). It is to be observed that the Syriac form of the word has *teth*, not *tau*, for the second radical. This is a change that would not likely take place had the Hebrew form been the original, whereas from the fact that *path* means in Hebrew "a portion," if the Hebrew were derived from the Syriac the change would be intelligible. It is confounded in ch. xi. 26 with נָתַן (*pathura*), "a table." It seems not improbable that both the LXX. and Theodotion read *pathura*. The word *path-bag* does not seem to have been known in Palestine; it does not occur in Chaldee, but does in Syriac. This is intelligible if the chapter before us is a condensation from a Syriac original rendered into Hebrew: the word *path-bag*, being unintelligible, is transferred. The etymology of the word is alleged to be Persian, but on this assumption it is a matter of dispute what that etymology is. One derivation is from *pad* or *fad*, "father" or "prince," or *pat* or *fat*, "idol," and *bag* (פָּאגָה), "food;" another is from *pai-bhagu*, "a portion." The question is complicated by the fact that in Ezek. xxv. 7 we have in the K'thib בָּג (*bag*), meaning "food." In that case *path-bag* would mean "a portion of food." The reading of the K'thib is not supported by the versions. In Daniel the word simply means "food," such as was supplied to the king's table. We see in the slabs from the palace of

Kou-youn-jik the nature of a royal feast. Animal food predominated. We cannot avoid referring to a singular argumentative axiom implied in all the discussions on Daniel. Critics seem to think that when they prove that certain words in Daniel are Persian, they thus prove Daniel was written nearly a couple of centuries after the Persian domination had disappeared. *Of the wine which he drank.* It is to be noted that there is a restriction. The wine supplied was the wine which the king drank—wine of which an oblation had been offered to idols. In thus bringing up hostages at his own table, Nebuchadnezzar was following a practice which has continued down to our own day. The son of Theodore of Magdala was brought up at the court of our queen. It was the regular practice, as we know, in Imperial Rome. Sennacherib speaks of Belibus, whom he made deputy-king in Babylon, as brought up "as a little dog at his table" (Bellino Cylinder, Schrader, vol. ii. p. 32, Engl. trans.). *So nourishing them three years.* This was the period during which the education of a Persian youth was continued. It is probable, as we have seen, that these youths were about sixteen or seventeen. At the end of three years they would still be very young. The grammatical connection of the word *bgadd'lam* is somewhat singular. The Septuagint reading probably had the first word in this verse in the infinitive also. This is more grammatical, as it brings the whole under the regimen of the opening clause of ver. 3. The force of the word before us is represented in "bringing up." The verb in its simple form means "to be strong," "to be great," hence in the intensive form before us, "to make great," "to bring up." *That at the end thereof they might stand before the king.* "Standing before the king" means usually becoming members of the council of the monarch, but in the present instance this does not seem to be the meaning. They were to be presented before the king, and in his presence they were to be examined. They were, then, possibly to be admitted into the college of astrologers and soothsayers, but only in a low grade. Irrespective of the fact that they would at the latest be twenty or twenty-one when this season of education was over, and, even making all allowance for Eastern precocity, this is too young an age for being a member of a royal privy council. But the next chapter relates an event which appears to be the occasion when they stood before the king, for they were not summoned with the wise men to the king's presence to interpret his dream.

Ver. 6.—Now among these were of the children of Judah, Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael,

and Azariah. The versions present no difficulty here, only the Septuagint adds a clause to bring this verse into harmony with ver. 3: the Septuagint rendering is, "And there were of the race of the sons of Israel that came from Judah, Daniel, Ananias, Mishael, and Azarias." That they were of "the children of Judah" seems to exclude the possibility of these four belonging to any other tribe, all the more that the whole children of Israel are spoken of in the third verse. The version which we find in the Septuagint leaves the matter free. At the same time, the addition is one that is so naturally suggested by the third verse, that we cannot claim that the reading of the Septuagint is the more probable. The names of the four companions all occur elsewhere, and, as is usual with Hebrew names, all are significant. Daniel means either "Judge of God" or "God my Judge." As Hebrew grammar is now, the latter is the meaning; but there was an older form of the construct state, which appears in proper names like "Gabriel," which makes it probable that "Judge of God" or "Divine Judge" is the meaning intended to be conveyed. This meaning is implied in the story of Susanna and the elders. David's son by Abigail the Carmelitess is called Daniel in 1 Chron. iii. 1.¹ In the case of the son of David, the name would probably indicate the confidence in God which his father felt, rather than any description of the son. In Ezra viii. 2 a Daniel is mentioned who seems to be a son of Ithamar. We say "seems to be," because it is evident that there is an omission somewhere of a name; if the omission has taken place before *m'bne Phinhas*, then Daniel becomes the representative of the sons of David, and Hattush the representative of the sons of Pahath. In Neh. x. 6, in the number of the priests who sealed the covenant, is a "Daniel" named, who may be the same as the preceding. In the LXX. version of the apocryphal additions to Daniel, the prophet is identified with the priest. The first verse in the story of Bel and the Dragon is, "There was a certain man, a priest, whose name was Daniel, the son of Abal, the familiar friend of the King of Babylon." There is nothing to make it certain, if we do not take the phrase here in its absolute sense, that Daniel did not belong to the family of Aaron; if we take the phrase in its restricted sense, then the balance of probability is that

¹ In 2 Sam. iii. 3 he is named Chileab. This reading is rendered uncertain by the fact that in the Septuagint the name becomes Δαλουία, a form that seems to be derived from "Daniel."

he was a member of the Davidic family. Hananiah (*Hananyah*; Greek, *Ἀνανίας*: the Hebrew form, as in the case of other names with the same termination, is sometimes lengthened to *Hananyahu*). The name means "The Lord Jehovah is gracious." This name is one of the most common in the Bible. Sometimes it is reversed, and becomes *Jehohanan* or *Johanan*, and hence "John." The earliest is the head of the sixteenth of the twenty-four courses into which David divided the Hemanites (2 Chron. xxv. 4). In the reign of Uzziah there appears one as a chief captain (2 Chron. xxvi. 11). In Jeremiah there are three; most prominent, however, is the false prophet who declared that Jeconiah and all his fellow-captives would be brought back in the space of two years (Jer. xxviii. 15). One of the ancestors of our Lord, called in Luke (iii. 27) Joanna, the son of Rhesa, grandson of Zerubbabel, is called in 1 Chron. iii. 19 Hananiah, and reckoned a son of Zerubbabel. In the Book of Nehemiah there are several persons spoken of as bearing this name, not impossibly as many as six. In New Testament times it was still common: Ananias the husband of Sapphira (Acts v. 1); the devout Jew of Damascus, sent to Paul (Acts ix. 10); the high priest in the time of Paul (Acts xxiii. 2). Unlike Hananiah, Mishaël is one of the rarer names. It occurs as the name of one of the sons of Uzziel, the uncle of Moses and Aaron (Exod. vi. 22; Lev. x. 4), and again as one who stood at Ezra's left hand when he read the Law (Neh. viii. 4). There is some question as to the meaning of the name. Two interpretations have been suggested; the simplest and most direct is, "Who is what God is;" the other is, "Who is like God." The objection to the first is that the contracted relative is employed, which does not elsewhere appear in this book. This, however, is not insuperable, as the contracted form of the relative was in common use in the northern kingdom, and might, therefore, appear in a name; the objection to the second is that a letter is omitted, but such omissions continually occur. Hitzig refers to מִשְׁאֵל, from מִשְׁ, as a case in point. Azariah, "Jehovah is Helper," is, like Hananiah, a very common name throughout Jewish history. It is the name by which Uzziash is called in 2 Kings xiv. 21; xv. 1, 7, 8, 17 (called Uzziab in vers. 13, 30, as also in 2 Chron. xxvii.). It is the name of four high priests: (1) one (1 Chron. vi. 10) during the reign of Solomon, the grandson of Zadok; (2) the high priest during the reign of Jehoshaphat (1 Chron. vi. 11); (3) high priest during the reign of his namesake Azariah or Uzziash King of Judah (2 Chron. xxvi. 17—20); (4) high priest in the reign

of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi. 10—14). There is also a prophet of this name (2 Chron. xv. 1) in the days of Asa King of Judah. While this name is so common before the Captivity, it is not so common after it, though there is a captain of the army of Judas Maccabæus called "Azarias." While all the names contain the name of God, either in the covenant form "Jehovah" or the common form "el," yet there is nothing in the names to suggest the history before us. Jewish tradition made them out to be of the royal family; of this there is no certainty. In the time of Jerome it was held they were eunuchs, and thus the prophecy in Isaiah (xxxix. 7) was fulfilled. Others have held that Isa. lvi. 3, "Let not the eunuch say, I am a dry tree," had a reference to those captives. So far, however, as we know, eunuchs might be attendants of Assyrian and Babylonian monarchs, might bear the state umbrella over their heads, might give the cup to them, might arrange their couch for them, or announce their approach to the harem, but were not their councillors or warriors. That was left for the days of the Byzantine Empire, when the eunuch Narses retained Italy for the empire.

Ver. 7.—Unto whom the prince of the eunuchs gave names; for he gave unto Daniel the name of Belteshazzar; and to Hananiah, of Shadrach; and to Mishaël, of Meshach; and to Azariah, of Abed-nego. The only thing to be noted in regard to the versions is that, with the exception of the Peshitta, all of them identify the name of Daniel with that of the last King of Babylon. Both are called *Baltasar* or *Baltassar* in the Vulgate, the LXX., and Theodotion. The difference made in the Peshitta is not the same as that in the Hebrew; the prophet is called Belteshazzar, and the king Belitshazzar.¹ This would indicate something wrong. The Greek versions render Abed-nego *Ἀβδὲνεγο*, which also the Vulgate has. This habit of changing the names of those who entered their service prevailed among Eastern potentates. Joseph became *Zaphnath-paaneah* (Gen. xli. 45). Not only did those about the court receive new names, but, not infrequently, subject monarchs, as token of subjection, were newly named, as Jehoiaquim, who had formerly been Eliakim. Professor Fuller mentions the case of the Egyptian monarch Psammetik II., whose name as subject of Asshur-bani-pal was *Nabo-sezib-ani*. Not only so, but monarchs of their own will changed their names with changed circumstances; thus Pul in Babylon is Tiglath-pileser in Nineveh. Still in modern times this is continued in the head

¹ In ch. vii. 1 the king's name is given as Belitshazzar.

of Roman Catholic Christendom, who has for the last twelve centuries always assumed another than his original name on ascending the papal throne. With members of a monarch's court this is easily intelligible. The desire was to have names of good omen; a foreign name might either be meaningless or suggest anything but thoughts full of good omen. In considering these names, there are certain preliminary facts we must bear in mind. In the first place, there is a great probability that all the names had a Divine element in them, that is, contained as an element the name of a Babylonian god. The great mass of the names of Babylonian and Assyrian officials had this. Next, it is by no means improbable that, at the hands of the Jewish scribes, the names have sustained some considerable change, more especially as regards the Divine element. The Jewish scribe had few scruples as to altering a name when there was anything in it to hurt his sensibilities. It is horrible to him that Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses the great law-giver, should be the originator of the false temple at Dan, and so he inserts a *nun*, and changes *Moshe*, "Moses," into "Manasseh." The scribe that copied out 2 Samuel, coming to the name of Jerubbaal, cannot endure to chronicle the fact that a judge in Israel ever bore the name of the abomination of the Zidonians as part of his name, and altered it to Jerubsheth. So we have in the same book Ishbosheth for Ethbaal, and Mephibosheth for Meribbaal. With a foreign potentate it is different; but in the case of a Jew there always was a tendency to blink such an awkward fact as bearing a name with heathen elements, by a slight change. The name given to Daniel is, in the Massoretic text, Belteshazzar. From the fact that in the Septuagint, Theodotion, and the Vulgate, we have the king Belshazzar and Daniel, as Babylonian magician, called by the same name, "Baltasar," and when in the Peshitta, the difference is very slight, and not always maintained, we, for our part, are strongly inclined to believe both names to have been the same. Professor Bevan ('The Book of Daniel,' 40) is quite sure that the author did not understand the meaning of the name given to Daniel. He (Professor Bevan) derives the name from *Balat-zu-utzur*, "Protect thou his life." Professor Fuller, with as great plausibility, makes it *Bilat-sarra-utzur*, "Beltil protects the crown." If that be the true derivation, then Nebuchadnezzar could quite correctly say that he was called after the name of his god. Still more accurate would this statement be if the name were Belshazzar. But an uneasy suspicion crosses our mind.

DANIEL.

Does the author of Daniel ever attribute to Nebuchadnezzar the words on which Professor Bevan grounds his charge? The words are not in the Septuagint. Thus Professor Bevan—never admitting the possibility of the name Belteshazzar having been modified from something else, although the evidence of the versions points most distinctly to that, and although he candidly admits it to have taken place in regard to Abed-nego—assumes an etymology for it, as if it were the only possible one, which it is not; and on the ground of this etymology, and on the assumption that certain words were in the original text of Daniel, which are yet not in the Septuagint, he concludes that the author of Daniel did not know the meaning of the name he had given to his hero. Surely this is special pleading. If there has been any tampering with the name or modification of it, then Professor Bevan's assumption falls to the ground, and his argument with it; but there seems every probability that there has been such modification, and the effect of such modification would be to deface the name of the heathen divinity in the name if there were such. Further, if Professor Fuller's etymology may be maintained, again Professor Bevan's assumption falls to the ground. These two arguments do not conflict. A Jewish scribe, ignorant of ancient Assyrian, might easily introduce a modification which, despite his intention, did not remove all heathen divinity from the name, only changed the divinity. If the original text of Daniel did not contain the phrase in the fourth chapter, "according to the name of my god," then again Professor Bevan's assumption is proved groundless, and his argument without value. The phrase in question is not in the Septuagint, and therefore it is, to say the least, suspicious. It has no such intimate connection with the context as to show it part of the text; it is just such a phrase as would be put on the margin as a gloss, and get into the text by blunder of a copyist. It may be observed that Professor Bevan merely follows Schrader, alike in his derivation and deduction; but he, not Schrader, had before him continually the Septuagint version of Daniel, and he, not Schrader, is commentator on Daniel. And to *Hananiah of Shadrach*. This name is explained by Dr. Delitzsch as being a modified transliteration of *Shudur-aku*, "the command of Aku" (the moon-deity). With this Schrader agrees. There is always the possibility of the name having undergone a change. On the other hand, as the name of the deity, *Aku*, does not appear in Scripture, the Puritanic scribe might be unaware of its presence here. And to *Mishaël of Meshach*. This name has caused

great difficulty; it is consonantly identical with מֶשֶׁח, "Meshech," the name of one of the sons of Japhet. Dr. Delitzsch would render it *Me-sa-aku*, "Who is as Aku." Schrader's objections to this are, that in the first place the Babylonian form would be *Mamm-ki-Aku*. And next, that there would not likely be a simple translation of the Hebrew name into Assyrian, but rather the giving a new name altogether. This second objection is valueless, for Pharaoh-Necho did not wholly change the name of Eliakim when he set him on the throne, since *Jehovah* may be regarded as the equivalent of *El*. The fact that "Meshech" is so like "Meshech" points to intentional modification, and, therefore, to the presence in the name of the designation of a Babylonian god likely to be known to the Jews, such as Merodach, whose name was known to the Jews by its occurrence in the names Evil-Merodach and Merodach-Baladan, and actually as a divinity in Jer. 1. 2. Such is Lenormant's hypothesis ('La Divination,' p. 178), which would render it *Misa-Merodach*, "Who is as Merodach"—a suggestion certainly open to Schrader's first objection. And to *Azariah of Abed-nego*. It has long been recognized that this name is a modification of *Abed-Nebo*. This identification is rendered all the more probable, that in New Hebrew and Aramaic *Naga* meant the planet "Venus," that is, "Nebo." The consonants are correct for this, but the vocalization is purposely wrong, in order to avoid the heathen name. If the author of Daniel was an obscure Jew, living in Palestine during the days of Epiphanes, when the influence of Babylon had disappeared, and its language had ceased to be studied, is it not strange that he should devise names which so accurately represent those that were in Babylon? One has only to read the Book of Judith, in all likelihood the product of the Epiphanes period (König, 'Einleitung,' 480), to see the wild work that Palestinian Jews of that time made of Babylonian names.

Ver. 8.—But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself with the portion of the king's meat, nor with the wine which he drank, therefore he requested of the prince of the eunuchs that he might not defile himself. The Septuagint renders the first clause somewhat paraphrastically, "Daniel desired in his heart," led possibly to this by the more limited meaning assigned to "heart" in the psychology of ordinary Greek speech. Theodotion is, as usual, in close harmony with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta, instead of "heart," has *rina*, "mind." As before noticed, the Greek versions here render מֶשֶׁח by δέσμιος. Jerome renders it *mensa*. In the Syriac

the word is present, as we before said. We have above indicated that it is possible that the original word was not *path-bag*, but *pathura*. In regard to the Massoretic text as compared with the Greek and Latin versions, it seems certain that *path-bag*, if belonging to the text, was only understood in the East—a phenomenon that would be intelligible if this chapter be a condensation and translation of an original Aramaic text, especially if the Aramaic were Eastern, not Western. An ancient feast had always the nature of a sacrifice. It was the case with the Jews: thus in Deut. xii. 11, 12, directions are given for sacrificing in the place which the Lord should choose, and they and all their household rejoicing. But if the place chosen were too far, then permission was given them to eat flesh, only they were to be careful not to eat with the blood. It was the characteristic of the classic nations all through their whole history, that the feast should be consecrated by the offering of something of it to the Deity. The immense probability was that this was the case also among the Babylonians. It may be that this consecration of the feast arose from the same justifiable religious feeling which leads us to ask a blessing on our meals. The habit of the African Church to celebrate the Lord's Supper at every supper, was probably connected with this offering to God of what the guests were about to partake. This fact, that every feast had the character of a sacrifice, might easily make these Hebrew youths refuse the royal dainties. So far as animal food was concerned, the careful directions as to not eating with blood made partaking of the feasts of the Babylonian monarch peculiarly liable to bring on them defilement. The fact that Evil-Merodach provided Jeconiah with a portion from his table, and that Jeconiah did not refuse it, does not necessarily militate against the early date of Daniel. Jeconiah probably was not as conscientious as those youths, and, on the other hand, Daniel's influence by this time may have arranged some consideration for Jewish scruples. It is certain that in 2 Macc. v. 27 Judas and his brethren are represented as living in the mountains on herbs, after the manner of beasts, that they might not be defiled; but as there is nothing parallel to this in 1 Maccabees, we may dismiss the statement as probably untrue. So the whole idea of this action on the part of Judas and his nine companions may have arisen from the case recorded before us. It has all the look of a rhetorical addition to the narrative, and the differences of the circumstances were not such as would strike a rhetorical scribe; but as this

abstinence appeared to add to the sanctity of these four Hebrew youths, would it not add to the sanctity of Judas also? In the Assyrian feasts the guests do not seem to have sat at one long table or several long tables, as is usual with us. The guests were divided into sets of four, and had provisions served to them, and it is to be observed that the youths before us would have exactly occupied one of those tables. The word used for "defile" (*ga'al*) occurs in Isaiah, Lamentations, Zephaniah, Malachi, Ezra, and Nehemiah. It is an Exilic and post-Exilic word mainly; the old priestly word *tama* had not disappeared—it is used in Haggai. It is to be observed that there is nothing about defilement in the Peshitta; it is not impossible that the word is a later addition, only its presence both in Theodotion and the Septuagint renders the omission improbable. There is nothing in the passage here which makes it necessary for us to maintain that the principle of action followed by those youths was one which was generally acknowledged to be incumbent on all Jews. It may simply have been that, feeling the critical condition in which they were placed, it was well for them to erect a hedge about the Law. There may even have been an excess of scrupulosity which is in perfect dramatic suitability to the age of the youths. Such abstinence may well have occasioned the regular abstinence of the Essenes, but this statement concerning Daniel and his friends can scarcely have originated from the Essene dictary. It has been noted, as a proof of Daniel's courtesy and docility, that he requested of the prince of the eunuchs that he might not defile himself. But to have refused the food provided by the king might have been construed as an insult to the king, and anything of that sort had swift and severe punishment meted out to it. Daniel's request was simply due to the necessities of the situation.

Ver. 9.—Now God had brought Daniel into favour and tender love with the prince of the eunuchs. The word here translated "tender love" really means "bowels," and then "mercy" or "compassion." Hence the Apostle Paul (Phil. ii. 1) combines the two meanings, "If there be any bowels and mercies." The Revised Version is here to be preferred, "favour and compassion," as the Authorized exaggerates the affection the prince of the eunuchs had for Daniel.¹ The versions in this verse do not afford any marked variations. The Septuagint has *Kúrios*, "Lord," usually

employed to translate יהוה, Jehovah, instead of Θεός (θεός). It is not impossible that the original reading may have been יהוה, though it is to be admitted not likely. *Rah-meem* is translated χάρις, "favour," in the Septuagint, which is a weak rendering; Theodotion renders οἰκτιρῶν, which may be regarded as practically equivalent to our Revised Version. While the third verse speaks of the "chief" (רֹאשׁ) of the eunuchs, a Babylonian and Assyrian title, the more usual Hebrew רֶבֹּעַ replaces it in this verse and in that which precedes it. From this root the Assyrian and Babylonian word for "king," *sar* or *sarru*, was derived, while *rab* fell on evil days. Among the later Jews it became equivalent to our doctors of divinity. Before the word for "God" (*Elohim*) there is the article. So far as the form stands, it might be plural, and therefore be capable of being translated "the gods," but the verb being singular renders that translation impossible. The affection with which the chief of the eunuchs regarded Daniel is notified to us as the result of God's goodness, who had thus given him favour in the eyes of him set over him. The Hebrew never failed to recognize, in his devouter moments, that the hearts of all men are in the hands of God; that by him kings reign and princes decree wisdom.

Ver. 10.—And the prince of the eunuchs said unto Daniel, I fear my lord the king, who hath appointed your meat and your drink: for why should he see your faces worse liking than the children which are of your sort? then shall ye make me endanger my head to the king. In the Hebrew of this verse there are traces that it has been translated from an Aramaic original. We shall consider the differences of the versions from the Massoretic below. The word (*sar*) for "prince" is continued from the preceding verse. *I fear*. In the Massoretic text, the word is not a verb, but an adjective. If the phrase were rendered "I am afraid," this would represent the construction; it is one that is specially frequent with this adjective; it resembles the construction so common in Aramaic of participle with pronoun where an ordinary preterite or imperfect would be used in Hebrew. *Your meat and your drink*. In this phrase the enigmatic word *path-bag* has disappeared; פָּתֵחַ (*ma'chal*), the ordinary word for "food," has replaced it. *For why should he see your face*. The construction here is decidedly Aramaic, and resembles a word-for-word rendering from an Aramaic original. The Targumic phrase here is דַּעַלְמָא (*dee'l'ma*) (Onkelos, Gen. iii. 3). The Peshittarendering here is *dalma*. The construction occurs in

¹ For the characteristics of Hebrew psychology, see Delitzsch's 'Biblical Psychology.'

Song of Solomon i. 7, *shallama*, only with the northern shortened relative. *In worse liking*. The word *so'pheem* means "and," "troubled" (Gen. xl. 6); the verb from which it comes means "to be angry" (2 Chron. xxvi. 19). It is to be noted that the Septuagint here has two renderings, probably a case of "doublet." The first *διατραμμένα* may refer to the mental confusion or sadness that they might be in if on account of their poor nourishment they were unable to answer the king's questions; the second, *δωθεν*, "weak," may refer to the body: *σκυθρωπά* is Theodotion's rendering, which may be rendered "sowling" (it is used along with *λατουμενον*, Plato, 'Symp.'). The Peshitta has *m'karan*, "ashamed;" that they would feel shame were they much inferior in looks or acquirements to their neighbours would be natural. The intimate connection between food and good looks and good mental qualities is well known as one much held, especially in ancient days. *Than the children of your sort*. *K'gilkem*; this word, *כִּגְלֵם* or *כִּגְלָם*, is maintained by Professor Bevan to be unused in early Hebrew in the sense of "generation" or "age." Fürst would regard the name Abigail as exhibiting the word as existing in early times. The only difficulty in this is that the name may have another derivation. The real meaning of the word in this connection is "a circle;" hence then a revolution of the heavens. It is explained by Buxtorf as meaning "constellation," "planet;" *בֶּן כִּגְלָם*, "son of his star"—born under the same constellation, contemporary. The Syriac paraphrases the word, and renders "of your year." Theodotion renders *συνήλικα*, "of like age." When we turn to the Septuagint, we find evidence either that the word was not there at all, or that it was misunderstood; the Septuagint rendering is "than the stranger (*ἀλλογενῶν*) youths brought up with you (*συντροφόμενοι*).² This is an evident case of doublet. The first that stands in the Greek is *συντροφόμενοι*: this represents a various reading, *גַּדְלָא בִּלְכֵם* (*gad'lu ilkem*), by no means an impossible reading. The other, *ἀλλογενῶν*, represents *גֵּרֵעֵם* (*geereem*): this is still more like the Massoretic reading *גַּלְכֵם* (*gealkem*). The Massoretic is possibly the reading from which the other two have sprung; if so, it is clear that the word *כִּגְלָם* has not in this sense been known to either of the two Egyptian translators. It is not Targumic, for Levy has it not in his Lexicon. Professor Bevan says it is Aramaic and Arabic. This, then, is a case where the Aramaic original shines through; the chief of the eunuchs would naturally speak in Aramaic. *Then shall ye make me endanger my head to the king*. Here

again is a word which Professor Bevan declares is late, the word here translated "make me endanger *מְחַיֵּיבֵתֵם* (*y'h'iyyab'tem*)." There is no difficulty as to the reading in the versions, save that the Septuagint reads the first person singular instead of the second person plural, in other words, *y'h'iyyab'ti*, "and I shall endanger," and "my neck," reading, instead of "my head," possibly *מַחַיֵּיבֵתִי* (*tsavvati*) or *מַפְרָאגְתִּי* (*maphraqti*), the latter reading due to the *mem*, the sign of the second person plural being transferred to the following word. It may certainly have been a paraphrase, but the phrase as it stands in the Massoretic seems awkward. Professor Bevan brings forward this word as Aramaic, and a proof of the lateness of Daniel. If we are correct, it is a case where the Aramaic of the original shines through. The word indubitably occurs in Ezek. xviii. 7. As counsel for the prosecution, Professor Bevan must get rid of this awkward fact. Cornill, one of his colleagues in the case against Daniel, suggests that another word should be read in Ezekiel, and Professor Bevan agrees, but differs as to the word. There is no indication in any of the versions that there is any uncertainty as to the reading in Ezekiel. It is a most convenient method of getting rid of an awkward fact; little extension of it might make any word one pleased a *hapax legomenon*. The critics might have tried the method more reasonably on Daniel than on Ezekiel; but as their brief was against Daniel, that did not occur to them. The picture presented to us in this verse is one that in the circumstances is full of naturalness. We have, on the one hand, the eager entreaty of the Hebrew youth; the kindly look of the prince, willing to grant anything he possibly can to his favourite, yet hindered by fear for himself, and at the same time a desire that Daniel, his favourite, should stand well with the king. The chief of the eunuchs knew that personal good looks were an important matter with Nebuchadnezzar. If they were badly nourished, these Hebrew youths would be handicapped in their examination before the king. But more, shame at their own appearance would disturb them mentally, even if they were able to study as well on this plain food they desired. If the failure were egregious, then investigation might be demanded, and then the fact that he had transgressed the orders of the king would be a serious offence—the king knew no mercy when enraged. It is to be observed that the chief of the eunuchs first appeals to the self-interest of the youths before him, that they would endanger their own prospects; but as that does not move them, he next tells them that his own life would

be endangered. In this case we must remember we have merely a summary, and a very condensed summary, of what was probably a prolonged argument. We have only the heads, and probably the succession of the arguments. It may, perhaps, be regarded as a proof of the authenticity of this speech that two Aramaic words are preserved in it. The Rabbaris most certainly would speak in Aramaic, and technical words such as *geel* and *heyyaltem* might be retained even in a translation, if there were no word which was quite an exact equivalent. Thus in translations from French or German into English, how frequently are words transferred from the original tongue! "Onesided" is a case in point.

Ver. 11.—Then said Daniel to Melzar, whom the prince of the eunuchs had set over Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. The reading of the Septuagint differs from the Massoretic in two particulars—instead of "Melzar," the name given is "Abiesdri," as in the third verse; and the verb *minnah* (מִנָּה) is read מִנָּה (*minnah*), "set over." The Peshitta reads instead of "Melzar," in this verse, "Mashitzar" (but see ver. 16). This confirms the idea that this is a proper name, not an official title. If the assumption of the Septuagint is correct, then the name in the Massoretic text ought to be Hammelzar. This might indicate the name to be Amil-Assur, corresponding to *Amil-Merodach*. Theodotion renders the name Ἀμέλσαρ. While a good deal can be said for making "Melzar" or "Hammelzar" a proper name, something may also be said for the idea which has gained ground that "Melzar," since it has the article before it, is the name of an official. Lenormant ('La Divination,' p. 196) makes the name *Amil-Ussur*. Such, at any rate, is the name of an official in the court of a Ninevite king; it is supposed to mean "steward," but it may be doubted if this is the exact equivalent of such an official as the one here referred to. Hitzig suggests παιδαγωγός, and for this rendering there is much to be said. It is an indirect proof of the antiquity of the book, that an official is referred to by a title the exact force of which had been forgotten when the Septuagint translation was produced, not later certainly than the first century B.C. Theodotion and Jerome are as far at sea as is also the Peshitta. The critical hypothesis is that this Assyrian name for "steward" remained known among the Palestinian Jews from the fall of the Babylonian Empire in B.C. 532 to B.C. 168, and then in less than a couple of centuries utterly disappeared. The reading of the Septuagint, "Abiesdri," may be laid aside; it is a reading that would

suggest itself to any one who appreciated the difficulty of the passage. In the previous verse we were made auditors to a conversation between Daniel and Ashpenaz, in which he does not consent to Daniel's request. In the verse before us Daniel addresses another request to a new but subordinate official. As the request is one that might naturally follow the refusal, mild but to all appearance firm, of the prince of the eunuchs, what could be more natural than to imagine that *Amelzar* was a misreading for *Abiesdri*? The story has been condensed. Had we the full narrative, we most likely would have seen that Daniel had to go over the argument with the subordinate that he had already had with the superior. It is not unlikely that the prince of the eunuchs was not expressly informed of the experiment being tried, of which the verse which follows informs us. This would help to save him from the responsibility of the thing; it is not inconceivable that he intentionally kept himself uninformed. Not only has Daniel secured a personal influence over the prince of the eunuchs, but also over this Melzar, or steward. There are people in the world who have this magnetic power over their fellows which compels their liking. When with this are united abilities of a man to do exploits and leave his mark on the world, we have a national hero. Napoleon the Great was eminently a man of this kind.

Ver. 12.—Prove thy servants, I beseech thee, ten days; and let them give us pulse to eat, and water to drink. The Septuagint seems to have read *gulan*, "let them be given," instead of *yitau*, "let them give." *Zero'im*, "seeds" (σπέρματα, Theodotion), "pulse" (δσπλωρ, Septuagint and Authorized and Revised Versions). This word occurs only here; it differs, however, only by the second vowel from *zêrûim* in Isa. lxi. 11, and there it is rendered as by Theodotion here, σπέρματα. As the vowels were not written for centuries after the latest critical date of Daniel, it is in the highest degree absurd to ground any argument on the pronunciation affixed to the word by these late scribes, probably with as great caprice as made them maintain to all time "suspended letters" here and there in the text, or sometimes begin a word with a final *mem*. Professor Bevan regards this word as possibly a scribe's mistake for *zêrûim*, a word with the same meaning, which occurs in ver. 16, and is found in the Talmud. He might more naturally regard *zero'im* as a scribe's mistake for *zero'im*. As, however, the word is Aramaic, occurring both in the Eastern and Western dialects, it may be a case where the original word shines through. *Prove thy servants ten days*. The word used for "prove" is that frequently used of God in relation to men, as in Gen.

xxii. 1, "God did prove Abraham." Calvin thinks that Daniel made this request because he had been directed by the Divine Spirit. We would not for one moment deny that all wisdom comes down from above, and that it is the Spirit of the Almighty that giveth understanding, yet the suggestion was a reasonable one, the period was long enough to have given signs that it affected them injuriously, and yet not so long but the evil effects might easily be removed. *Ten days.* It may be that this is merely a round number—an easily marked period—but an experiment would have a definite period. It is approximately the third of a revolution of the moon, and as the Babylonians were attentive observers of the movements of the heavenly bodies, especially of the moon, "ten days" is likely enough to be a period with them, as certainly a week was. Moreover, among all the nations of antiquity numbers were credited with special powers, as all who have studied Greek philosophy know. Pythagoras rested the whole universe on number. This theory, in which to some extent he was followed by Plato, seems to have been derived from Assyrian, if not Babylonian sources. Thus Lenormant, in 'La Magie,' gives a dialogue between *Hea* and his son *Siliq-mulu-gi*. Everything depends on knowing "the number."¹ It may be noted, as bearing on this, that in the bas-reliefs portraying a feast from the palace of Asshurbanipal, the guests are seated in messes of four round small tables. If, then, as is probable, all these young cadets at the Babylonian court sat in the royal presence, they would have a table to themselves, and thus the peculiarity of their meal would not be patent to the whole company. Had the number of friends been more, they would have been conspicuous; had they been fewer, they would have been observed by those added to make up the number. Their request to be allowed to eat only pulse and to drink only water, had not, as we have already said, anything necessarily of the asceticism of the Essenes. They, the Essenes, rather started from Daniel and his friends. Maimonides tells us that there were three kinds of *zēronim*—*thū'ah*, "crops," wheat, barley, millet, etc.; *galonith*, "small crops," peas, beans, lentils; *ge'nah*, "garden seeds," such as mint, anise,

and cummin. The English versions and the Septuagint agree in regarding the second of these classes as here intended. There is this to be said, that seeds are the most nourishing form of vegetable diet. Aben Ezra suggests "rice" as the seeds used for this purpose; but as, just as in all hot climates, vegetables and fruits of all sorts were largely consumed in Babylon, definition is unnecessary. To the present day among the inhabitants of the district around ancient Babylon, indeed, over the Levant generally, dates and raisins, with grain, and in the season fresh fruit, form the staple food. Daniel really prayed to live as the common people.

Ver. 13.—Then let our countenances be looked upon before thee, and the countenance of the children that eat of the portion of the king's meat: and as thou seest, deal with thy servants. The Septuagint Version here differs considerably from the Massoretic text; it is as follows: "And should our countenance appear more downcast than (*διατραπημένην παρά*) those other youths who eat of the royal feast, according as thou seest good (*θέλεις*), so deal with thy servants." In the text before the Septuagint translator *פָּנֵינוּ* (*phanika*), "before thee," is omitted, and instead of *מֵהָרָחֵק* (*merekh*), "appearance," is read *עֵינֵינוּ* (*zo'aphim*), and after is inserted *מִן* (*min*), "from," the sign of the comparative, equivalent to "than." Theodotion, Jerome, and the Peshitta represent accurately the Massoretic text. Against the Septuagint reading is the fact that in the Massoretic, *marayeen* is construed a singular, but in Ezek. xv. 10 it is plural. The vocalization of *tirayh*, "thou shalt see," is Aramaean,¹ and therefore confirms the idea that this chapter is a translation in which the original shines through. The reading of the Septuagint implies that a different meaning must be put on the last clause from that in the English Version. It means that, should the experiment prove a failure, they were willing to suffer any punishment that the official in question saw good. Such an interference with the arrangements of the king would be a crime to be punished with stripes. Although a perfectly consistent sense can be brought from the text behind the Septuagint, yet, from the fact that the phrase, *עֵינֵינוּ מִן־הָרָחֵק* (*zo'aphem min-hay'ladeem*), occurs in the tenth verse, and therefore may be repeated here by accident, we would not definitely prefer it. Further, the Massoretic text follows more naturally from the context. Let the steward see the result of the experiment after ten days, and, as he sees, so let him judge and act. Daniel and his companions

¹ Rawlinson ('Five Great Monarchies,' iii. 31) mentions that certain numbers were sacred to certain deities. Lenormant ('La Magie,' 25) says the numerical system of the Babylonians was founded on a sexagintal system; hence the powerful numbers were fractions of this, as $\frac{1}{2} = \frac{30}{60}$, $\frac{1}{3} = \frac{20}{60}$, $\frac{1}{4} = \frac{15}{60}$, and each of these fractions represented different classes of dreams.

¹ Ewald, 'Lehrbuch,' 224, note.

leave the matter thus really in the hands of Providence.

Ver. 14.—So he consented to them in this matter, and proved them ten days. The literal rendering is, *And he hearkened unto them as to this matter, proved them ten days.* The Septuagint reading is again peculiar, "And he dealt with them after this manner, and proved them ten days."

יָשַׁם is not very unlike יָשַׁם, nor לָרַב very unlike לָרַב, and this is all the change implied. The Massoretic reading seems the more natural, but it might be argued that this very naturalness is the result of an effort to make the Hebrew more flowing. But further, from the fact that יָשַׁם ('*asay*'), imperative of the same verb, precedes almost immediately, the word might come in by accident, or another word somewhat like it might be misread into it. The consent of the subordinate official implies, if not the consent, at least the connivance, of the superior. As we have already explained from the arrangements of a Babylonian feast, the plan of the Hebrew youths could the more easily be carried out.

Ver. 15.—At the end of ten days their countenances appeared fairer and fatter in flesh than all the children which did eat the portion of the king's meat. The Septuagint is a little paraphrastic, and renders, "After ten days their countenance appeared beautiful and their habit of body better than that of the other young men who ate of the king's meat." Theodotion is painfully faithful to the Massoretic text. The Peshitta translates טוב (*tob*), "good," "fair," by *shapeera*, "beautiful." We have here the result of the experiment. At the end of the ten days these youths who had lived plainly are fairer and fatter than those who partook of the royal dainties—a result that implies nothing miraculous; it was simply the natural result of living on food suited to the climate. The grammar of the passage is peculiar; *mareehem*, which so far as form goes might be plural, is construed with a singular verb and adjective, but *b're'eem*, "fatter," is plural. The explanation is that while "countenance," the substantive, is in the singular, it is not the substantive to the adjective "fat," but "they" understood. The sentence is not intended to assert that their faces merely were fatter than those of the other youths of their rank and circumstances, but that their whole body was so. This contrast of reference is brought out in the Septuagint paraphrase. Any one looking on the Assyrian and Babylonian sculptures, and comparing them with the sculptures and paintings of Egypt, will observe the relatively greater stoutness of the Assyrians. In the eunuchs especially, one cannot fail to notice the full round

faces and the double chins of those in immediate attendance on the king. Among savage nations and semi-civilized ones, corpulence is regarded as a sign of nobility. The frequent long fasts, due to failure of their scanty crops or the difficulty of catching game, would keep the ordinary savage spare; only one who could employ the sinews and possessions of others would be sure of being always well fed, consequently the corpulent man was incontestably the wealthy nobleman. In semi-civilized countries, as Babylon, this was probably a survival. On the sculptures the kings are not unwieldy with corpulence, but the eunuchs have an evident tendency to this. A king, abstemious himself, might feel his consequence increased by having as his attendants those who bore about in their persons the evidence of how well those were nourished who fed at his table. There is no reason to imagine that Nebuchadnezzar was superior to his contemporaries in regard to this. The *melzar*, having thus seen the result of the experiment, must see that, so far as externals were concerned, the Hebrews who fed on pulse were better than their companions. The period of ten days was a short one, but not too short for effects such as those mentioned to be manifested. Jepheth-ibn-Ali thinks that special leanness was inflicted on those who were unfaithful or had failed in courage. That, however, is an unnecessary supposition.

Ver. 16.—Thus Melzar took away the portion of their meat, and the wine that they should drink; and gave them pulse. The Massoretic has the article here before "Melzar"—a fact that the Authorized does not indicate; the Revised renders more correctly, "the steward." The version of the Septuagint does not differ much from the Massoretic, only the word translated "that they should drink" is omitted; on the other hand, we have the verb δίδωμι (*didōmi*) put in composition with ἀντί (*anti*) (*antididōmi*), "gave them instead," as if, in the text before the translator, the *mem*, which begins *mishtayhem*, had been put to the end of *yayin*, "wine," making it "their wine"—a construction which would be more symmetrical than the present. Only it is difficult to see how either *tahath asher* could be changed into *shtayhem*, or *vice versa*. The Septuagint translation suggests a simpler and more natural text—not a simplified one—therefore it is, on the whole, to be preferred. The careful word-for-word translation of the beginning of the verse renders it little likely that the translator would paraphrase at the end; e.g. the word translated in our version "thus" is really *ve'ay/he*, "it was," and in the LXX. this is rendered ἦν, "it was." Theodotion

is in absolute agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta calls the steward *manizor*, and renders the last clause, "and he gave to them seeds to eat, and water to drink," evidently borrowed from the twelfth verse. The result of the success of the experiment is that the youths are no more importuned to partake of the king's dainties. The steward, or the attendant who looked after their mess, supplied them with pulse. It has occurred to two commentators, widely separated from each other in point of time, that the consent of the "Melzar" was all the more easily gained, that he could utilize the abstemiousness of these Hebrew youths to his own private advantage. Both Jephthibn-Ali in the beginning of the eleventh century, and Ewald in the middle of the nineteenth, maintain that the "Melzar" used to his own purposes, possibly sold, the portion of food and wine that the Hebrew youths abjured. Certainly the verb *nasa* means the lifting and carrying away, and suggests that every day the portions of food and wine were first carried to the table of these Hebrews, and then, after having been placed before them, were removed and pulse brought instead. When we think of it, some such process would have to take place. If it had been observed that one table was never supplied with a portion from the king's table, there might have been remarks made, and the "Melzar" would have fallen into disgrace with his sovereign, and the Hebrew youths would possibly have shared his disgrace. As to how the portions thus retained were disposed of, we need not be curious; there would, no doubt, be plenty of claimants for the broken victuals from the King of Babylon's table, without accusing the "Melzar" of dishonest motives. The fact that the verbs are in participle implies that henceforth it was the regular habit of the "Melzar" to remove from before the four friends the royal dainties, and supply them instead with pulse. We have already referred to the word used for "pulse;" it is here *zayroneem*, whereas in the twelfth verse it is *zayroem*. Not impossible in the verse before us we have another case of the original Aramaic shining through the translation; in the Peshitta the word is *zer'oona*, **ܙܪܘܢܐ**. Whatever the word was, it seems certain that originally it was the same in both places, as in none of the versions is there any variation. It is not so impossible that originally the vocalization was different, and that the word was the ordinary word *zra'im*, "seeds." This certainly is the translation of Theodotion.

Ver. 17.—As for these four children, God gave them knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom: and Daniel had under-

standing in all visions and dreams. Or, as the words might be more accurately rendered, "these lads, the four of them" (Ezek. i. 8—10). This indicates that somehow they were separated off into a quaternion. In Ezekiel, where a similar phrase occurs, the four cherubim form a quaternion in a very special way. As we have already seen, the Assyrians in a feast arranged the guests in messes of four. Those thus seated together would most likely be associated in some other way. In the case of these youths, who were permanent guests at the table of the King of Babylon, they would most likely be associated in their studies from the first. The Septuagint Version omits the numeral, but is pleonastic in a way that suggests a coalescing of different readings. The rendering is, "And to the youths the Lord gave understanding and knowledge and wisdom in the art of learning (the grammatic art—grammar), and to Daniel he gave understanding of every kind (in every word), and in visions, and in dreams, and in every kind of wisdom." The omission of the word "four," and the insertion of two words, "understanding" and "knowledge," suggest that the one has somehow taken the place of the other; it may be that the word **אַרְבָּעָה** was read instead of **אַרְבָּעָה**. The Massoretic original of the phrase, "skill in all learning," may be rendered literally, "skill in every kind of books." This has a special meaning in regard to the Babylonian and Assyrian books, which were clay tablets incised when wet, and burnt into permanence. Rolls of parchment were, as we see from Jeremiah, the common material for books among the Jews. Among the Egyptians, papyrus largely took the place of parchment, so the knowledge "of every kind of books" meant "every language." It is certain that three languages were to a certain extent in use in Babylon—Aramaic, the ordinary language of business and diplomacy; Assyrian, the court language, the language in which histories and dedications were written; Accadian, the old sacred tongue, in which all the formulæ of worship and the forms of incantation had been originally written. From the fact that Babelshakch could talk Hebrew when conversing with Eliakim and Shebna, it would seem that the accomplishment required from a diplomat implied the knowledge of the languages of the various nations subject to the Babylonian Empire or contiguous with it. "Knowledge and skill in all learning and wisdom" would seem to mean the complete curriculum fitted to make these youths able diplomatists and wise counsellors. And Daniel had understanding in all visions and dreams. All the nations of antiquity laid stress on

dreams as means by which the future was revealed to men; but in no nation was there so elaborate a system of interpretation as among the Babylonians. Lenormant ('La Divination') gives a long account, with many passages translated from their books, of their mode of interpreting dreams. "Visions" may be regarded as appearances of the nature of the alleged second sight among the Scottish Highlanders. It may, however, refer to appearances which are regarded as omens of good or evil fortune. We see in all the elaborate distinctions of omens preserved to us in Lenormant only the folly of superstition; but we may not assume that Daniel and his friends did not believe in them. It has been objected that if Daniel and his friends were so scrupulous in regard to the dainties and the wines of the Babylonian monarch, because these were connected with idol-worship, they ought logically to have refused to learn these superstitious formulæ. But men are never completely logical; life is wider than logic, and hence there are always elements that are left out in our calculations. The possession even of Divine inspiration would not suffer men to annul the two millennia and a half that separate us from the days of Daniel. They—Daniel and his friends—did not see in this so-called science of oneiromancy mere superstition. Still less did they recognize it as having a necessary connection with the idolatries of Babylon. In the following chapter we see the theory Daniel himself had of the matter, namely, that God used dreams as means to make known the future to men. No one can say he was mistaken in this. When Luther described heaven to his child, he filled it with what would be most happy for the little boy; he takes the child at the stage at which he is, and tells him the truth, but in limitations suited to his knowledge. May we not reasonably argue that the great Father deals so with his children? When they are in the state of knowledge that makes them expect to have his will revealed to them in dreams and omens, then he will make known his will by dreams. Daniel knew all that Chaldean science could tell him, but he saw that it was limited, that behind all the canons of interpretation there was the Eternal Mind, the Great Thinker, whose thoughts are things. In other words, he did not recognize the so-called science of Babylon, its astrology, its incantations, its omens, its interpretations of dreams as false so much as limited. It has been placed by Jerome as a parallel, that Moses was learned in all the learning of the Egyptians. Jerome assumes "they learned not that they might follow, but that they might judge and

convict (*convincant*)."

We do not see the need of any such supposition. In their own land they in all likelihood believed in the interpretation of dreams, not unlikely in omens too in some degree. When they came to Babylon they came among a people who had reduced all this to a form that had a delusive appearance of scientific accuracy. They could not fail to believe in all these things. Long after the latest critical date of Daniel, the Jews believed in omens and dreams. Josephus tells us of his own skill in these matters, and is still more explicit in respect to the wisdom of the Essenes in regard to the future. Students of the Talmud will not require to be told of the *bath-qol* and other means by which a knowledge of the future was derived. We must, we fear, assume that Daniel was not so far ahead of his contemporaries as not to believe in the science of Babylon, and therefore to expect him to protest against it and refuse to acquire it is absurd in the last degree. This fact of these four Hebrew youths not objecting to heathen learning is an indirect proof of the early date of Daniel. If this book had been written in the days of the Maccabees, then the learning of the Chaldeans would be a synonym for the learning of the Greeks. We know that, so far from the *Hasideem*—the party from whom, by hypothesis, "Daniel" emanated—looking favourably on Greek learning, they hated and abhorred it. We see in the Second Book of Maccabees (iv. 14) the feelings with which they regarded those who favoured Greek manners; how even the innocent game of *discus* was full of horror for them, because it was Greek (i. 14); and in the first book with what horror the pious looked on the erection of a gymnasium in Jerusalem. This hatred of everything Greek was very natural, and certainly was very much in evidence in their history. For business purposes they had to know the Greek language; but the learning, the philosophy, and literature of Greece would have been to those engaged in the Maccabean struggle abomination. Is it, then, to be imagined that a writer of the Maccabean period, describing an ancient hero from whose example his contemporaries were to draw encouragement and guidance, would represent him as zealously addicting himself to the pursuit of Gentile learning, and making such progress in it that he excelled all competitors? The attitude ascribed to him would have been more like that of the Rabbi Akiba, who declared that "Greek learning could be studied in an hour that was neither day nor night;" or like that other rabbi, who declared that "the translation of the Scripture into Greek was a disaster to Judaism equal in horror to the

fall of Jerusalem." We hear a great deal of the historic imagination and the necessity of applying it to questions of Biblical criticism. Surely the minds must be strangely deficient in the power of imaginative reconstruction who cannot feel the thrill of abhorrence of everything foreign that must have filled the Jews during the Maccabean struggle. If the critics had only realized this, they would have seen how utterly impossible it is to conceive that a religious novel, written at that time, intended to nerve the Jews for fiercer resistance to their oppressors, should represent the hero complacently acquiring Gentile learning, and acting the submissive courier in the tyrant's palace.

Ver. 18.—Now at the end of the days that the king had said he should bring them in, then the prince of the eunuchs brought them in before Nebuchadnezzar. The Septuagint Version here is shorter and simpler: "After these days the king commanded to bring them in, and they were brought in by the prince of the eunuchs." The only difference is that *חַאֲיֵלֶךְ* (*haayleh*) is read instead of *אֲשֶׁר* (*asher*), and the *maqeph* dropped. Theodotion is in close accordance with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta is also simpler than the Massoretic text, though founded on it: "And after the completion of the days which the king had arranged, the chief of the eunuchs brought them before Nebuchadnezzar the king." Both the Massoretic and Peshitta texts represent the prince of the eunuchs bringing the youths before King Nebuchadnezzar when the time had elapsed, without any orders from the king himself. According to the Septuagint, it was the king himself that required them to be presented before him. It seems more like the active-minded king, that he should recall his purpose of examining these youths, and command them to be brought in, than that the prince of the eunuchs should bring them trooping in without warning into the royal presence. Such an examination, whether conducted by the king personally, or in his presence, or under his superintendence, would need to be prepared for; something equivalent to examination papers, test questions, would have to be arranged, or the presentation before the king would be a farce. All this implies that Nebuchadnezzar himself arranged the time of the appearance of those youths before him. We can scarcely imagine the awe with which those young captives must have looked forward to standing before the terrible conqueror who had swept the army of Egypt before him, and had overthrown all who ventured to oppose him, who had sent home hosts of captives to throng the slave-markets of Babylon. We are not told whether each

separately was brought before Nebuchadnezzar, or whether the whole number of the cadets were presented at once. It is the earliest instance of promotion by competitive examination. The clear, sharp eye of the young conqueror was probably worth more than all the questions prepared. While certainly the words used seem to imply that the hostages were called merely to be examined, the occasion may have been the "dream" narrated in the next chapter.

Ver. 19.—And the king communed with them; and among them all was found none like Daniel, Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah: therefore stood they before the king. The word translated "communed" really means "spoke," and is the common word for this. The Septuagint translates here *ὁμιλῶντες*, which does mean "commune." Theodotion renders *ἐλάλησε*. Jerome has *locutus*; the Peshitta has *malel*; all these may be rendered "talked." From Nebuchadnezzar's great reverence for the national religion and for the national magic, we may be certain that much of the conversation would turn on those magical formulæ which have been to such a large extent preserved to us. Even if, as we think, the immediate occasion of Daniel and his companions appearing before the king was his "dream," still he would not unnaturally examine them further. It is not unlikely that this conversational examination would involve naturally the languages they would have to be proficient in were they to be of the royal council. They would have to be acquainted with Accadian, the original tongue of all the most sacred magical formulæ; with Assyrian, the language in which the royal annals were recorded; and with Aramaic, which was, as we have already said, the language of commerce and diplomacy. Hebrew, the language of the four in whom we are more especially interested, was spoken, not merely by the holy people, but also by the Edomites, Ammonites, Moabites, and the Phœnicians. Further, Egypt was a factor that had to be taken into account, and so, not unlikely, the tongue of Egypt would be known by some, at any rate, of the court officials in Babylon. The empire of the Hittites had certainly passed away, but, probably, their language was still known and spoken by a large number of the inhabitants of Nebuchadnezzar's extensive empire. Not only were the languages of peoples west of Babylon to be considered, but also those to the east; there were the Aryan tongues too. If the tradition is correct that Nebuchadnezzar married a Median wife, the Median tongue, which seems to have been the same with that of Persia, would be, above all, important. Not unlikely questions of policy

and statecraft would be submitted to these candidates, to see what they would say. Above all, in personal intercourse the King of Babylon would be able to form some estimate of the real worth of these youths. There probably would enter in a large measure of caprice, or even superstition, into his choice, yet not unlikely his strong practical sense would limit his superstition. The result of this examination is eminently satisfactory to the young Hebrews. They were found superior to all their competitors. *Therefore stood they before the king.* Professor Bevan would render this "became his personal attendants"—a very natural translation. We know, from the Ninevite marbles, that the king is always, alike on the field of battle, the hunting-field, and the council-chamber, attended by eunuchs. It may, however, be regarded as referring to the special subjects of their study. As they had been admitted to the class of magicians and astrologers, it would mean they were admitted to the number of those who were royal magicians and astrologers—those whom the king consulted. It is not to be understood that, even though they were admitted to this number, they were therefore necessarily admitted before the king in this capacity on ordinary occasions. They would occupy but a subordinate position in the huge Babylonian hierarchy. We must note here a variation in the Septuagint, ἡσαν, "they were." We, for our part, agree with Professor Bevan, in regarding this as a scribal blunder in the Greek, and that the original text was probably ἑστησαν. The only difficulty is that the blunder is also in Paulus Tellensis.

Ver. 20.—And in all matters of wisdom and understanding, that the king inquired of them, he found them ten times better than all the magicians and astrologers that were in all his realm. The Septuagint rendering here has a considerable addition, which really means, as it seems to us, the coalescence of two readings. It reads thus: "And in all learning (λόγῳ, a literal rendering of דָּבָר, *dabhar*, 'a word' or 'thing'), and knowledge and education (παιδείᾳ) whatsoever the king asked of them, he found them ten times wiser than all the wise and learned men in all his kingdom." Thus far the verse is a rendering, almost slavishly close, of the Massoretic text; while the translator has recognized that the sentence is incomplete as it stands, and has inserted σοφωτέρους, and translated ὑπὲρ (al) by ὑπέρ. But the translation proceeds, "And the king honoured them, and appointed them rulers." This seems to have been due to a various reading. The sentence here translated was probably, in an old recension of the text, all that stood here, and some

scribe, finding it, inserted it here to complete the sentence. The translation, however, proceeds yet further, "And constituted (*ἀπεδείξαν*) them wiser than all those of his in affairs in all his land and in his kingdom." This sentence has all the appearance of an attempt to render into Greek a piece of Hebrew that the translator imperfectly understood. As we find that *ἀπεδείκνυμι* represents occasionally דָּרַךְ, and as the Syriac *sav* and the old Hebrew *y* were almost identical in shape, יָדַע (*yod'a*) might be read as דָּרַךְ; evidently the translator has read חֲכָמִים (*hacmeem*) instead of חֲכָמִים (*hartummeem*), and has transferred the 'al col from before *hartummeem* to before the next word, which seems to have read, not 'ashshapheem, but *hartzo*, the relative seems to have been omitted, and the second col, "all." This great variety of reading suggests suspicions of the verse altogether, which the content of the verse rather strengthens. Theodotion is in strict agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta also is at one with it in this, but these are late compared with the Septuagint. It has been reasoned that the Book of Daniel is a story modelled on the history of Joseph, and the presence of *hartummeem* here is regarded as a proof of this quasi Egyptian origin (see Gen. xli. 8; Exod. vii. 11, etc.). One thing is clear, that the word—whatever it was—was unknown in Alexandria, where this translation was made; *hartummeem*, as occurring in the Pentateuch, the earliest part of the Old Testament translated, was certain to be known: how did the word here happen not to be known? We can understand the phenomenon if some word, probably of Babylonian origin, and unknown in Egypt and Palestine, occupied the place and was modified into a more intelligible shape by being turned into *hartummeem*. As the verse stands, *hartummeem* is grammatically placed in apposition to the following word, 'ashshapheem, as there is no conjunction to unite the two words. It is acknowledged by Professor Bevan that the latter word has an Assyrian origin; it is not inconceivable that *hartummeem* is really the explanatory word, though the arrangement of the words is decidedly against this view. It is to be observed here that 'ashshapheem has been naturalized in Eastern Aramaic, but has not found a lodgment in Western, save in Daniel. We cannot help feeling a little suspicion of the authenticity of this verse. This phrase, "ten times better," has all the look of that exaggeration which became the prevailing vice of later Judaism. As we have indicated, the variations in regard to the precise reading deepen this suspicion. If, however, the reference here is really to Daniel's revelation to the king

of his dream, then the statement in the text is less objectionable. This was such a marvellous feat, and one that so put Daniel above all the wise men of Babylon, that the language of the verse before us is rather rhetorical than exaggerated.

Ver. 21.—And Daniel continued even unto the first year of King Cyrus. The Septuagint supplies *Περσῶν*. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic. It has been objected by Canon Driver that the natural classical order of the latter two words should have been *hammelek Koresch*, not, as it is in the Massoretic, *Koresch hammelek*. The Septuagint text seems to have had *parseem*, which would make the order perfectly classical. A greater difficulty is to explain how it is said that Daniel “continued,” or, if we take the Hebrew literally “was,” until the first year of “Cyrus the king,” when in the tenth chapter the third year of Cyrus is referred to. There are several ways of getting over this difficulty. The first way is to suppose that some words have dropped out of the text. There are, however, different ideas as to the words so lost. Thus Bleek would supply “in high respect in Babylon.” Earlier commentators would supply “in Babylon,” thinking that not impossibly he returned to Palestine. Jerome—one of these—does not, however, intrude his suggestion into the text, as does Ewald. His suggestion is that the omitted words are “in the king’s court,” which is much the same as Delitzsch’s “at the court.” Hitzig is credited by Kranichfeld with asserting that the author did not intend to make his hero live beyond the year he refers to—the first year of Cyrus. In his commentary, however, Hitzig suggests that *b’sha’ar hammelek*, “in the gate of the king,” has dropped out. He does certainly hint that the sentence, to be complete, would need *hayah* (הָיָה), not *hayah* (הָיָה). Zöckler would supply the same word. There is certainly this to be said for the above theory—that the sentence as it stands is incomplete. The verb *hayah* is never used instead of *hayah*. At the same time, there is no trace in any of the versions of any difficulty in regard to the text. Another method of meeting the difficulty is that adopted by Hengstenberg, followed by Hävernich, but suggested in the eleventh century by Jepheth-ibn-Ali. It is this—that as the first year of Cyrus was the year when he allowed the Jews to return to their own land, that the attainment of this *annus mirabilis* was an element in his wonderful prosperity, that he who had mourned for the sins of his people, who had been one of the earliest to feel the woes of captivity, should live to see the

curse removed, and Judah permitted to return to their city and temple. The objection to this view, urged by Professor Bevan, is that the author elsewhere “never alludes to the event save indirectly (ch. ix. 25).” To this it may be answered that the whole ninth chapter goes on the assumption that the seventy years are now all but over, and therefore that the return cannot be long delayed. We regard this silence of Daniel in respect to the return from Babylon as one of the strongest evidences of the authenticity of the book. Everybody knows how largely it bulks in preceding prophecy, and how important it is in after-days. No one writing a religious romance could have failed to have laid great prominence on this event, and introduced Daniel as inducing Cyrus to issue the decree. On the contrary, he does not even mention it. This is precisely the conduct that would be followed by a contemporary at the present time. In religious biographies of the past generation that involve the year 1832, when the Reform Act was passed—the greatest political change of this century—we find that most of them never once refer to it. If any one should take Cowper’s ‘Letters,’ written during the American War, he will find comparatively few references to the whole matter, although from, at all events, 1780 to 1783, we have letters for nearly every week, and they occupy nearly three hundred pages. Now, if a person were condensing these and selecting passages from them, he might easily make such a selection as would contain not a single reference to that war or to any political event whatever. Yet Cowper was interested in the struggle that was going on. The main objection to Hengstenberg’s view is the grammatical one that it implies that we should read *וַ* instead of *וְ*, and there is no trace in the versions of this various reading. The LXX. has *ἦν*; Theodotion has *ἔγενετο*; the Peshitta has *ܐܝܬܐ* (*hu*); Jerome has *fu*. It is somewhat difficult to come to any conclusion, but there are certain things we must bear in mind. In the first place, an author does not usually contradict his statements elsewhere directly. He may implicitly do so, but not when direct dates are given. If he should fail to put the matter right, some other will be sure to do so, if his work attains sufficient popularity to be commented upon. We may thus be sure that there is some solution of the apparent contradiction between the verse before us and ch. x. In the next place, we must note that this verse is the work of the editor, probably also the translator and condenser, of this earlier part of Daniel.

Therefore the difference may be found quite explicable could we go back to the Aramaic original. If *'ad* represented *'ad di* (ch. vi. 24) in the Aramaic, and the two latter clauses were transposed, we should translate, "And Daniel was for Cyrus the king even before his first year." The connection is somewhat violent; but if we regard the redactor as thinking of the success of Daniel, this might be a thought which suggested itself to his mind—he was with Nebuchadnezzar, and he was with Cyrus. The difficulty of the date is not of importance. That might be got over in several ways. Either by adopting in ch. x. 1 the reading of the Septuagint, which is *πρώτης*, instead of *τρίτης*—the only objection to this is that it is a correction that might easily be made by a would-be harmonist; but, on the other hand, the "third" year of Belshazzar being mentioned in the eighth chapter may have occasioned the insertion of "third" in the tenth. Or, since we know that, though in his proclamation Cyrus styles himself "King of

Babil," yet in some of the contract tables of the first two years of his reign he is not called "King of Babil," but only "king of nations," and there are contract tables of those years that are even dated by the years of Nabunahid, is it not, then, possible that the third year of Cyrus as "king of nations" might coincide with the first year of his reign as "King of Babil"? Yet further, we must remember that the reign of Cyrus could be reckoned from several different starting-points. He first appears as King of Ansan, then he becomes King of the Persians, and as such he conquers Babylon. His first year as King of Babylon may have been his third year as King of Persia. Thus it would be equally true to say that the Emperor William I. of Germany died in the seventeenth and in the twenty-eighth year of his reign—the one statement reckoning his reign as emperor, the other as king. No solution seems absolutely satisfactory. The difficulty presses equally on the critics and those who maintain the traditional opinion.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1, 2.—*National retribution.* I. HE WHO KNOWS NOTHING OF GOD MAY BE THE UNCONSCIOUS INSTRUMENT OF THE DIVINE WILL. Nebuchadnezzar, who has never heard of the Hebrew prophecies, fulfils their solemn predictions. This throws some light on God's providential relations to evil. 1. The motives which prompt a bad man to an action may be different from the motives which incline God to permit it. God may permit the action of selfish cruelty because he sees it will issue in righteous chastisement. 2. A man who ignores the Divine guidance can still go no further than God permits him. Jerusalem was delivered into the hand of Nebuchadnezzar, and only because this was the case was the King of Babylon able to take it. 3. There is a twofold Divine permission—the moral permission, which sanctions conduct; the material permission, which does not visibly restrain it. We see here that when the latter is accorded, though it does not justify the morality of the agent, it indicates the ultimate working of all things together for God's will (Ps. lxxvi. 10).

II. NATIONAL SIN INCURS NATIONAL RETRIBUTION. Though guilt is personal, and though national actions can only be the outcome of individual actions, it often happens that men do in their public capacity what they would shrink from doing in private life. The resultant, too, of the individual actions of all the members of the community may not be a mere multiplication of those actions, but, owing to their mutual interaction, it may be something quite different, and thus characteristic of the nation rather than of the individual. Now, these national actions, when wrong, become distinctly national sins, and incur national retribution, one great characteristic of which is that it happens in this world. The retribution for individuals is largely postponed to the next life, perhaps because earthly life is too short for conduct to ripen all its fruits. But we have no reason to believe that the national entity is perpetuated in the next life. On the other hand, the nation survives its individual members on the earth, and lives on from age to age, and thus gives time for the harvest of its conduct to come in. It is one special design of the histories in the Bible to trace this process out. The fate of the Jews is just an instance of it. The same principles apply to all nations.

III. THE EARTHLY GROUND OF CONFIDENCE WHICH TAKES THE PLACE OF GOD IN OUR FAITH MAY BECOME THE VERY SOURCE OF OUR RUIN. Against the advice of their prophets, the Jews had weakly entered into an alliance with Babylon. Thus they were drawn into the quarrel of Babylon with Egypt. Pharaoh-Necho had deposed Jehoahaz,

the son of Josiah, for his Babylonian alliance, and set up Jehoiakim in his place. It was natural that Nebuchadnezzar should aim a blow at Pharaoh through his weak vassal, and at the same time reduce to a state of harmless helplessness the people who had been transferred from the protection of Babylon to that of Egypt. If the Jews had been true to their destiny of isolation and simple trust in God, the political cause of their overthrow might never have existed. No foe is more dangerous than the friend who has taken the place of God in our trust.

IV. WHEN THE SPIRITUAL TREASURE OF TRUE RELIGION IS LOST, THE LOSS OF ITS MATERIAL TREASURES MAY FOLLOW AS A WHOLESOME CHASTISEMENT. Nebuchadnezzar carried away part of the sacred vessels of the temple and offered them as booty to his god. No miracle rebuked him as when, in an earlier age, the image of Dagon was found fallen and broken before the ark (1 Sam. v. 4). Now there was little spirituality left among the Jews to render their sacred vessels of any real use. They had been already desecrated by the wickedness of the nation. True sacrilege is not pagan pillage, but the association of an immoral character with the observance of religious rites. When the soul has gone out of our religion, it may be well if the external ordinances are disturbed, (1) to save us from the additional sin of hypocrisy; and (2) to open our eyes to our loss of the greater spiritual treasures, and thus to prepare the way for genuine repentance.

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—4.—*Administration serving and served.* "And the king spake unto Ashpenaz the master of his eunuchs," etc. The introduction should perhaps clear up the chronology of ver. 1; give succinctly the history of the deportation to Babylon (this is given concisely by Keil, p. 70, references always to English edition); and describe the temple of Bel, in which the treasures were deposited (see Rawlinson's 'Anc. Mon.,' iii. 343). After this, two topics demand attention.

I. THE AIM OF GOVERNMENT. Nebuchadnezzar had an eye for intellectual wealth as well as material. There might be stores of capacity in his train of captives. These were to be brought out, developed for the public service. Herein a lesson as to the aim of government, not merely political, but of administration in general, whether in the family, the Church, or the nation. 1. *To utilize all talents*; e.g. those of the four. 2. *To develop spiritual gifts*. "Whatever would help to lay open the future or to disclose the secrets of the invisible would have become precious in Babylonian esteem. It became known far and wide that Divine communications, in the form of prophecy, had been vouchsafed to the Hebrew nation. Dwellers in Babylon might imagine that inspiration and prophecy were permanent endowments of this favoured people. To utilize these endowments might have been one object with the king." 3. *To conciliate subjects*. Government of any sort is of little value without the moral element, which consists mainly of love. An administration that is only feared is of little power and less use. The elevation of the few would conciliate the Hebrew many. 4. *To maintain intercourse*; e.g. through the few with the many.

II. THE CONDITIONS OF SERVICE. Nebuchadnezzar pointed out what would be requisite in these candidates for court service. They are for the most part the conditions of all ministration to the public weal, of effective ministry (not using the word in an official sense) in the Church of God. Here it may be desirable to distinguish between a man's being simply a Christian—a believer in the Lord Jesus—and being consecrated as one of the Lord's servants. 1. *Conditions intellectual*. (1) *Ability*. "Such as had ability," etc. (2) *Knowledge*. (a) Some knowledge to begin with. "Cunning in knowledge." (b) Capacity generally. "Understanding science." (c) Special aptitude, i.e., for Chaldean science; i.e. the science of the magi. "Skilful in all wisdom" (see the original of first part of ver. 4). (3) *Docility*. 2. *Conditions physical*. "No blemish, but well favoured." The king, no doubt, desired comeliness of person. We have here to do with it only on its ethical side, as expressing character, and so being a passport to the confidence of men. 3. *Moral and spiritual*. Not named by the king; but must be mentioned, illustrated, and enforced here. For these, see the career of the four, but especially that of Daniel.—R.

Vers. 5—21.—*Moral heroism*. "But Daniel purposed in his heart that he would not defile himself" (ver. 8).

I. THE VARYING CONDITIONS OF IMMORTALITY. The reference is to subjective immortality, i.e. in the memories of men. The principal stable condition seems to be the possession of soul-power (see Luke i. 80; ii. 40). But this may develop itself: 1. *Evilly*. The immortality then is one of infamy. 2. *Continuously*; e.g. Daniel, through a long life. 3. *Specially at a crisis*. These thoughts are suggested by the little we know of the three Hebrew children. *One heroic resolve made them immortal*. But how much in their antecedents did that heroism imply? Picture the parental culture of the Jerusalem home, etc. The lesson, Live not for fame; but to do that which God may think *worthy* of being held in everlasting remembrance.

II. THE ELEMENTS OF MORAL HEROISM. Describe the offence in the king's portion. (1) Food forbidden by the Mosaic Law. (2) Food consecrated by presentation to idols. In moral heroism there will be one, or some, or all of these constituent elements. 1. *Resistance*; i.e. to strong and overwhelming temptation. In this case: (1) The tempted were away from home. (2) Early religious associations had been broken down. Note the change of names (ver. 7), and the significance of it. (3) There was temptation to regard the matter as a trifle, of no account; but great principles are often involved in the trivialities of life. (4) To regard the circumstances as peculiar. (5) To be afraid of undue self-assertion. It might have seemed to Daniel that he was about to be righteous over-much. (6) The heroic act was against their own interests. (7) And imperilled the lives of others. 2. *A certain obscurity of origin*. "Purposed in his heart." The resolution took its rise in the depths of the soul, like a river in the hills far away. 3. *Fortitude*. Daniel thoroughly and irrevocably made up his mind. 4. *Gentleness*. No mock-heroics with him; but, having made up his mind, combined the *suaviter in modo* with the *fortiter in re*. "He requested," etc. (ver. 8). 5. *Perseverance*. Defeated temporarily with Ashpenaz, Daniel tried Melzar. 6. *Wisdom*. Proposed only an experiment for ten days. 7. *Inspiration*. Daniel's resolve seems to have stirred up the others.

III. THE PREVENTIONS OF GOD. (Ver. 9.) When men resolve on the right, they soon find that God has gone before them to prepare the way (Ps. xxi. 3). (See a grand and suggestive sermon from this verse in 'Westminster Chapel Pulpit,' 1st series, No. 2, by Rev. S. Martin.)

IV. THE SEQUENCES OF GOD. Very encouraging is it to know that God is alike our vanguard and our rearguard on our moral way. In this case (and always is it so more or less) the sequences were: 1. *Physical health and vigour*. Not miraculous. 2. *Intellectual attainment and strength*. 3. *Moral and spiritual power*. For proof, see after-history. 4. *Continued prosperity and influence*. (Ver. 21; Job xvii. 9.)—R.

Vers. 1, 2.—*Decadence of Israel*. I. THE TREMENDOUS RESPONSIBILITY LODGED IN KINGS. We sometimes speak of Oriental monarchs as holding an irresponsible sceptre, by which we simply mean that there is no earthly tribunal before which they can be cited; yet, in reality, they are the appointed guardians of a nation's well-being, and are responsible to the supreme Sovereign of heaven. The morals, the religion, the temper, the habits of a monarch have always been eminently contagious. Evil results of vice in a private individual are restricted within a circle comparatively narrow. But the influence of a king radiates in a thousand directions, as from the apex of a pyramid. Peace or war, order or anarchy, liberty or thralldom, godliness or impiety, abundance or famine, in the empire depend largely on the personal character of the sovereign. Without a copious supply of Divine wisdom, this elevated position is not to be envied. A true king should aspire to be eminently holy.

II. AMPLE OPPORTUNITY FOR AMENDMENT. Jehoiakim had inherited by nature qualities both bad and good. To him had been entailed the evil example of his ancestor Manasseh, and the noble pattern of his father Josiah. Here was a grand opportunity for making a wise choice—an opportunity for stemming the ebbing tide of prosperity, and averting the anger of Jehovah. His father's excellent counsellors had advised, admonished, warned. Special prophets had brought counsel and remonstrance from the source of heavenly wisdom. Sufficient time was allotted for reflection, decision, amendment. For three years in succession the great Husbandman visited

his vineyard, and tested the fruitfulness of this royal tree. The patience of God was richly displayed. But as sunshine and rain and dew fall in vain upon the sandy deserts of Arabia, so did God's alternations of kindness and severity leave Jehoiaikim unmoved. He preferred the patronage of Pharaoh to the favour of the omnipotent God.

III. THE IMPOTENCE OF MATERIAL DEFENCES. Material fortifications and material weapons have their use. Even David, notwithstanding his stalwart faith in God, did not confront the Philistine without his sling. Bars and ramparts, shield and sword, may be regarded as instruments by means of which faith exercises an active obedience; they are not to become objects to detain our faith or to supplant our dependence on God, else they become fetishes and idols. As fishermen of old bowed down to their net and burned incense to a drag, so many a warrior nowadays worships his artillery and his ironclads. "Some trust in chariots, and some in horses;" but "God is our Refuge and Strength;" "In the Name of our God we will set up our banners." Hezekiah's fervent prayer had proved, in former years, a better protection for the royal city than all its walls and towers. If God is on our side, weakness itself becomes for us a very "munition of rocks." But all the mountains and natural bastions round about Jerusalem are no mightier than a spider's web if God be arrayed against it. The crystal flakes of snow did more deadly work for Napoleon than all the thunders of Russia's artillery. "*The Lord gave Jehoiaikim King of Judah into his hand.*"

IV. PARTIAL DISASTER SHOULD BE A PRACTICAL WARNING. An old Roman legend affirms that "the gods have feet of wool." They conjectured that, when their deities bestirred themselves to avenge injustice, they came silently and suddenly upon their victims. So does not our God deal with his subjects. When the interests of righteousness demand that the scourge of judgment shall be inflicted, the God of heaven gives timely and repeated warning. "The axe is laid at the root of the tree"—a visible premonition that doom awaits unfruitfulness. One defeat in battle was not final overthrow. Honour, virtue, dignity, power, might still be saved. The favour of Jehovah might yet be regained. Repentance and reformation might even then have stayed the setting sun. What though some of the vessels of Jehovah's temple have become the spoil of the foe? Their loss can easily be repaired, if only the Lord of the temple be there in Person. But if the real presence of the living God has been withdrawn, the symbols of heavenly things may as well follow his departure. The truths symbolized in this temple-furniture shall now proclaim, in silent eloquence, their pregnant message in heathen lands. The God of Israel, who aforetime gave the ark of the covenant into the hands of the Philistines, now gave the vessels of the sanctuary into the hands of Nebuchadnezzar.—D.

Vers. 3—21.—*Training for imperial office and work.* The name and the nature of a king are not always yoked together. Jehoiaikim had been *professedly* a king, but was, in truth, a slave. Daniel and his companions, though led into exile as captives, had within them kingly qualities, which could not be degraded by strangers. As living water from the flinty rock will rise through every kind of strata, and find its way to the surface, so, through all adversities, innate nobleness will assert its imperial power. If a counterfeit king has become a captive, *one* from among the Jewish captives shall become a real king—a true man, whom all ages shall admire and follow. There is set before us in this passage—

I. A POLICY REALLY ROYAL. This King of Babylon, unlike the majority of Eastern monarchs, did not abandon himself to voluptuous ease. It must have required some force of character to withstand the customs, precedents, and temptations of the luxurious palace. Yet, however stupendous the difficulty, Nebuchadnezzar rose above it. We can easily imagine the formidable array of prejudices which the Chaldean nobles would present to this new policy of the king. Was not such a plan unheard of in the entire history of the empire? Was it not a departure from the path of cautious prudence to introduce foreigners, and foreign captives, into the councils of the court? 1. It was a policy characterized by *far-seeing wisdom*. Already the Chaldeans had risen out of a state of barbarism, and had begun to appreciate knowledge and intellectual skill. They had learnt to observe with accuracy the motions of the stars. They had attained to considerable skill in architecture and sculpture. They knew something of

the science of government. The king was a foremost man in the march of intellect. He knew that, in many respects, the Hebrews excelled his own countrymen. In agriculture, in instrumental music, in historical composition, especially in possessing the gift of prophecy, the Hebrews held the palm. Conscious that the triumphs of peaceful science were nobler and more enduring than martial victories, Nebuchadnezzar sought to strengthen and embellish his reign with all the learning and talent which he could secure. It was the Elizabethan period in Chaldean history. Although the idea had not yet been embodied in aphoristic words, the monarch had a vague feeling that knowledge was power. 2. It was a policy *inspired by public spirit*. In an age when Oriental sovereigns sought to use the machinery of government for their own personal advantage, Nebuchadnezzar seems to have been primarily concerned for the well-being of his people. When jealous mainly for their high prerogatives, kings have judged it safer to keep their subjects in a condition of ignorance, to the end they might render mechanical and servile obedience. This Chaldean king was a man of broader mind. He identified himself with the nation. *His interest and its interest were one*. He found his joy, not in personal indulgence and obsequious flattery, but in the advancement of the common weal. While he forgot himself, in his desire to elevate the nation, he was unconsciously sowing the seed of future fame. 3. It was a policy *marked by catholic generosity*. It was a part of his plan to obliterate the distinctions of nationality among his subjects—to merge all into one. This badge of servitude it was his wish to obliterate. Were not these Hebrews as richly endowed with intellectual capacity as the Chaldeans? Had they not *special* aptitude for some of the sciences? Would not their gifts and services benefit the state-politic? And would not the entire body of exiles be more content in their lot if their own nobles were honoured with a place at court? This generous policy of Nebuchadnezzar may yet serve as a pattern to our modern rulers. It is paltry meanness and contemptible pride which seek to repress the intellectual energies of men who happen to have been born under other skies.

II. AN IMPERFECT METHOD. The method which the king adopted was partly wise and partly unwise. There was wisdom in the arrangement that a maintenance should be supplied for these young nobles. The sustenance of life must always be the first care of men; and, until the necessities of hunger are met, no time nor energy can be spared for the researches of science or the acquisition of learning. But it was very unwise that the appetites of these young men should be pampered with royal dainties. It was perilous to the morals of these young men that their passions should be excited with royal wine. Very likely this king was a materialist in philosophy, and imagined that artificial excitements of the brain provoked the mind to loftier efforts. This was a perilous error. Frugal fare, simple habits of life, abstemiousness at the table, are most conducive to vigour of intellect and tranquillity of feeling. Long before the stage of intoxication is reached, imperceptible injury is done by stimulants to brain and nerve. More mischief is wrought by want of thought than want of will. Further, these young men were designated by new names. We might have supposed that this was done to obliterate national distinctions, or to allay the prejudice of the Chaldean nobles. But, inasmuch as the former names (at least of those mentioned) had incorporated in them the name of Israel's God, and inasmuch as the new names bore some allusion to Chaldean idols, it is more likely that religious pride had prescribed these appellations. By conferring on these young men names which honoured their own deities, the Chaldeans supposed that their deities would reciprocate the honour by conferring on the bearers of their names some portion of their spirit. Yet to be labelled "saint" has never served to secure a saintly nature.

III. THE KING'S METHOD SECRETLY MODIFIED. The sum-total of earthly wisdom never resides in one man—not even in a king. No mortal has a monopoly of goodness. Daniel and his companions, though young, had already learnt that self-restraint is the surest path to health and usefulness and joy. One part of our nature is to be cultivated; one part of our nature is to be crucified. Every inclination and tendency which has its terminus in self—in self-pleasing or self-elevation—is to be repressed and curbed. Every disposition and energy which has its terminus in others—especially in God—should be fostered. Besides, it is very likely that the food furnished by the king had, in some way, been associated with idol-worship. On this

account, it may be, the royal viands were supposed to possess some special virtue. These loyal servants of Jehovah would not consent to sanction this idolatrous belief. They declined to be partakers in other men's sins. Moreover, God had taken the pains to give to Israel minute directions what animals they might eat, and what flesh they might *not* eat. The use of blood in food was prohibited. They were not to eat such animals as had been strangled. Hence Daniel and the others were bound by an earlier and a higher allegiance, which they had resolved not to violate. They had not the power of choice left. In religious duty they were bound to the King of heaven. "They were willing to render unto Cæsar those things which were Cæsar's, but they were determined also to render unto God the things which were God's." We may often obtain by a conciliatory request what we cannot obtain by an imperious demand. Modesty of deportment is a grace peculiarly befitting the young. It is a false estimate of dignity when men suppose they must be self-assertive, arrogant, and unyielding. Persuasive kindness wields the mightiest sceptre. "The meek shall inherit the earth." Sweet amiability in Daniel was blended with firm principle, as luscious dates adorn the stately palm. Very likely Daniel had tacitly resolved not to violate his conscience, whatever the prince of the eunuchs might urge. But he would try gentler measures at first. He would not defeat his own ends by precipitate speech. Words, once uttered, are not easily recalled. The excellences of Daniel had already gained for him a place in the heart of this chamberlain, and the influence over this officer which Daniel had virtuously gained was used for his companions as much as for himself. The fruits of our goodness, *others* share in. We cannot live wholly for ourselves. The human race is an organic body, the several parts of which are united by ligaments of mutual service and reciprocal interest.

IV. THE OPERATION OF SELFISH FEAR. This palace official seems to us a man mild and placable, but a slave of formal routine. The maxim of his life was this—That which has been from time immemorial must continue world without end. To presume to offer a suggestion to his royal master was an offence bordering on treason. It had never occurred to him to question the wisdom of previous kings and chamberlains. *Of course* viands coming from the royal larder, and consecrated to the gods, *must* feed and vitalize human brains. It would be rank impiety to doubt it. So men hand down beliefs and customs from age to age, without bringing them to the test of practical utility. Their business runs daily in some narrow groove, and they become so completely the creatures of habit that all the energies of mind are lulled into inglorious sleep. "Let well alone" is one of their easy-going adages; forgetting that there is a "better" and a "best." This subordinate prince does not attempt to reason on the merits of the case. He is not willing to tolerate in these Hebrew youths the exercise of intelligence, judgment, or conscience. At once, he thinks exclusively of the injurious effect upon himself: "I fear my lord the king." Had he argued that he had a duty to the king, which obligation required him to fulfil, there would have been an element of nobleness in his attitude. Or had he showed anxiety for the risk of loss these young men ran, it would have been commendable. But this fear for himself is mean and despicable. Indeed, the service he had engaged to perform was one beyond his power to carry into effect without the consent of these youths themselves. This chamberlain could have spread the students' table with the prescribed food and wine, but no human power could have compelled these youths to partake. With the spreading of the periodic repast, the chamberlain's duty would properly have terminated; but he was confronted with a difficulty he had not expected, and showed the weakness of his character by giving way at once to selfish fear. If he found that his royal master required of him unreasonable or impossible service, he could surely have requested his sovereign to relieve him from that post, and place him in some other position. A loss of official station is not necessarily a disgrace: it is often an honour. A good man need fear no one save God.

"Fear him, ye saints, and you will then
Have nothing else to fear."

V. THE EXPERIMENT PROPOSED. Daniel readily proposed a plan which might quiet the chamberlain's fears. He suggests that an experiment be made for ten days only, during which time he and his comrades should diet on vegetable food and water.

1. It was a reasonable suggestion. The question at issue was one that could be brought to the test of practical demonstration, and controversy would be saved by such an appeal. An hour of experiment is more fruitful than years of speculative reasoning. The eye is not always a safe arbitrator. No organ is so easily deceived. But in this case the eye was a competent judge. A competition was instituted between self-indulgence and self-restraint. The virtue of abstemiousness was placed upon its trial, and we do well to note the result. 2. Nor can we close our eyes to the fact that Daniel regarded this self-abstinence as a branch of religious duty. No department of our daily life is beyond the reach of conscience. As each ray of sunshine, and each flake of snow, contributes its quota to the autumnal harvest; so each act in a man's life, even the most trivial, produces its effect upon his interior nature—contributes either to his nobleness or to his degradation. There are occasions when men use this plea of conscience dishonestly. They make conscience a mask wherewith to hide inclination and self-will. But Daniel was a true man. Transparency of motive was a jewel that glittered on his brow. 3. Daniel proposed this ordeal in the exercise of full confidence in God. He had, without doubt, already proved in himself the benefit, bodily and mentally, of simple diet. Never, until now, had he been brought into the circle of such fascinating temptation; and now it was to be seen whether his faith in God would bear the trial. Yes! his faith was not only food-proof, but even fire-proof. Full sure was he that "man did not live by bread alone, but by every word of God." One wiser than himself, and kinder than any human friend, had, with blended authority and love, decreed what might and what might not be eaten, and Daniel knew that devout obedience would secure a certain blessing. "He that doubteth is condemned if he eat."

VI. OBSERVE THE SUCCESSFUL RESULT. The experiment terminated favourably on their health. They were both "fairer and fatter in flesh" than their competitors. Physical beauty, as well as physical strength, is to be adequately valued. Both are gifts of God; their possession ought to awaken thankfulness. Both *may* lead to sin. We must distinguish between natural appetites and acquired depraved tastes. To satisfy natural appetite is to do the will of God; to pander to needless cravings is to violate Divine authority. There is a large *amount* of pleasure arising from robust health, although the *quality* of this pleasure is none of the highest. To make the development of the body—the attainment of physical perfection—a study, during the growing years of youth, is a religious duty. The possession of perfect health, and the enjoyment arising therefrom, are within the reach of the poorest born. The jainties and effeminacies prevalent in marble palaces hinder, rather than help, the perfection of physical beauty. Daniel's simple pulse had more worth than the king's delicacies. Real hunger furnishes the best condiments. 1. The *prizes of virtue are manifold and cumulative*. Daniel's frugal diet brought its own inward satisfaction. Ten days' trial showed a perceptible advantage over the self-indulgent. That advantage increased during every succeeding day, until, at the end of three years, the results in health and strength and comeliness were incalculable. Meanwhile, the power of self-control over other inclinations and passions had largely increased, and this brought new delight. The consciousness that their God was right and kind in requiring this discipline of the appetites, increased their reverence and love, made them more resolute in their heavenly allegiance. They felt they were on the ascent to true nobleness and final honour, whatever temporary obscurity might arise. Their knowledge grew. Their wisdom ripened. Even foreigners and rivals rendered them real respect. Conquests over the difficulties of Chaldean learning were daily acquired, and they hailed, with glad anticipation, the approach of a royal test. They held their heads aloft, with a sense of manly greatness, when summoned into the presence of their king. "Better is he that ruleth his own spirit than he who taketh a city." 2. Then over and above this natural success and joy there was a *special reward conferred by the hand of God himself*. He who constructed the human mind knows well the avenues by which to gain access to all its chambers, and is able to enrich, illumine, and beautify any part. To doubt this would be infidelity. To these four young men God gave "skill in all learning and wisdom;" to Daniel in particular he gave special inspiration, a royal imagination, power to unravel dreams. We are prone to think that in the shadowy, weird territory of dreamland the reign of law is not

known. Yet we err. Every wild phantom of the human mind is a link in the chain of cause and effect. Only a poet can fully appreciate true poetry. Only a man of imaginative genius can resolve the problems of dreams. This is a God-given power—a species of inspiration. 3. *The day of public manifestation at length arrived.* As there is many a starting-point in human affairs, so there is many a goal. The first presupposes and determines the second. "The king came in to see his Hebrew guests." It was only fitting that he should. Every part of human life is probation—trial, which has respect to honour or to disgrace. Though the end may seem far distant, yet this is only *seeming*. The end is really near. Righteous judgment is ever proceeding. This Chaldean monarch was, in this matter, a model prince. In many aspects of this event we have a striking forecast of the final judgment. With marked condescension, the king "communed" with these captive Hebrews, and was so far impartial in his just estimate as to confess publicly their diligent industry and their superior attainments. "He found them ten times better than all the magicians in his realm." Such knowledge as they professed was *real*. They made no pretensions to what was beyond their power. They did not boast of access to *arcana* of nature or of Divine providence really closed against them. They admitted the confines of real knowledge; they confessed the limitations of the human mind. *Pretended* skill is only contemptible. The truly great man is as ready to acknowledge his ignorance as his knowledge. Only a fool is unwilling to give this reply to many inquiries, "I do not know." 4. *The eminence which Daniel justly attained was permanent.* Real greatness, like the granite rock, is enduring. Suns rose and set; years came and went; kings flourished and fell; changes swept over all the empires of Asia; but Daniel, throughout the allotted period of his life, maintained his power and pre-eminence. Nor did his regal influence disappear with his dying breath; 'twas not interred in his tomb. It lived on: it lives still. The noble qualities of Daniel have reappeared in others, age after age. The tyranny of monarchs, in the East and in the West, have been held in check by him. "Being dead, he yet speaks," yet rules! His name stands on Heaven's bead-roll among the most saintly of his race—with Samuel and with Job. In his own identical person he has lived a continuous and a progressive life in a higher sphere than this. *There* he occupies a throne; his hand holds a sceptre; his head is surmounted with a diadem. The voice of the Highest has said to him, "Be thou ruler over ten cities." In his own glad consciousness, his prophetic words have been fulfilled, "They that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever." *Evanescence* is a quality of what is worthless. Faith is the seed of which the full development is "life everlasting."—D.

Ver. 8.—*A noble purpose the root of true renown.* All real dignity has its beginning, not in ancestral fortune, but in righteous purpose. The heart is the seed-plot of all noble deeds. "Keep thy heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life."

I. THE COMMONEST MEAL FURNISHES AN OCCASION ON WHICH TO DEFILE OR DIGNIFY THE MAN. Then character is discovered. Then we see, as in a mirror, whether the *higher* nature or the *lower* is dominant. Some men live only to *eat*; some eat only that they may *live*. Daniel desired to shun this sudden extreme of good fortune. "It is *better* to go to the house of mourning than into the house of feasting." Moreover, this participation in royal dainties would be a connivance with idolatry. "Whether therefore ye eat or drink . . . do all to the glory of God."

II. SELF-PURIFICATION IS THE SETTLED PURPOSE OF A RENEWED HEART. What grimy dirt is to the fair countenance, what rust is on virgin gold, what soot is on crystal snow, such is sin on the human soul. Wickedness is defilement, disease, curse, rottenness. If self-preservation be a primary instinct of man as a member of the animal race, the maintenance of purity was originally an instinct of the soul. If we cannot wash out old stains, we can, by Divine help, avoid further contamination. To be pure is to be manly—God-like.

III. HUMAN OPPOSITION MAY USUALLY BE DISARMED BY KINDLY SOLICITATION. Love wields a magic sceptre, and kindness is practical love. If the highest end we seek cannot be gained at a single stride, we may gain a step at a time. The Christian

pilgrim does not walk in five-leagued boots. Daniel "requested of the prince of the eunuchs that he might not defile himself." A request so reasonable, so innocent, commended itself to the judgment of the *man*.—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER II.

Vers. 1-49.—DANIEL FIRST BECOMES DISTINGUISHED.

Vers. 1.—And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams, wherewith his spirit was troubled, and his sleep brake from him. The versions only differ verbally from the Massoretic text as represented by the above. The Septuagint renders, "And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, he chanced to fall into dreams and visions, and to be troubled with his vision, and his sleep went from him." The differences here that may evidence a difference of text are slight. Theodotion and the Peshitta are very close to the Massoretic. The Vulgate renders, "In the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar Nebuchadnezzar saw a vision, and his spirit was troubled, and his vision (*somnium*) fled from him." If this is the true text of the Vulgate—and it is pre-Clementine—the variation seems too great for paraphrase, and yet it is an unlikely lectional variation. It is easier to imagine the change taking place in the Latin, *somnus* becoming *somnium*, especially if the final *m* was represented, as so often in Latin manuscripts, by a line over the preceding vowel. And in the second year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. This forms one of the chronological difficulties in the interpretation of Daniel. There seems to be a contradiction between the statement in this verse and the chronological data afforded us by the preceding chapter. If Nebuchadnezzar was already king when he placed Daniel and his three companions in the hands of "Ashpenaz" and assigned them three years of study, then as the three years are by implication ended when the examination took place (ch. i. 18, 19), the events narrated in this chapter must be dated not earlier than the third year of Nebuchadnezzar. Most commentators recognize this as a difficulty, the explaining of which is incumbent on them, whatever their views as to the date or authenticity of the book as a whole may be. A really great writer—and that title cannot be denied to the author of "Daniel," if the book be a fiction—could never fall into such a glaring self-contradiction. We do not deny that even very great writers have been guilty of chronological self-contradictions;

but these contradictions were such as were not obvious. The only commentator who does not feel it incumbent on him, having noticed the difficulty, to give some hint of a possible solution, is Professor Bevan. From the obviousness of the discrepancy, we must assume that it was known to the writer, and from this we must further assume that the discrepancy was regarded by him as a merely apparent one, the explanation of which was so obvious at the time he wrote that it was needless to state it. In making this statement, we refer to the original documents from which our present Daniel was compiled. Another hypothesis certainly is possible—that there is a false reading here. Ewald has suggested the twelfth year, which implies that the word עֶרֶךְ (*esreh*) has been omitted. The main difficulty is that there is no sign that there is any difference of reading. If we are to correct the reading, we must go behind the present book to those documents from which it has been formed. If this portion of Daniel is a translation and a condensation of an Aramaic text, then תַּרְטִין (*tar'teen*) is "two," but "three" would be תַּלְתִּין (*l'tath*). When the 5 loses from any cause, its upper part, it becomes little distinguishable from 7; this renders it not impossible that in the original Aramaic narrative the events in this chapter were dated "the third year of Nebuchadnezzar," not "the second." This explanation does not apply to the older form of script as seen in Sindschirli or in Egypt. There have been various other ways of getting over the difficulty. One device, that of Josephus ('Antiq.' x. 10. 3), maintained also by Jepheth-ibn-Ali, is to date the reign from the conquest of Egypt, when Daniel is supposed to reckon that Nebuchadnezzar began to reign over the world. The conquest of Egypt, by means of certain recondite interpretations of Scripture, Jepheth dates in the thirtieth year of Nebuchadnezzar; the date of this chapter, then, according to him, is the thirty-second year of Nebuchadnezzar. Rashi explains this date by referring it to the destruction of the temple. There is, however, nothing to indicate that any of these dates was ever reckoned of importance in Babylonian chronology. And, however important the destruction of the temple was to the Jews, few of them, even at the latest date criticism assigns to Daniel, would have the hardi-

hood to date a monarch's reign from this. Another solution is that the second year is reckoned from the time when these Jewish captives stood before the king. This would have implied a different reading, but, as we have said, so far as this clause is concerned, there is no variation. Another suggestion may be made, viz. that this appearance of Daniel before the king is the same as that mentioned in the previous chapter (i. 18—20). This is Wieseler's hypothesis. As a reign was not reckoned from the date of accession, but from the beginning of the year following, Nebuchadnezzar's second year might well be the third year of the training of those Hebrew captives. The occasion of their appearance before the king may not have been that he took thought on the matter—a view which, though that of the Massoretic text, is not supported by the LXX.—but may have been caused by this disquieting dream. On the supposition which we have suggested, that in ch. i. we have a condensed version from an Aramaic original, this solution is plausible. The main difficulty, that the quiet communing implied in the nineteenth verse does not suit the fury of the king and the threatened death of the wise men, cannot be pressed, as the communing might follow the interpretation. It may seem to some better to maintain that the incidents of this chapter occurred some little time after Daniel and his three companions were admitted to the royal council. The band of captives and hostages, with the mass of the Babylonian army, arrived at Babylon, according to Berosus, some time after Nebuchadnezzar himself, who had hurried across the desert; still, a month would probably be the utmost of the difference. There might, therefore, be many months to run before the first year of Nebuchadnezzar actually began, when these captives were placed under the charge of the Melzar; so that if our suggestion of a various reading of "third" instead of "second" be accepted, the years would be over while the "third" year of Nebuchadnezzar was still proceeding. However, although many prisoners and hostages may have been sent along with the main army, after Nebuchadnezzar learned of the death of his father, many may have been sent earlier, and among these Daniel. The main difficulty is to imagine the orders of Nebuchadnezzar, while merely crown prince, being carried out with such exactness, or that he should be spoken of as "my lord the king" (ch. i. 10). But their training must have begun during the lifetime of Nabopolassar, if the three years were completed while the second year of Nebuchadnezzar was still to finish. If we reject both these solutions, we are shut up

to the idea that there is something amiss with the reading—always a thing to be deprecated—and the simplest emendation is to imagine that the "third" has been misread "second." This, as we have shown, would be easy in Aramaic. On the assumption that the text before us is a translation and condensation of an Aramaic text, it is easy to understand how all derivative texts followed its initial mistake. There is a certain importance here due to the copula "and;" "And in the second year of Nebuchadnezzar." When any one attempts to read this verse in connection with the last verse of the first chapter, it at once becomes clear that the twenty-first verse of ch. i. is an interpolation. It is probable that the condensation, which was likely to be considerable in the first chapter, becomes less so now, before passing from the one portion to the other; hence either the translator or some other added the note which is contained in ch. i. 21. *Nebuchadnezzar dreamed dreams.* The Greek versions and the Syriac of Paulus Tellenius omit the name "Nebuchadnezzar," either as nominative or as genitive. The Peshitta follows the order of the Massoretic text. The omission does not alter the sense; possibly the proper names thus came in close juxtaposition in the Massoretic in consequence of an endeavour to condense by omission, without making any further change. It would seem that the LXX. had read נִקְרָא (*niqra*) instead of חָלַם (*halam*). The rendering is, "It happened (*συμβη*) that the king fell into dreams and visions." This awkward sentence seems to be the result of a difficulty and consequent slavish following of the text before the translator; it is difficult to imagine what the reading could be which could be translated as it is in the Septuagint, and yet was not totally unlike the Massoretic text. "Dreams and visions" is the evident result of a coalescence of two renderings of חֲלֻמוֹת (*h'alomoth*). It is to be observed that it is "dreams" that Nebuchadnezzar had, and yet only one "dream" is spoken of. Kliefoth thinks this refers merely to the class, so that "dreamed dreams" is equivalent to "was dreaming." Agreeing with this is Hävernicks. Jephthibn-Ali takes the plurality to refer to the contents of the dream—that it refers to the four world-kings and that of Israel (so Kranichfeld and Keil); for a similar use of plural for singular, he refers to Gen. xxxvii. 8. Moses Stuart thinks that it is implied that the dream was repeated. It seems to be somewhat of a mannerism of Daniel to use plural for singular, as the "visions of the head" of ch. iv. *Wherewith his spirit was troubled.* The same phrase

occurs in regard to Pharaoh (Gen. xli. 8), when he had dreamed of the seven kine and seven ears of corn. The similarity of the thing to be stated might easily lead to a similarity of statement, without there being any necessary copying. If, as we believe, this portion of Daniel had an Aramaic original, the resemblance in language to Genesis proves very little. In this case also the reading of the Septuagint is different. Instead of *רוח* (*ruho*), "his spirit," the translators must have had *רוחא* *in ro' dunnaw*; also instead of the feminine *תלת* (*tith'pa'em*), the reading must have been *תלת* (*yith'pa'em*). Though *yod* and *tau* are not readily confused, *nun* and *tau* in the older script are, and in Eastern Aramaic *nun* is the preformative of the third person imperfect, and a change may have been made in translating from the Aramaic. Professor Fuller, following Saadia, makes too much of the fact that, while in the present case the conjugation used is the hithpael, in Genesis it is niph'al, since the niph'al conjugation occurs in ver. 3. Kranichfeld holds that the "hithpael heightens the idea lying in the niph'al." In Biblical Aramaic hithpael takes the place of the Hebrew niph'al. And his sleep brake from him. While the meaning here is plain, the words are used in an unusual sense; the word here translated "brake from" is the passive of the verb "to be," in this precise sense only used here. The fact that the substantive verb in Eastern Aramaic has this significance (Nestle, 'Gram. Syr.' 100) indicates that this is a case where the Syriac original shines through the translation. This is all the more obvious when we remember that in Eastern Aramaic (*nun*) was in the preformative. Analogous to this is the Latin use of the perfect of the substantive verb, e.g. *fuius* Tross; comp. Rom. vi. 17, "God be thanked that ye were (*fore*) the servants of sin." As we have said, the meaning of this verse is perfectly clear, and although there are differences of reading, there are none that affect the sense. "In the second (or third) year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar had a dream." To us in the West, living in the nineteenth century after Christ, it seems puerile to date so carefully a dream, of all things; but in the East, six hundred years before Christ, dreams had a very different importance from what they have now. In the history of Asshur-bani-pal dreams play a great part. Gyges submits to him in consequence of a dream. In consequence of a dream Urdamane (Nut-mi-ammon) invades Egypt. Again and again is Asshur-bani-pal encouraged by dreams which appear to seers. It is ignorance of this that

makes Hitzig declare, "The character of the king as here represented to us has no verisimilitude." Although Herodotus does make dreams prominent in his history, we could not imagine any of the *diadochi* recording and dating his dreams as does Asshur-bani-pal.

Ver. 2.—Then the king commanded to call the magicians, and the astrologers, and the sorcerers, and the Chaldeans, for to show the king his dreams. So they came and stood before the king. The Septuagint renders, "And the king commanded that the magicians, astrologers, and sorcerers of the Chaldeans be brought in to tell the king his dream. And they came and stood before the king." The difference is slight verbally, but very important. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree closely with the Masoretic. The Vulgate renders *m'cash'-pheem*, "sorcerers," *malefici*, "evil workers." Then the king commanded to call the magicians. The scene seems to stand out before us—the king, excited and sleepless, calling out to his attendants to summon to his presence all the wise men in the capital of his empire. The first that are named are the *hartummeem*. The name is derived by Gesenius from *חרת* (*heret*), "a stylus," and he supposes them to be sacred scribes. We find the word in Gen. xli. 24. Although the order may have existed among the Egyptians, the name given to them here and in Exodus may quite well have a Semitic origin. The Tel-el-Amarna tablets show us how well the language of Assyria was known in Egypt. Hitzig is quite sure that Nebuchadnezzar "est Abbild des Pharo und zugleich Vorbild des Antiochus Epiphanes." It is a way critics have; they are always quite sure. It may be observed that both the Greek versions have for this word *ἑραιοδοίς*, "those who use incantations." The Peshitta has *harasha*, primarily "one who is silent," then "one who mutters," then "one who sings an incantation." Paulus Tellensis has *lehasha*, "to whisper," and then "to repeat a charm" or "incantation." Jerome renders *arioli*, "foretellers." While the Peshitta interprets *hartummeem* in Genesis by the same word as that used here, in the Septuagint the word in Genesis is *ἐγγρηγής* instead of *ἑραιοδοίς*, and Jerome uses *conectores* instead of, as we have seen, *arioli*. In Exod. vii. 11 *hartummeem* is translated in the Septuagint *ἑραιοδοίς*. Jerome renders *ipsi*, as if the word had not been in his text. If, then, the word *hartummeem* stood in the text of Daniel when the Greek versions were made, there was an uncertainty as to the meaning to be assigned to it in Egypt. The distinction between the two meanings drawn from the etymology of the word *hartummeem*, and that derived from the

Greek equivalent, is not great. The religion of the Chaldeans was largely a system of incantations that were preserved primarily in the Accadian—a tongue known only to the sacred scribes. Many of the formulæ are translated into Assyrian—a language, by the time of Nebuchadnezzar, practically as much restricted to the scribes and learned class as the Accadian. Hence only a scribe could know the proper words to use in an incantation, only he could perpetuate and preserve them. It is difficult to know on what ground the translators of the Authorized Version selected the word “magicians.” The Geneva Bible rendered it “enchanters,” which is adopted by the Revisers. Luther is further afield in rendering *sternsehera*. The name is Assyrian, and apparently derived from *harutu*, “a staff” (Norris, ‘Assyr. Dict.’). This staff was possibly used, as the staff of the Roman augur, to mark off the regions of the heavens, or, it may be, to ward off demons. *And the astrologers.* The Hebrew word used here is *ashshaphem*. “In Assyrian the word *asep* or *aspu* is used in the sense of diviner. The word was actually borrowed by the Aramaic of Daniel under the form of *ashshaph*” (Sayce, ‘Hibbert Lecture,’ p. 51). It is supposed to mean “one who uses enchantments.” It is not Hebrew, but really Syriac or Eastern Aramaic. In both Greek versions the equivalent is *μάντις*, which Jerome follows. The Peshitta reserves *magosha* for the next term. The assertion that this word was really the Greek *σοφολ* is now abandoned. The Greek *σ* is never rendered by *š*, which represented a sound not present in Greek at all. The fact that this non-Hellenic sound is doubled makes it utterly impossible that this word could be brought over from the Greek. It is impossible to assign to this word the precise shade of meaning which belongs to it. There is nothing to suggest “astrologers” in the root of the word. *And the sorcerers.* The Hebrew here is *m'kashsh'pheem*. Dr. Robertson Smith, as quoted in Professor Bevan, suggests that the word is derived from *קש*, “to shred or cut to pieces,” hence “to prepare magical drugs.” This is in agreement with the Greek versions, which render *φάρμακοι*. The verb, however, is a Syriac one, and means “to worship” (Acts iv. 31; Phil. i. 4). It occurs in the Hebrew of Exod. vii. 11 along with *hartummeem*; in Deut. xviii. 10, in a verse forbidding to the Israelites the use of magical arts; in 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6, in an account of how Manasseh traversed that law. It may be noted that in this last verse the Peshitta renders *Chaldea* “Chaldeans.” Again we have to repeat the remark that we do not know the distinctions involved in these

different names. *And the Chaldeans.* The Hebrew word here is *כשדים* (*Kas'deem*); both the form *Kasatu* and *Kaldu* occur in inscriptions. The meaning of this word has caused great discussion, and its use in this chapter for a class of magicians has been held as a strong proof that the writer of the book before us lived long after the time in which he places the events he narrates. The use of “Chaldean” for “magician,” “astrologer,” or “soothsayer” in classic times is well known. The difficulty here is that the name “Chaldean” is used for a particular and limited class in the nation, and at the same time for that nation as a whole. This is not necessarily impossible. In Scotland, although the inhabitants are all called Scots, there is also the clan whose surname is Scott, or, as it was earlier spelt, “Scot.” It would not show confusion or ignorance did a writer of the fifteenth century speak in one page of the Kers, the Hepburns, and the Scots (Scotts) as forming one army, and then in the next page proceed to speak of the whole army as the army of the Scots. His use of the name in the one case for the nation and the other for the clan, so far from showing an insufficient acquaintance with the constitution of Scotland, or the history of its affairs, really evidences the accuracy of the writer's knowledge. We cannot conclude that the author therefore made a mistake in speaking—if he does so—of a class of the Babylonian magicians being called Chaldeans because the nation bore the same name. We certainly have as yet found no trace of such a usage, but the *argumentum e silentio* is of strikingly little value in regard to Babylon—her annals are so very incomplete. We must bear in mind that the text of Daniel is in a very bad state: it has been subjected to various interpolations and alterations. It is, therefore, hazardous to rest any stress on single words. It is clear the writer knew perfectly well that the nation were called Chaldeans. According to the Massoretic text, Dan. v. 30 asserts, “In that night was Belshazzar King of the Chaldeans slain;” according to the LXX. version of the same verse it is, “And the kingdom was taken from the Chaldeans and given to the Medes and Persians.” If we are sure the writer did make the Chaldeans also a class of magicians, the probability is that he knew what he was talking about, and made no explanation because, as a contemporary, he took for granted everybody knew how this was. But is it absolutely certain that the writer of Daniel does make this assertion? It is true that in the Massoretic text the *Kas'deem* are represented as a class of magicians co-ordinate with the *hartummeem*,

ashshapheem, and *m'kashsh'pheem*, but in the Septuagint we find the word *Xaδaλov* in the genitive. Consequently, the sentence reads, "the magicians and the astrologers and the sorcerers of the Chaldeans." If at the time the Massoretic recension was made the name "Chaldean" had gained its later significance of "soothsayer," one can easily understand how natural it would be to insert the copulative before the preposition. The construction of the sentence in the text before the translator of the LXX. Version is certainly irregular, but not unexampled. It is not so easy to imagine the Septuagint translator changing the nominative plural into a genitive, especially when, by the time the translation was made, the usage we have spoken of above was in full force. We may assume, then, that in the original text of Daniel the "Kasdeem" were not spoken of, in this verse at all events, as a class of magicians. As the clause appears in the LXX., Nebuchadnezzar assembled all the magicians of his nationality, the Chaldeans as distinguished from the Babylonians. Perhaps he had more confidence in them. While the change we have suggested would make only the *m'kashsh'pheem* connected with the Chaldeans, the grammatical structure of the verse has the aspect of a freer rendering than that in Theodotion; hence it might quite well have been that the original Hebrew had the meaning represented by the Greek of the Septuagint. Lenormant sees in the four classes here an exact representation of the four classes of Babylonian soothsayers. We do not feel obliged to maintain that all the different classes should be called in on the occasion of this dream. We do not know precisely the characteristics that separated one class from the other, but it seems little likely that they all devoted themselves to the interpretation of dreams. There were other omens and portents that had to be explained. *For to show the king his dreams.* The natural sense is that represented by the Greek versions, "to tell the king his dream." The usual reason for these officials being called was to declare to the king the interpretation of the dream; but here it was to declare the dream itself. Yet if they could foretell the future, could they not much more easily tell what had happened? They professed to know what was coming; they could—so Nebuchadnezzar might argue—readily enough reason back from the future they knew to the sign of the future, the dream which had been given to him. *So they came and stood before the king.* We can imagine the long ranks of the principal classes of Chaldean soothsayers in Babylon hastening into the royal pre-

sence. All the soothsayers, we see, were not summoned, for Daniel and his friends were not, and they were not singular, else the writer would have given some reason for this omission. The writer assumes that his readers know so much about the habits of Babylonian wise men and their schools, as to be aware that certain individuals might nominally be summoned to the court; and yet it might be some time before they were summoned on any critical occasion. The absence of the four Hebrews might be explained in two ways: either only the Chaldean magicians were in this case summoned, and, as Daniel and his friends were not Chaldeans, they were omitted; or they were not summoned because their training was not yet complete.

Ver. 3.—And the king said unto them, I have dreamed a dream, and my spirit was troubled to know the dream. The Revised Version improves the English of the verse by putting the verb in the present, "My spirit is troubled to know the dream." The Septuagint Version has the appearance of a paraphrase, "And the king said to them, I have seen a dream, and my spirit is troubled, and I desire to understand the dream." It is an unusual combination "to see a dream;" from its unusualness the reading of the Septuagint is to be preferred. In old Hebrew ל (*l*) and י (*y*) are not unlike each other, nor are נ (*n*) and י (*y*). Yet these two letters are the only differences between *halanti*, "I have dreamed," and *hazithi*, "I have seen." The Peshitta has *haloma hazithi*, which gives the same combination, and would indicate that here too the Aramaic original is shining through. It is, however, difficult to see how such a word as *ahpatz*, "I wish," could drop out of the Massoretic. The most natural solution is that the translator added θελω to complete the sense. Certainly a link is wanting as it stands in the ordinary interpretation of this verse. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic, while the Vulgate paraphrases the last clause, "And the king said to them, I have seen a dream, and confused in mind I have forgot what I saw." The king has been perturbed by the dream, and his perturbation leads him to wish to know the dream—not necessarily what the dream actually had been, but what it meant. Thus in ch. i. 17 Daniel had understanding "in all visions and dreams;" this meant that he knew the meaning of dreams and visions. The other versions give us no assistance to explain this. Archdeacon Rose says, "The king here plainly intimates that, though the dream had troubled and perplexed him, he could not remember what it was." It does not appear to us quite so plain. It is certainly not impossible to imagine that, while

the king had been strongly affected by the dream, he might not remember distinctly what it was. If, however, he had no remembrance of the dream, and only the feeling of perturbation, any grandiose vision might have been brought before him, and he would not have been able to check it, or say that was not the dream he had had. If, again, he had some fragmentary remembrance, he naturally would have told what he remembered, in order that they might reconstruct his dream for him. Nebuchadnezzar's great purpose is not merely to see again his dream, but really to test these soothsayers that promised so much. If they could with such certainty as they professed tell what was about to happen, surely it was no great demand that they should know this dream of his. The king seems merely to have made the general statement, and left the soothsayers to tell at once the dream and interpretation. There sits the king with troubled brow, and there stand before him the principal adepts at interpretation of dreams. Some have found it a difficulty that God should reveal the future to a heathen monarch. But in the parallel case of Pharaoh this occurred; certainly the future revealed to him was the immediate future of the land he ruled, whereas the dream of Nebuchadnezzar extended in its revelation to the very end of time. Archdeacon Rose refers to Pilate's wife and her mysterious dream at the trial of our Lord. The revelation as given to Nebuchadnezzar served a double purpose—it gave emphasis to it when, not an obscure Hebrew scholar got the vision, but the great conqueror; further, it gave an occasion for bringing Daniel into prominence, and gave thus to him and to his companions an opportunity of showing their fidelity to God. This gave an occasion for miracles, the effect of which was to strengthen the Jews in their faith.

Ver. 4.—*Then spake the Chaldeans to the king in Syriack, O king, live for ever: tell thy servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation.* The versions do not imply any important difference. *Then . . . the Chaldeans.* This does not mean merely that one class of soothsayers—a class the existence of which is doubtful—nor that the whole band of soothsayers bore the name “Chaldeans.” The name is simply the name of the nation, but is here used of this small portion of it that were soothsayers, in the same way as in John ix. 22 “Jews,” the name of the nation, is used for the rulers: “For the Jews had agreed already that if any man did confess that he was Christ, he should be put out of the synagogue.” Hence it is needless to speak of the Chaldeans being the principal class, and therefore “for the sake of breviloquence” (Moses

Stuart) “put for the whole.” So also Killefoth (‘Kom,’ p. 79), “Because the Chaldeans were the first class, they alone are named.” The Chaldeans were not the inhabitants of Babylonia, but belonged to several cantons south and east of Babylon. *Spake.* The word *y'dabb'r'u* is usually followed by the verb *amar* in the infinitive. In Ezek. xl. 4 we have the verb *dibber* used without *amar*, to introduce the thing said. It is not improbable that in this instance *Aramith*, “in the Syriac tongue,” helped to the omission of *amar.* *In the Syriack (Aramith).* All scholars know now that there are two leading dialects of the Aramaean or Aramaic—the Eastern or Syriac, and the Western or Chaldean. The terms are very confusing; as Syria was certainly to the west of Chaldea, it seems strange that the usage should ever have sprung up to call the Western variety Chaldean, and the Eastern variety Syriac. The usage having been established, it has a certain convenience to be able to name all the Western, or, as they may be called, Palestinian dialects of Aramaic Chaldean, and all the Eastern varieties Syriac. While the English version uses the term “Syriac,” as the portion of Daniel which follows has come down to us, it is not written in Syriac, but in Chaldean. We shall, however, endeavour to show that this is due to changes introduced by transcribers. As to the word *Aramith* occurring here, there is great force in the view maintained by Lenormant, that it is to be regarded as a note to the reader, indicating that at this point the Hebrew ceases and the Aramaic begins. The reason of the change from one language to another has been already dealt with in considering the question of the structure of Daniel. In the mean time it is sufficient to say that our theory is that the Hebrew in the beginning of Daniel is due to the editor, who collected the scattered fly-leaves. In the first chapter and in the three opening verses of that before us, we have the results of translation and condensation. As the previous sacred books had been written in Hebrew—the prophecies of Isaiah and Jeremiah, not to speak of other books—it was natural that the editor, especially if he were under the influence of Ezra, would desire to see a book that had so much of holy hope and aspiration about it, in the sacred language of the patriarchs and prophets. There would be probably a considerable mass of irregular material to be gone over before a connected account could be given of the early days of Daniel. These sources would be necessarily in the main Aramaic, and hence the translation and condensation. It was formerly one of the objections urged against Daniel that the author regarded Aramaic

as the language spoken in Babylon. By this time the language engraved on the tablets had been discovered not to be any previously known tongue. It is now found that, although the inhabitants of Babylon used the cuneiform for inscriptions, the language of ordinary business and social intercourse was Aramaic, and had been for several centuries. Dr. Hugo Winckler says, in his 'History of Babylonia and Assyria,' p. 179, "Aramaic soon became the language of social intercourse (*umgangsprache*) in nearly the whole of Mesopotamia, and expelled the Assyro-Babylonian, which continued only as a literary tongue (*schriftsprache*)."

Bronze weights have been found dating back to the Sargonic, with the weight marked on the one side in Aramaic, while on the other the titles of the king are given in Assyrian. When Sennacherib sent Rabshakeh to Jerusalem, Eliakim and Shebna wished the conversation to be carried on in Aramaic, implying that by this time Aramaic had become the ordinary language of diplomacy. The single Aramaic verse in Jeremiah (Jer. x. 11) implies that the Jewish captives would be dwelling among a people who ordinarily spoke Aramaic. Some have deduced from the phrase, "then spake," etc., that Aramaic was not the ordinary language of the speakers—a deduction that would be plausible if it had not been that from this point till the end of the seventh chapter the book is in Aramaic. Jephth-ibn-Ali thinks that Nebuchadnezzar had first addressed the wise men in some other language, and then betook him to Aramaic. *O king, live for ever: tell thy servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation.* The soothsayers address the king in terms of Oriental adulation. Similar phrases are found in despatches to Assurbanipal. In the Septuagint Version the phrase is accommodated more to the Hellenic usage, and the king is addressed as *κύριε βασιλεῦ*. Their language implies that they expected to be told the dream, and then, having been told the dream, they would apply the rules of their art to it, and declare to the king the interpretation.

Ver. 5.—*The king answered and said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me: if ye will not make known unto me the dream, with the interpretation thereof, ye shall be cut in pieces, and your houses shall be made a dunghill.* The version of the LXX. has slight but important differences from the Massoretic text. It is as follows: "And the king answered and said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me: if therefore ye do not tell me the dream truly, and show me the interpretation thereof, ye

shall be made an example of, and your goods shall be escheat to the royal treasury." Theodotion renders the last portion of the verse, "ye shall be destroyed (*eis ἀπώλειαν ἔσσεσθε*), and your houses shall be plundered (*διαπραῖσσονται*)."

The Peshitta is closer to the Massoretic, but, like Theodotion, softens the last clause into "plundered." The Vulgate retains the fierceness of the Massoretic, softened merely in phrase, not in meaning. *The king answered and said to the Chaldeans, The thing is gone from me.* The first thing to be noticed is the difference of the Q'ri and the K'thiv in the word "Chaldean;" it is written *כְּדָיִם*, according to the Syriac usage, not *כְּדָיִם* according to the Chaldean. As the Book of Daniel was copied and recopied many times, probably at least scores of times before, on the latest assignable critical date of Daniel, the Massoretic text was fixed, and copied mainly by those whose language was Western not Eastern Aramaic, the occurrence of Syriac forms is more likely to be survivals from a Syriac original than insertions, either accidental or intentional. When the differences are so slight as those between Eastern and Western Aramaic, the tendency is to remove them rather than to accentuate them. The older interpretation of *mill'tha*, "thing" or "word," was to take it as referring to the dream—that it was the matter that had gone from him. This, however, depends to a large degree on the meaning to be attached to *azda*. Is it to be regarded as equivalent to *azla*, as if it were derived from *לָזַח*, "to go;" or is *azda* to be regarded as Persian *azdu*, "sure," "diligent"? Delitzsch suggests *azanda*, "known." The two Greek versions render, *ὁ λόγος αὐτοῦ ἀπέστη*, a phrase which may either be "the word has gone from me," or "the matter has departed from me," the latter being the more natural, from the meaning of *ἀφίστημι*. The Peshitta rendering is, "Sure is the word I have spoken." The older commentators have mainly taken this sentence as asserting that Nebuchadnezzar had forgotten the dream; Calvin, however, does so only because he feels himself compelled to take ver. 8 as meaning this; while Jephth-ibn-Ali and others assume this to be the meaning of the phrase. Aben Ezra takes *azda* as meaning "firm" or "sure." Bertholdt, among moderns, maintains that *mill'tha* is "the dream." Most others assert the sentence to mean, "The word which has gone forth from me is sure;" this is also Professor Bevan's interpretation. Hitzig's view here is peculiar: he would translate, "For the matter is important to me." This view does not suit ver. 8. The lexicons differ in this. Winer first gives *elapsus est, abiit*

then adds, "unless rather it be derived from the Arabic **اَصَد** (*atsad*), 'strong,' or from the Rabbinic **רוביט**, *robustus*." Buxtorf does give the alleged Rabbinic use of the verb, but gives reference only to occurrence in the passage before us and ver. 8, and renders *abire*. Gesenius renders, "to depart," and quotes in support of this the Rabbinic formula, **אָדאָ לִפְנֵי**, "to go to one's own opinion," spoken of a rabbi who holds a view not shared by any other. At the same time, Gesenius gives a meaning to the clause as a whole which accords with that of most commentators, "The word has gone out from me." Fürst takes the word as meaning "firm," "sure," "unalterable." He too quotes the Rabbinic formula, as if it confirmed his view, which really it does

not. Castell gives **רָא** as *robur*, but appends no reference. Brockelmann does not give it at all, nor does Levy. Had Castell given any reference, it might have been argued to be a survival of a Syriac word through transcription; but we must remain in doubt in this, all the more so that the Peshitta does not transfer the word, which it would naturally have done had the word been extant in Syriac in A.D. 100. This would make it probable that it is an old word. The fact that it is used in Talmudic only in a formula, and then in a sense unsuitable to the present passage, confirms the idea of its age. It had probably a technical meaning, denoting that a certain matter was irrevocable. The Persian derivation of the word is by no means certain, though supported by Schrader and Noeldeke. It may have a Shemitic root. **אָז** (*azaz*) Assyrian (Schrader, 526), "to be firm," may be the Assyrian form of the word, which becomes **אָז** in Syriac, and **אָז** in *status emphaticus*. In Aramaic **ז** of Hebrew becomes **ז**, as **זָהָב** (*zahab*) and **זָהָב** (*d'hab*), "gold." The Assyrian use of sibilants is more akin to Hebrew than to Aramaic. *Sa*, "this," is equivalent to **זָה** (*zeh*), Schrader, "Keiln.," 586. If **אָז** were transferred from Assyrian and put in the *status emphaticus*, **אָז** is not an unlikely form for it to assume. Even grant the word to be Persian, it is far from proving, or even rendering it probable, that Daniel was composed in the days of the Maccabees. There is no trace of Persian producing much effect on the language of the numerous peoples that were subject to the Persian empire. There is no sign that the word was known in Palestine during the time when the Targums were becoming fixed. In Alexandria, where the Septuagint version of Daniel was made, the meaning of the word was not known, and was thought

to be equivalent to **אַזַּל** (*azal*). In Asia Minor, where Theodotion made his version, it was unknown. Jerome, who made his version, if not in Palestine, yet under Palestinian guidance, translates it also as equivalent to *azal*. The natural conclusion is that this book must have been composed not later than the Persian period, and not far from the centre of government. As we have already said, our interpretation agrees with that of Professor Bevan; we would render the phrase, "The word which has gone forth from me," i.e., "is fixed." The reason of the king's refusal to tell the wise men his dream is that he cannot do it, not because he has forgotten it, but because he has already announced that he wishes these soothsayers to prove their ability to give the interpretation of the dream by telling him what the dream was which he had had. He has committed himself to that course; he is a king, and he may not change. *If ye will not make known to me the dream, with the interpretation thereof, ye shall be cut in pieces, and your houses shall be made a dunghill.* The king, unaccustomed to be opposed or refused anything, at once determines that it is not inability to tell him what he wishes to know that hinders the soothsayers, but unwillingness. Of course, the abruptness of the action, immediate sentence pronounced on their hesitating to satisfy his demand, seems improbable. We must, however, remember that we have the account given us in the utmost brevity. We have the substance of the dialogue between the king and his astrologers. It is put in dialogue form simply because the Shemitic tongues naturally lend themselves to this mode of presentation. The sentence, "ye shall be cut in pieces," suggests some of the punishments inflicted by Assurbanipal on those who rebelled against him. In the Aramaic the meaning literally is, "Ye shall be made pieces of." This is considerably softened in both the Greek versions. In the LXX. the rendering is, **Παρά δειγματισθήσεσθε**, "Ye shall be made an example of." Theodotion renders, **Εἰς ἀπόλειαν ἔσσεσθε**, "Ye shall be for destruction." The Peshitta is stronger, if anything, from the succession of words, "Piece piece ye shall be cut." The punishment certainly was horrible, but not more so than the punishment David inflicted on the murderers of Ishbosheth. Indeed, in European countries a century and a half ago punishments yet more revolting were frequent. The punishment for treason in our own country was as horrible as anything well could be. The sentence, however, went further than merely the individuals. *And your houses shall be made a dunghill.* In the 'Records of the Past,' i. 27, 43, are references to some-

thing like this, "houses reduced to heaps of rubbish." That the houses thus made heaps of rubbish should therefore be made dunghills, is in perfect accordance with the manners at present holding in the East. The rendering of the Septuagint is very peculiar here, "And your goods shall be oscheat to the royal treasury (*καὶ ἀναληφθήσεται ὑμῶν τὰ ὑπάρχοντα εἰς τὸ βασιλικόν*)." This cannot be due to any desire to soften the meaning, for in the first place, in ch. vii. 29, where the same phrase occurs in the Aramaic, it is paraphrased, but not really changed; it is rendered *δημευθήσεται*. But further, the meaning here is perfectly different from that in the Aramaic of the Massoretic recension. Theodotion's rendering is a softening of the Massoretic, "Your houses shall be (*διαπραγήσονται*) torn down;" but the Septuagint quite changes the meaning. If the translator had a slightly blurred copy before him, he might read *ללך* instead of *לך*; that is to say, instead of "a dunghill," he read it as the third person plural pael of the verb *לך* (*azal*), "to go." When written in Samaritan characters, or in old Phœnician characters, the last word would not be unlike *למלך*, "to the king." This is the only explanation of this variation that seems feasible, and it implies that the manuscript before the Septuagint translator was written in Eastern, not Western Aramaic. The preformative *ל*, used as the sign of the third person, is the peculiarity of Eastern Aramaic. The translator must have had this generally before him in his manuscript, or he never could have made this mistake. This is another indication that the Aramaic of Daniel was originally not Chaldee, but Syriac. We can imagine the striking scene: on the one side the haughty young conqueror, blazing in indignation at the obstinate refusal, as he counts it, of his soothsayers and augurs to tell him his dream and the meaning of it; on the other, the crouching crowd of magicians, astrologers, and oneiromantists, dispirited and nonplussed. Brought up in an absolute faith in astrology and augury, the king never doubted their ability to tell him his dream; it could only be a treasonable desire to hinder him from taking the suitable steps to avoid whatever danger might be threatened by it, or to gain whatever advantage might be promised. They would not tell him the dream, because by their rules the interpretation would be fixed, and from that they could not escape. The king will not and cannot reverse his word, and they cannot tell him what he desires, and so they stand facing each other.

Ver. 6.—But if ye show the dream, and

the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive of me gifts and rewards and great honour: therefore show me the dream, and the interpretation thereof. The Septuagint Version is "If ye will show me the dream, and tell me its interpretation, ye shall receive every sort (*παντοία*) of gifts, and be honoured by me: show me the dream, and judge." There are indications of differences in the text, which are considered below. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic in its rendering of this verse. The Peshitta also manifests no serious difference. All these older versions render it doubtful whether *nēbizba* was part of the original text. But if ye show the dream, and the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive of me gifts and rewards and great honour. Ewald would conjoin with this verse the latter part of the verse preceding, with considerable justification. Like the latter part of the previous verse, it is to be taken as the summation of a long argument, in which threats and promises would bear a large part, probably both heightening as they failed to produce the effect required of making the soothsayers reproduce to Nebuchadnezzar his dream. Now the acme is reached—on the one hand, a death of torture and infamy is threatened; on the other hand, in the verse before us, "gifts, rewards, and great honour." The king is eager to have his dream interpreted, but he has taken his stand—before he will listen to the interpretation, they must afford him evidence that they can interpret correctly this dream, by reproducing it to him. One of the words here has been used by Bertholdt as evidence that the Book of Daniel originated in the days of the Maccabees, when Greek was largely spoken. The word translated "reward" in our version is *nēbizba*; this, it was argued by Bertholdt, is *νόμισμα*, *m* becoming *b*—a not infrequent commutation. In support of this, if we take *νόμισμα* as meaning "coined money," this would make a distinction between this word and *matnan*, the more ordinary word for "a gift." Jepheth-ibn-Ali translates in accordance with this meaning: "I will give you raiment and dinars," he makes Nebuchadnezzar say. Yet this view is now abandoned by all critics, and however many alleged Greek words are found in Daniel, this is never now brought forward as one of them. Lexicographers are practically unanimous in rejecting this derivation. There are two other derivations, one making it a palpal form of the *נָז* with a *ל* preformative which was Gesenius's view in his 'Thesaurus.' He later abandoned this view, and maintained that it was connected with some Persian root. Wiener maintains the former of these views, and Fürst the latter. As a Persian word, it

is supposed to prove the late date of Daniel. It does seem somewhat strange logic to argue, from the presence of Persian words in a document, that therefore it was written late in the Greek period. The prior question presents itself—Is the word Persian, Greek, or Aramaic, really a part of the original text of Daniel? In regard to this the Septuagint Version is of importance. Its rendering of this clause is, as we have seen, "But if ye shall show me the dream, and tell me the interpretation thereof, ye shall receive all manner of gifts, and shall be honoured by me." This interpretation implies a different text—the word *n'bizba* disappears from the text altogether, for no one would translate it *warroia*; evidently the translator had before him some combination of *col*, "all." The combination *matnam n'bizba* occurs in the Targum in Jer. xl. 5, therefore, had it been present, the translator would have been aware of its meaning. Theodotion renders it *dupeds*. If the phrase occurred elsewhere, there would easily be a motive to introduce the word *n'bizba*, but there seems none to substitute for it another word altogether; certainly *col* and *col* are not unfrequently confounded, and a defective *l* might be read as a *col*. It would not be difficult to reproduce a Hebrew sentence, the rendering of which would require *warroia*. This much is clear—*n'bizba* was not before the Septuagint translator. It is further to be observed that the Septuagint translator has had before him, not the noun *y'gar*, "honour," but the verb in the passive or ethpacl. These, however, are not all the points where the Septuagintal text must have differed from the text we have received from the Massoretes. The adjective *sagi*, "great," occurs in the Authorized Version, but is not represented in the Septuagint. The order of the Greek words suggests a different order in the original Aramaic. Other things being equal, the shorter a reading, the more likely it is to be the original reading. It is clear that this advantage is with the Septuagint reading. If there were any likelihood of certain words being omitted from any probable cause as homoioteleuton, it would be different. On the other hand, the addition of a kind which is frequently seen, the more recent word *n'bizba* is put alongside its more ancient equivalents. In the other case, the adjective *sagi*, "great," is inserted, as frequently happens, with a view of heightening the effect. Another explanation may be suggested. We know the Aramaic docquets on the back of the contract tablets are written in a script resembling Phœnician characters. If the original manuscripts were written at the date assigned by tradition, then it would be written in this style of letter. In

it we find that *w* and *n* were liable to be mistaken, as also *l* and *j*; we should then have *mn* (*minnt*), "from me," as a possible reading which had been misread by some Palestinian scribe into *sl* (*sagi*), "great," and the *n* added to complete the word. The case is only a familiar case of doublets. When we have further *sl* *sl*, "from me,"

the change of the preceding is thus in a sense necessitated. This may be regarded as an indication of age, as the square character had begun at least a century before Christ (Driver, 'Samuel,' p. xxi.).¹ This leaves but little time for modifications and blunders of penmanship between this and the critical date of Daniel. The latter clause of this verse shows us another variation between the Massoretic text and that lying behind the Septuagint. The Massoretic recension is well represented in the Authorized Version. *Therefore show me the dream, and the interpretation thereof.* The version of the Septuagint indicates a different reading, and has a different point, "Declare to me the dream, and judge." According to the Massoretic reading, the king merely repeats his demands, the only reference to the preceding promises and threatenings being in the conjunction *lāhen*, "therefore." Whereas the main reference of the clause, according to the Septuagint, is to the immediately preceding promises, "Show me the dream, and judge if I will do as I have said." Another supposition possible is that there has been a transposition. In the very next verse *h'vah* is represented by *klpva*—in that case it may mean "interpret," the rendering then would be, "Show me the dream and interpret," and represent some part of the verb *wh*, only there is the awkwardness of using the same word as equivalent to two different Aramaic words in contiguous verses. The difference is not of great importance; the king is eager to get the magicians to tell him his dream and its interpretation, but, having commenced the experiment as to their powers, he will not allow himself to be driven from it. Before leaving this verse, we must note the presence of certain signs of old date in the Aramaic of the passage. First, the word *hēn*, "if," is not used in the Targums; it is not in Levy's Dictionary; neither Gesenius nor Fürst gives any non-Biblical reference for the use of the word. In the same way, its derivative *lāhen*, "therefore," is equally peculiar to Biblical Ara-

¹ The introduction of the square character seems, in Egypt at any rate, to have taken place considerably earlier than Driver thinks, if we may judge from the papyri of the Corp. Inss. Semit.

maio. Particles are good notes of age, as they are less liable to change than nouns substantive.

Ver. 7.—They answered again and said, Let the king tell his servants the dream, and we will show the interpretation of it. The Septuagint Version here is, "And they answered the second time, saying, O king, tell the dream, and thy servants will judge of these things." Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate agree with the Massoretic. The wise men are unable to satisfy the king's demands. Ewald comments on the fact that none of them had the inventiveness to make up a dream, and tell the king that had been his dream. He admits himself that there might have been risk of the king discovering the deception, if no flash of reviving memory in his mind answered to their invention. On our hypothesis that the king had not forgotten his dream, but was testing their powers, it was not only in the highest degree hazardous, but it was certain of failure. They must have known the case to be as we imagine it, or, when they were sentenced to death, they would have run the hazard, on the plea, "If we perish, we perish." There was a chance, though a faint one, of success in the attempt to palm off upon the king their own imaginings for his dream; there was a certainty of death if they did nothing. All they can do, however, is simply to repeat what they before said, "Tell us the dream, and we will find the interpretation of it." Nebuchadnezzar has often been denounced as specially foolish and tyrannical on account of this demand which he made of the wise men; but tyrannical though he was, and foolish though he seems at times, looked at from our elevation, this demand of his is not an example either of his folly or his tyranny. These soothsayers enjoyed great honour and great revenues, on the assumption that they possessed certain powers of foreseeing the future. He demands of them, instead of an enigmatical statement of what was coming on the earth, that they tell him what he had dreamed. They professed to be able to discover thefts, and where stolen property was; they professed to point out men who were devising evil against another. If their claims were true, they could surely tell the king his dream. They were thus employed and honoured in order that they should foretell to the king any fortune, good or bad, impending himself or the nation. His dream presumably foretold the future; they affirmed that they knew the future; they surely might tell the king what prophecy was made to him in his dream. Believing in the reality of their powers with all the faith of a fanatic, their refusal

could only mean to him treason. They did not tell him his dream, not because they could not, but because they would not, in order that the disaster—for such he would be sure the dream portended—might not be averted by timely sacrifices. If the elaborate treatises on magic and divination which have come to us, so far as has been discovered, only in fragments, were complete, it is not impossible that we might be able to tell what interpretation these wise men would have put on the dream, had they been told it. It would be a curious exercise, for certainly Daniel's interpretation would not be the result. We must return to the versions for a little. In one respect the Septuagint is closer to the Massoretic than Theodotion, by having λέγοντες, the participle, instead of εἶπεν. We direct attention to this, with a view to the phenomenon we find in the succeeding clause. The Septuagint rendering is given above. The most noticeable thing which the reader will find about this rendering is the change of person in the last clause. As it stands in the Massoretic text, it is certainly the first person plural imperfect *pa'el* of *הוֹדִיעַ*; but in Syriac the preformative *y* was the sign of the third person in the imperfect, as well as of the first person plural; hence, if there were a little uncertainty as to the end of the word, it was an easy mistake to one who was reading from a manuscript in Eastern Aramaic, but an impossible one for a scribe translating from a manuscript written in Chaldee, or Western Aramaic. It cannot be urged plausibly that the change might simply result from a free translation, for the slavish accuracy of the rest of the verse precludes that escape. As the reading of the Greek is confirmed by the version of Paulus Tellenius, the probability is great of a various reading. This is another evidence that Daniel was originally written in Eastern, not Western Aramaic. It may be observed that while in the Massoretic text the verb "tell" (*y'amar*) is put in the imperfect, in the Septuagint it is translated as if it were imperative. The difference between the third person imperfect and the second person imperative is the presence, in the case of the former, of the preformative *y* (י), which is absent in the other. That is a thing that might easily happen, that *y* (*yodh*) might be dropped or inserted mistakenly; consequently, this affords no evidence that the Septuagint translator took liberties with his text. The question may be put, how far these soothsayers knew they were impostors. Most likely they were unconscious of anything approaching imposition. We know the elaborate rules by which they determined the exact meaning of every

sign and portent. We know how prone men are to supplement such rules by a native faculty for foreseeing what is likely to happen, and how, further, explanations may be devised to save the credit of these canons of interpretation, even when most hopelessly proved to be false by events. Arohdcacon Rose appeals to modern spiritualists as examples in point, regarding both the Chaldean soothsayers and modern spiritualists as equally impostors. We feel inclined to regard them as so far alike in this—that most of both classes imposed most on themselves. The presence of these false prophets is an evidence of the existence of the true prophets at some time, at all events; there would be no counterfeit coin were there no genuine money.

Ver. 8.—The king answered and said, I know of certainty that ye would gain the time, because ye see the thing is gone from me. The versions here do not differ in any essential point. The king now becomes certain of the reasonable purpose of the soothsayers. The word *šban* means not so much "gain" as "purchase," "barter." To the king the meaning of their obstinate refusal to submit to his requirements is that they know that some great advantage may be gained by the king, or some great disaster forefended, if he only knows the meaning of this dream, and that if the king does not submit to them and yield up his decree, and, putting his pride under his feet, tell them the dream, the time when its revelation may be taken advantage of may be passed. In these matters everything was supposed to depend on the thing to be done being done precisely at the right conjunction of the planets. His last utterance seems almost to rise to agony, "Because ye see the thing is fixed away from me!" We have the same word (*azda*) translated here, as in the fifth verse, "gone." As we saw above, its real meaning is rather "fixed," "settled," "determined." His decree had gone out, and he would not—nay, so strongly had he willed it that it was as if he could not—alter his decision. It has been regarded as bearing on this passage that St. Paul (Eph. v. 16) uses the same word as that by which the Greek versions translate *šban*, "redeeming the time, because the days are evil." The meaning of the apostle is to some extent in contrast to that here. Believers are, as it were, to purchase the time from the evil days. Nebuchadnezzar thought the astrologers were, as it were, meaning by their delays to buy the auspicious moment for the kingdom from under his feet. It is a mistaken idea that he thought they merely wished to gain time. It would seem, from what we read further of his treatment of Daniel's request for time, that, had they

merely asked for time, Nebuchadnezzar would have granted their request. He had staked his faith in their ability to unfold any mystery on this one test, and they seemed to him obstinately to refuse to submit to it. To believe them unable to reveal the truth that he wished, would be to overturn all the fabric of his faith in the religion of his fathers; therefore, with all the strength of a strong man, and all the blind faith of a fanatic, he will not acknowledge the inability of the soothsayers to tell him his dream; it must be obstinacy, he thinks, that prevents the soothsayers telling him, and that obstinacy must have a sinister purpose. There is a clause in the Septuagint completing this verse, but it is not parallel with any clause in the Massoretic text: "Then just as I have ordered, thus shall it be." This probably is an alternative rendering. *Azda* is taken in what is now regarded as its meaning—"that which is fixed," or "decreed," in which case this final clause might be rendered, "What is fixed from me is a decree;" and of this the above-mentioned clause is a somewhat free rendering. This interpretation of the clause confirms our view of the situation.

Ver. 9.—But if ye will not make known unto me the dream, there is but one decree for you. The words translated (*dī hēn*) "but if" have caused some difference, most translating as if the first word were not present. This is the rendering of the Septuagint. Theodotion and Jerome render the first word, which is really the relative, as "therefore," *ergo*, "then," *ōv*. The Peshitta has *dēn*, the corresponding Syriac phrase, which has a similar sense to that assumed here. The rendering of the next clause, both in the Septuagint and in the version of Theodotion, differs considerably from the Massoretic text. The rendering of the Septuagint is as follows: "If ye do not truly tell me the dream, and show me the interpretation, ye shall die." The version of Theodotion is shorter, "If, then, ye will not tell me the dream." Theodotion thus omits the clause translated, "there is but one decree for you;" the only word that may be the remains of it is *οὐδὲν*, or simply the participle. The Syriac is, "If ye will not declare the dream to me, one is your plan and your word." The text of the Septuagint in this case indicates that we have here additions from previous verses. The phrase, "and declare to me the interpretation," is evidently supplied from ver. 5, whereas "ye shall die," literally, "ye shall chance to (fall into) death," has a different origin. This phrase has all the appearance of a translation. It would seem applicable on the idea that in the text before the Septua-

gint translator, instead of דחכון (*dathcōn*), "your decree," there stood מחכון (*mothcōn*), "your death," the ו (*vav*) being omitted, and possibly the preposition ל (*la*), and *milah* being read into some part of *n'phal*, "to fall," probably תפול (*tipp'lūn*). The omission of this clause, as above mentioned, from Theodotion renders it a little doubtful, as it indicates that in the text used by the Jews of Asia Minor this phrase was wanting. Most commentators take *dath* in the sense more common in Eastern than in Western Aramaic, of "plea" rather than "decree." Ewald and Professor Bevan oppose this view, as also Keil, the last with great positiveness. The fact that so many commentators give this meaning, and also certain Rabbinic authorities referred to but not named by Jephth-ibn-Ali prove it to be no impossible translation. Hitzig, Von Lengerke, Maurer, Michaelis, and Moses Stuart are not quite despicable. The main reason against this view is that in Western Aramaic *dath* means "decree," in Eastern Aramaic it means, according to Castell, *scopus*, *meta*, *finis*, *voluntas*. The only difficulty is that he gives no reference, and Brockelmann gives only *lex*, which in this case it cannot be, though this is the only reference beside Hoffmann's 'Glossary.' It might be an individual "decree," but a "law" it cannot be. On the received renderings the succession is somewhat violent. "If ye will not tell me the dream, one is your decree," can only be made consecutive by a violent jerk away back to the fifth verse. It seems more natural to take it as meaning, "Ye have agreed together to say one thing to me." The accusation of conspiracy naturally followed from the king's firm conviction that the soothsayers could tell, if they only would, what he required of them. If there began to dawn upon him any idea that their silence was due to inability to answer, it might well move him to redoubled anger that they had been guilty of imposture in claiming such lofty powers and being so highly paid and honoured for their exercise. The king's mind had not yet abandoned the faith of his fathers in magic and divination. For ye have prepared lying and corrupt words to speak before me. If the Septuagint is to be taken as our guide, the word *sheethah* is a doubtful addition to the Massoretic text. It is, however, in the other later versions. According to the rendering of both the Greek versions, the meaning here is stronger than that which is expressed in the Authorized Version; *hizdamintōn* really means "to conspire." He will not admit the plea of inability to satisfy his demands—the vague suspicion may be floating before his

mind—as, if he were to admit their inability to satisfy what he wished to learn, then, according to his logic, all their claims were false. Hence the accusation of "lying and corrupt words" would still stand, and have all the greater emphasis. Waiving the question of the authenticity of "corrupt," the distinction between the two words "lying" and "corrupt" seems to be in this: the first refers to the person addressed—to Nebuchadnezzar,—the words are untrue, they are lies—as coming from the soothsayers they are "corrupt," because they are symptomatic of a corrupt disposition, probably traitorous. Till the time be changed. Theodotion renders here, "till the time be passed." The Septuagint follows a similar reading to that in the Massoretic text. The Peshitta rendering is akin to that of Theodotion. While in all forms of magic and soothsaying, time was an element not to be neglected, it was doubly important in regard to astrology, and an hour or two changed the position of the moon in relation to the constellations. If something required to be done in consequence of this dream, then most likely it would require to be done in a certain relation of the heavenly bodies to each other. Therefore tell me the dream, and I shall know that ye can show me the interpretation thereof. The Septuagint rendering is paraphrastic, "Now then, if ye tell me the thing which I saw in the night, I shall know that ye can also show the interpretation." While we have called it a paraphrase as regards the Massoretic text, the rendering in the Septuagint may represent the Egyptian recension of the text of Daniel. The use of ἡνῆμα for "thing" suggests translation, and assumes *millah* or *mill'itha*, which has the same double suggestion of "word spoken" and "thing spoken about." If the Septuagint text were assumed here, we should have confirmation of our view that Nebuchadnezzar remembered his vision, but was determined to experiment on the soothsayers of his court. This view is certainly implied in the following clause. The first word of this clause is peculiar grammatically: אַיִן (*'in'd'a*) instead of אֵיךְ (*'iyda*) or אַיִן (*'idda*). This form of compensating for a dropped consonant by inserting ו (*vav*) instead of doubling occurs elsewhere in Biblical Aramaic (see ver. 30). This is rare in Syriac, and in the Targums found only in those later, especially those of the Megilloth, which have affinities with the form of Aramaic seen in the Babylonian Talmud. This peculiarity is common in the Mandaitic dialect. It is thus a distinctively Eastern form of Aramaic that is indicated here. When we pass beyond the grammatical elements, we find that Nebuchadnezzar would take correct information

as to what he had dreamed a guarantee of the correctness of the interpretation of the dream which the soothsayers might afterwards give him. His attitude was purely and truly scientific, as it is stated. In his own mind he was warped and confused by his overmastering belief in omens and auguries, in gods and demons, in magicians and astrologers. With this faith in his heart, his only explanation of the silence of these soothsayers was treason.

Ver. 10.—The Chaldeans answered before the king, and said, There is not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter: therefore there is no king, lord, nor ruler, that asked such things at any magician, astrologer, or Chaldean. It is to be noted, in the first place, that we have the same Syriac form of ܐܢܝܢ. This seems to us a survival from an earlier condition of the text, when the Syriac forms were predominant, if not universal, in it. Scribes accustomed to speak and write in Chaldean would naturally harmonize the text to the language they were accustomed to use. The word "saying" ("and said," Authorized Version) is omitted from the Septuagint, but it is found in all other versions; its omission in the Septuagint may have been due to error—the Aramaic is not complete without it. ܐܢܝܢ (*la-itha*), "there is not." The ordinary Targumic and Talmudic usage is ܐܝܢ (*layith*), "is not," one word. This full way of writing this negative form is an undeniable proof of antiquity. Neither Levy nor Castell gives any example of the full writing which is the regular practice in Biblical Aramaic. Merx, 'Chrestomath. Targ.', 168, 225, also gives only ܐܢܝܢ. As a rule, the fuller a form is, the older it is. *Earth*; literally, *dry ground*—the same word as is used in the Targum of Genesis, "Let the *dry land* appear," but not the usual word for "the world." Theodotion, in accordance, translates *gnās*; the LXX. renders merely, *ἐστὶ γῆς*. The Peshitta

has ܐܢܝܢ (*ar'a*). The king's matter (*millath malē*); literally, *the king's word*, which, consequently, Theodotion translates *βῆμα*. The LXX. renders, "to tell the king that which he has seen." It is evident that he read *millath*, as if derived from *m'al*, "to speak," as *emallala*. The rendering, "that which he has seen," is due to reading ܠ (l) into ܕ (d); the verb *h'va* was read *h'za*, and then the change in meaning becomes intelligible. Therefore there is no king, lord, nor ruler. The more natural interpretation of the Aramaic is, "There is no king great and powerful." Some have regarded *rab ushlāt* as a title of the King of Babylon, but this does not seem to be borne out by

inscriptions. The sense is rather that of the marginal rendering, "There is no king be he never so great and powerful." Theodotion has this reading. The Septuagint renders, "no king and no ruler (*πᾶς βασιλεὺς καὶ πᾶς ἀνάρχης . . . οὐκ*)," reading ܐܢܝܢ (*cōl*) for ܕ (d). The Peshitta follows the Masoretic closely here. In this connection, it may be observed, ܫܠܝܬ (*shalef*) is not frequent in the Targums, but it occurs in the Peshitta. *That asked such things. Kidnāh*, "like this." This form of the demonstrative, ending with ܢ (*h*), instead of ܟ, is regarded as older than the Targumic form. Theodotion inserts *βῆμα* here. At any magician, or astrologer, or Chaldean. The first thing that strikes the reader of the Aramaic, and for that matter the other versions, is the omission of one of the classes of soothsayers—that called "sorcerers" in our Authorized Version. We saw that, according to the Septuagint, the "Chaldeans" were not a separate college of augurs or soothsayers. When we look attentively at the Aramaic, the reason of the presence of "Chaldeans" here, and the absence of "sorcerers" becomes probable. In the first place, ܟܫܐ is written without the ܟ, as singular. When so written, its resemblance to ܟܫܐ (*m'kashshāph*) suggests the question whether there might not be, occupying this place, an Aramaic noun equivalent to *ashshaph*, which we see is really Assyrian, and, interpreting it we find *m'kashshāph* put thus after *ashshaph* elsewhere, but omitted here. The solution of the omission of *m'kashshāph* is the likeness the latter part of the word bears to *Kasdi*, especially in the script of Egypt, in which ܟ and ܟ were very like each other. These assembled wise men protest against the test to which the king would put them as essentially unfair. They had been trained to divine the future from dreams, but never to find out dreams by what they had learned from their arts the future would be; and in proof of this they urge that no king, however great, had made such a demand of any astrologer or soothsayer. Nay, they go further, and say that no man upon the earth is able to tell the king what he wishes. They endeavour to make the king see that what he asks is an impossibility.

Ver. 11.—And it is a rare thing that the king requireth. The Septuagint Version of this passage is, "The thing which thou requirest, O king, is hard and strange." The last two words are most likely a case of doublet—two different renderings of the same Aramaic word, *yakkirah*. The primary meaning of this word is "heavy," and by transference it becomes "difficult," and then, "strange" or "rare." There may

have been a slight difference of reading to account for the sentence taking the vocative form it does. It may be due to reading דָּרַר instead of דָּרַר in the following clause. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic text, and translates *yalkirah*, *ῥαῖος*. The Peshitta does not differ here from the Massoretic text. The soothsayers still pursue their line of defence, which they had adopted in the preceding verse. The king cannot get the answer he demands—his demand is so difficult and strange. And there is none other that can show it before the king except the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh. The Septuagint rendering differs somewhat, though slightly, from the Massoretic text: "And there is no one who will show these things to the king, unless some (τις) angel, whose dwelling is not at all with flesh." The omission of *ahoran*, "other," gives some slight confirmation of the suggestion that ἄλδος , "strange" or "peculiar," represents it. It is very characteristic of the time when the Septuagint translation was made, and of the opinions then current, that the word אלהין (*elohin*), "gods," should be rendered *ἄγγελος*, "angels." By this time there was an avoidance of the use of the Divine name, and anything that suggested it; further, there was an avoidance of the names of heathen deities. The same feeling that makes the historian of the Book of Samuel represent (1 Sam. xxix. 6) Achish swearing by Jehovah rather than by his own gods, as would certainly be the case, makes the translator here represent the soothsayers referring to "angels." The idea of angels of the nations, which we find later in this book, was generally adopted by the Jews in Egypt (as e.g. Deut. xxxii. 8, LXX.). A question has been raised here as to whether the statement, "whose dwelling is not with flesh," is to be regarded as distinguishing all gods from human beings, or as distinguishing certain of the higher gods from the others. The first view is that of Hitzig, Kranichfeld, Bevan, and others; Professor Fuller and Von Lengerke and others maintain the latter opinion. There is one thing certain—that the soothsayers and interpreters of dreams and auguries believed, or, at all events, pretended they believed, themselves each under the guidance of a special *genius* or subordinate god. Such a god had his dwelling with flesh—that is to say, with humanity; but there were in their pantheon higher gods, whose dwelling was not with flesh. In some of the incantations and magical formulæ which Lenormant has collected in his 'La Magie,' we find (p. 21) Selele-Moulou-ki coming to Ea his father for information as to the causes of disease, etc. Marduk is the Babylonian name for

Selele-Moulou-ki, and Marduk was the great revealer; but by this his dwelling was with flesh. As we see, however, there were gods whose dwelling was not with flesh, who knew secrets hid even from Marduk. This excuse of the wise men is a preparation for Daniel's claim to reveal the secret of the king by the power of a higher God than any that communicated with the Babylonian soothsayers. Hitzig regards this as an artistic device of the author. We regard it as the providential intervention of God himself, that these heathen soothsayers should shelter themselves under an excuse that forced into clearer light the supremacy of Jehovah. It indicates a special knowledge of Babylonian worship thus to lay stress on this distinction between higher and lower gods.

Ver. 12.—For this cause the king was angry and very furious, and commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon. The Septuagint rendering differs little in sense from the above, but in words it does considerably, "Then the king, becoming gloomy and very grieved, commanded that they lead out all the wise men of Babylonia." The main thing to be observed is the softening of the meaning in the hands of the Septuagint translator. This is so great as to suggest that he read לְהוֹקֵץ instead of לְהוֹרֵקָה . The *aphel* of לֵא is not used in Chaldee, but is used in Syriac. Theodotion's rendering is, "Then the king in anger and wrath commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon." The Syriac has a shade of difference, "Then was the king vehemently enraged, and in great fury commanded to destroy all the wise men of Babylon." It is evident that Theodotion read בָּנָס (*b'nas*), "was angry," as if it were the preposition ב , and the Syriac noun בָּנָס (*nas*), "anger." He also must have inserted the preposition before קִצָּפָה (*q'izaph*), "wrath;" in this he is followed by the Peshitta. The Septuagint is freer in its rendering in this verse, and one cannot argue anything from it. The probability seems to be that בָּנָס (*nas*) is used as a noun, and that the Targumic verb was formed from the mistake of a scribe dropping the preposition before קִצָּפָה (*q'izaph*). If we are correct in this, we have an additional evidence that the original language of Daniel was not Chaldee, but Syriac, or, at all events, Eastern Aramaic. As a grammatical note, we direct attention to the form לְהוֹרֵקָה , where the ק of the root has totally disappeared before the ה of the *haphel*, the equivalent in Biblical Aramaic of the Chaldee and Syriac *aphel* with its preformative ק . Professor Bevan says that

this distinction is only a matter of orthography. Are we to deduce that Professor Bevan has a cockney disregard for *h's*? The writer now drops reference to special classes of wise men, and names them generally *hakeemin*. The king is unconvinced of the truth of these wise men (*hakeemin*), or rather he is convinced that they are traitors and deceivers. They are either concealing from him the knowledge they have, and are, therefore, traitors to him; or the gods have withdrawn from them, and therefore they must have been untrue to the gods. On both these grounds Nebuchadnezzar thinks them worthy of death. He at once issues the decree that all the wise men in the city of Babylon should be slain. If the LXX. reading of ch. ii. 2 be correct, he had only summoned the Chaldean wise men. If all the wise men of Babylon were ordered to be slain, the punishment is extended beyond the offence. Possibly he argued, "If even my fellow-countrymen, the Chaldeans, are traitors, much more will the Babylonians be so." So far as words go, it is doubtful whether this decree applies to the province of Babylonia, as the Septuagint translator thinks, or merely to those in the city. But cruel and furious as was the young conqueror, he was scarcely likely to order the wholesale massacre of those who, in Sippara and Borsippa, had neither refused to do what he wished, nor by implication called him an unreasonable tyrant, as had the wise men in Babylon.

Ver. 13.—And the decree went forth that the wise men should be slain. As the Aramaic stands, it might be translated as does Professor Fuller, "And the decree went forth, and the wise men were being slain;" the *î* of co-ordination may be regarded as here used of subordination. Further, the use of the participle for the preterite is not by any means uncommon in Daniel, certainly mainly in the principal clause, as in ver. 5 of the present chapter. Nöldeke, in his 'Syriac Grammar,' 278a, gives examples of the passive participle being used as here in the subordinate clause. The Septuagint is very condensed, but possibly drawn from a similar text, only such extreme condensation is unlike the translator elsewhere. It is possible that some part of the *ܡܕܢܐ* (*p'gad*), "to decree," was used, perhaps the participle *hithpael*. It is possible that the verb *q'tal* was in the infinitive. Theodotion renders, "And the decree went forth, and the wise men were slain." This, though a possible translation, does not fit what we find represented to be the circumstances, as ver. 24 seems to assume that the wise men were not yet destroyed. On the other hand, it would be hardly possible to

imagine the king allowing these wise men who had refused to answer his question, to go out of his presence in safety and unbound. It would seem more natural to imagine that they were carried off to prison, and that all the soothsaying class were intended to be gathered together in prison, in order that the vengeance of the king might be more appallingly manifest. The sentence looks at first sight to us as too savage to be true, but just as savage proofs of vengeance were given by Assurbanipal. And they sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain. The Septuagint translation of this clause is somewhat paraphrastic, "And Daniel was sought for and all those with him in order to be put to death." The want of an antecedent to fix the nominative of the verb probably led to the sentence assuming its present mould; but "all" seems to have no word to occasion it. Theodotion follows the Massoretic text closely; so also does the Peshitta. It is clear from this that Daniel and his companions had not been summoned into the royal presence when the question concerning the dream was put to the wise men. This would seem to contradict the statement of ch. i. 19, "Therefore stood they"—to wit these Hebrew youths—"before the king." Their position was probably like those who had passed the examination for the Indian Civil Service—they are accepted, but they have still a season of study, and then, after they go out to India, they occupy only subordinate situations at first. While permitted to enter the ranks of the soothsayers and astrologers to the court, they were placed at first only in the lower grades, and would have to rise by degrees, and in ordinary circumstances a long time would elapse before they would be summoned into the immediate presence of the sovereign. On the reading of the LXX., Daniel and his friends would not, because they were Jews, and not Chaldeans. One has only to turn to the Talmudic tales to see how unlike this reasonable position is to the ordinary Jewish fictitious narrative. The Book of Daniel is not nearly prodigal enough in wonders to be a representative of the Jewish Midrash. It is further clear that the decree of the king went beyond those who had actually been in his council-chamber on that memorable day. The idea of the king probably was that the treason which he had found in the heads of the various classes of Chaldean soothsayers would have permeated all the members, Babylonian and foreign, as well; therefore he orders them all to suffer a common fate. Wieseler's hypothesis, that this event took place close to the end of the three years of study which had been assigned to these youths, would suit the

statement of events which we find here; although it is not necessary, yet on this assumption, the succession of events as narrated in this chapter becomes perfectly natural.

Ver. 14.—Then Daniel answered with counsel and wisdom to Arioch the captain of the king's guard, which was gone forth to slay the wise men of Babylon. The text here does not seem to have differed much from the Egyptian recension, the translation of which we have in the Septuagint Version. "Then Daniel spake with the counsel and knowledge which were his to Arioch the chief executioner [ἀρχὴ μαρτυρῶν, 'chief butcher,' used by Plutarch for 'chief cook'] of the king, to whom it was appointed to lead out the wisemen (σοφιστὰς) of Babylonia." The text before the Septuagint translators seems to have had דָּלִיָּהּ (deleḥ), "which to him," equivalent to "which he had." The LXX. text had דָּלִיָּהּ instead of דָּלִיָּהּ. Something may be said for this reading, as the ה of the succeeding word may have occasioned the disappearance of the ד, which might be regarded as a ה defectively written. Theodotion agrees perfectly with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta is somewhat of a paraphrase in regard to the first clause, "Then Daniel pacified and consulted, and said to Arioch the chief of the king's guard, who had gone out to slay the wise men of Babylon." It would seem as if there had been some confusion of the words here, though the meaning is not far from that of the other version. The Vulgate Version differs, "Then Daniel asked about the law and sentence (sententia) at Arioch, who had gone forth to slay the wise men of Babylon." The state of matters implied here reveals to us the fact that several links of the story are wanting. There seems to have been absolute secrecy as to what had taken place in the royal council-chamber, and how absolute had been the failure of the Chaldean wise men to satisfy the demands of the king. We could imagine the strange turmoil that this would have caused in the college of young cadets of the various guilds of soothsayers and augurs, had it been announced that these great heads of their various orders had failed. News may have come of the wrath of the king, and close behind the angry sentence of extirpation, passed not only on those who had been the immediate occasions of the king's wrath, but on all the guilds of wise men in Babylon. This must have filled those who belonged to the various guilds implicated, not only with terror, but with amazement. It was next brought to them that they, though only in the lower stages

of these famous guilds, were doomed to a common destruction with the past masters of the craft. That this was allowed to reach these subalterns proves that popular opinion had not gone with the fiery edict of the king. Above all, Arioch, captain "of the guard" — "of the cut-throats," as the Spanish translators have rendered it; "chief butcher," as both Theodotion and the Septuagint render his title—acts as if he is not in favour of it. He is compelled to do the king's bidding; but he is evidently bent on going about the matter in such a leisurely fashion that the great body of the condemned may escape. We may stay to notice that the name Arioch is a genuine Babylonian name, *Eri Aka*, "Servant of the moon-god." Professor Bevan declares it is borrowed from Gen. xiv. 1, as his title is from Gen. xxxvii. 36. It is singular that when the author's acquaintance with the earlier Scriptures was so full and accurate, he should drop into the blunders he is accused of. In Genesis the executioner does not execute anybody; in Daniel he is represented as engaged in organizing the massacre. Daniel seems not to have waited till the terrible band of guardsmen-executioners arrived at the college where he and his friends were living, he goes direct to the chief of the band. The fact that he is not cut down immediately on his approach seems to argue that even the common guardsmen shrink from the duty imposed on them. Their horror and shrinking were perfectly natural. Let us suppose a company in a regiment of Irish Roman Catholics ordered to shoot down their own priests, and we may have some idea of the feelings of these soldiers. These augurs and soothsayers, these astrologers and magicians, had been their counsellors; they had been their intercessors with their deities. If they were all slaughtered, would not the sheer blank in their own lives be immense? There would be no one now to tell them, however falsely, of the future; no one to tell them what to do to propitiate the gods. But more, the gods might well be supposed to be enraged by the slaughter of so many of their special servants, and might be expected to pour down vengeance on the whole nation as well as on the king who had commanded it, but most of all on those who, under whatever compulsion, raised their sacrilegious hands against the priests of the holy gods. It is even not improbable that, once the immediate paroxysm of his fury had passed, Nebuchadnezzar would be appalled at what he had himself ordered, and would connive at delay, in the hope that, though late, these wise men might come to reason and tell him what he wished. Daniel seems to find

no difficulty in gaining access to the presence of Arioch. There are men who have a magnetic power over their fellows, and bend every one to their way, and still gain their affection. And Daniel seems pre-eminently to have been a man of this type. Personal good looks and suave manners had their own share, but something more was needed to carry a condemned man through the ranks of guards right into the presence of their chief. This is made all the more striking when we bear in mind that preparations were being made for the great massacre.

Ver. 15.—He answered and said to Arioch the king's captain, Why is the decree so hasty from the king? Then Arioch made the thing known to Daniel. The opening clause in this verse is doubtful. In the Septuagint the verse is rendered, "And he asked him saying, Ruler, why is it decreed so bitterly by the king? And he showed him the warrant." Theodotion is yet briefer, "Ruler of the king, why has so harsh a sentence come forth from the king? And he declared (*ἐκνέμει*) to him his orders." But briefest of all is the Peshitta. It begins at once without any address, "Why is this harsh decree from the king? And Arioch showed the matter (*miltha*) to Daniel." As a rule, the shorter a reading is the better it is. Therefore we are inclined to prefer the Peshitta rendering. "Answered and said" is a formula that might easily be stuck in where anything of the kind seemed needed. Here it is not suitable, as Daniel is already said to have "answered Arioch with counsel and prudence." The addition of the Septuagint is more reasonable, "He asked him saying, Ruler." Theodotion feels some title is necessary, so he calls Arioch "ruler of the king." It appears to us that the brief Peshitta represents the best text. *Hasty* represents to some extent, though not fully, the element of blame implied in the word *m'hak'tzrah* in greater degree than our English word would indicate. It means "rough," "raging," "shameless;" it might be too strong to say that "scandalous" represents Daniel's meaning. Some commentators cannot imagine a man thus criticizing a royal decree to one of the court officials. Much, however, is permitted to a man speaking about a decree which has condemned him to death without his having an opportunity to defend himself. It is possible that he might be able to use all the more freedom by seeing that Arioch had no favour for the business to which he was ordered. The Greek versions represent that Arioch showed the warrant, the king's order for the execution. As that would not be considered an answer to Daniel's

question, on the one hand, so on the other, it would not be an occasion for the step Daniel immediately thereafter took. We think, on the whole, that the Massoretic reading amended here by the Peshitta is the better. As leader of the royal body-guard, the place of Arioch would be beside Nebuchadnezzar, even in the council-chamber. He would thus be quite cognizant of everything that took place—the demands of the king, the arguments of the wise men. All this scene he could portray for the information of Daniel. The mere exhibition of a warrant would tell nothing more than the fact that the action of Arioch was in obedience to orders.

Ver. 16.—Then Daniel went in, and desired of the king that he would give him time, and that he would show the king the interpretation. The version of Theodotion omits all mention of Daniel's going into the palace, "And Daniel petitioned the king that he should give him time, and he would tell his interpretation to the king." The rendering of the Peshitta agrees with this, "And Daniel petitioned the king for time, and he would show the interpretation to the king." The version of the Septuagint is longer, "And Daniel went in quickly to the king, and petitioned that time should be given him from the king, and he would show all things to the king." Jerome gives a rendering of the Massoretic text in Latin condensation. The question of reading here is of some importance in the light of the apparent contradiction implied in the twenty-fifth verse. There Arioch declares that he "had found a man of the captives of Judah, that will make known unto the king the interpretation"—as if Nebuchadnezzar had never seen him before, whereas, if the Massoretic recension is correct, Nebuchadnezzar had seen Daniel but a little while before. According to the reading of Theodotion and the Peshitta, Daniel petitioned the king for time, but that petition does not imply necessarily that he was admitted into the king's presence; the petition would pass through court officials, and reach the king in due course. We may note the ease with which he granted this request, and look upon it as confirmatory of our notion that the king, now that his rage had gone down, repented of his harsh decree, and was hoping against hope that the catastrophe would be averted. The only other explanation that would save the authenticity of both passages is that Daniel's entrance into the palace and his petition to the king happened without Arioch being aware. The most natural explanation of Arioch's conduct in postponing the execution of the royal decree is that the postponement was during the

interval the petition for time was being presented, but still not decided on. This seems not unlikely. Of course, it is always open to us to declare the verses from this to the twenty-fourth inclusive an interpolation; Daniel has suffered so much from this, that an additional case has no *prima facie* probability against it. Moreover, the prayer or hymn has strong resemblance to the prayer of Azarias, which is acknowledged to be an interpolation. Still, one ought to be slow to cut a knot in this way, unless there is some clear ground of suspicion. It may be observed also that the Massoretic text does not necessarily assert entrance into the palace or into the king's presence. Certainly כָּלַל (*kalal*) means "entered," and in the connection this would suggest the palace as the place entered, but it may have been the house of Arioch, though this is not likely. We have no means of knowing whether any others of those implicated in the sentence of the king petitioned also for time. Not impossibly they did. The king, who was so suspicious that the wise men wished to delay till the auspicious time was passed, is willing to grant time when it is asked. This is explicable on the idea that Nebuchadnezzar was anxious to be delivered from the horrible slaughter which his decree involved. Another thing to be observed is that in the Massoretic text, Theodotion, and the Peshitta, there is no word of the dream being told. Of course, this interpretation implied a knowledge of the dream also, but it would appear to be another evidence that the king was relenting, when a petition that omitted the crucial point of the question between him and the wise men should be granted without difficulty. We are not told the amount of time requested, the word used, יָמִים (*zman*), is, "a fixed time," from יָדַע, "to determine." It occurs again frequently in Daniel, as in ver. 21. It is generally of a fixed point of time, but sometimes, as ch. vii. 12, their lives were prolonged for a season (יָמִים). There being only one instance among the other passages where this word occurs, in which it means a space of time, we are inclined to think that here Daniel petitioned that a time be appointed him when he too should have an audience of the king in regard to the matter of the dream, as the other wise men had. There certainly is implied a space of time in this request. The space must have involved at least twenty-four hours, as the matter is revealed to Daniel in "a night vision." It is unlikely it would be much longer, for fear the planetary collocation would change—certainly not more than a week. Tertullian (*Adv.*

Psychicos, 7) says, "*Daniel Deo silens . . . spatium tridui postulat.*"¹ We learn from what follows that Daniel acted merely from his general faith in God, and was confident that God would not suffer his saints to be destroyed causelessly. It is noted by Calvin that Daniel does not tell the king the reasons of his confidence. A *falsarius* would have taken the opportunity of making Daniel declare his confidence in the God of heaven from the very first. The real Daniel acts as any wise saint would do, confident that God would do justly, hopeful that he would reveal to him the secret, yet too careful of the honour of Jehovah to put it in pledge; he knew God could and would defend his own honour, but his plan might not involve the saving of their lives.

Ver. 17.—Then Daniel went to his house, and made the thing known to Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, his companions. There is nothing in the versions that calls for remark here, save that the Septuagint seems to have had כָּל, "all," or some such word, instead of *mill'tha*. After having got his petition granted, to all appearance easily, Daniel now proceeds to his own house. As during the period of their education the four friends had formed one "mess" in the hall of Nebuchadnezzar, and it is probable had one table set apart to them, so when in college—if we may use the phrase—they occupied one apartment or set of apartments. Their life in the matter of food was simple and abstemious, and it is little likely that they would require extensive accommodation. Having got the reprieve he had petitioned for, Daniel now informs his friends of it. We have assumed that the news of the royal decree had reached the college where, among other students and soothsayers of as yet lesser grade, Daniel and his friends abode; in that case, he would merely have to inform them how he had sped with Arioch, and how he had further presented a petition to the king for a time to be set when he should answer the king's request, and how he got what he desired. It may, however, have been that Daniel had alone heard the dreadful news, and then acted so that his companions heard only of the threatened disaster when they heard of the mode of escape. It is to be observed, in passing, that the names of the friends are given in the Hebrew, not in the Babylonian form. Alone with each other, we may imagine they

¹ We cannot say where Tertullian got this; if from the Latin Version of Daniel current in Africa in his days, it must have differed somewhat from the Septuagint, with which it seems generally to have agreed.

used the old Hebrew names of their childhood. Now especially would the sacred tongue be present to their lips and their thoughts when the cloud of a great danger hung over them. It was as Jews, members of the holy people, that they could appeal for help and deliverance to Jehovah the God of Israel.

Ver. 18.—*That they would desire mercies of the God of heaven concerning this secret; that Daniel and his fellows should not perish with the rest of the wise men of Babylon.* The Septuagint has as close a connection between the preceding verse and that before us as has the Massoretic, only it is slightly different in its rendering, "And he told them to fast and pray [urged them to fasting and prayer], and to seek help from the Lord the Highest, concerning this mystery, in order that Daniel with his companions might not be given over to destruction with the wise men of Babylon." It is, certainly, possible that the Septuagint translator had a different reading here. The verb *εὐχ*, "to fast," in the infinitive, might have begun the verse. Still there would be the difficulty of finding anything to correspond to *παρήγγειλε*. It, however, was probably added to bring the sentence into Greek regimen. The Septuagint translator read the words as nouns in the accusative, and of this case *ἐ* was a frequent sign. Thus what they had was *ἐπιχ* *ἐλπίς*. The Hebrew word corresponding to the Aramaic word here translated "mercies," *רחמי* (*rah'min*), "bowels," "mercies," is common enough in Biblical language; but the phrase, "to desire mercies," is not found elsewhere in Scripture. It occurs in the later Targums, as Numb. xii. 13, as a paraphrastic addition to the simple statement of Onkelos, that Moses prayed before the Lord; only in the case quoted, as generally, the order is not, as here, the object before the verb—a construction more frequent in Assyrian than in Aramaic, save in poetry. The phrase is elliptical; the ruling verb is omitted. One is tempted to wonder whether the word had not originally been *לבקש*, making it a case of the Babylonian or Eastern Aramaic, third person plural imperfect; then the preceding word would be *לענות*, with the *vav* dropped as unnecessary, and the *mem* inserted to make the word a regular infinitive. Confirmatory of our view is Theodotion, whose rendering, *ἐξήκουσεν*, implies that he had a third person plural imperfect here. We do not maintain that it is necessary that he should have had such a reading, but there is at least a high probability that he had. The Peshitta reverses the order of the

words, and omits the conjunction *vav*, and, inserting the relative *ὅς*, as sign of subordination, proceeds, "that they entreat mercies from before God." Here, also, the third person plural imperfect is used. From the greater freedom that Jerome allowed himself in his translation, and from the wide difference between the grammatical construction of a Latin and an Aramaic sentence, no stress can be laid on the fact that he too translates by the third plural imperfect — *ut quaererent misericordiam*. The balance of probability is that here we have to do with one of those indications of the Eastern origin of the Aramaic of Daniel. There is an instance of doublet in the LXX. here in the case of the phrase, *τυμωριαν ζητῆσαι*, "to seek succour." Tertullian, in his reference to this passage, to which we have referred above (ver. 16), adds to what we quoted above, *cum sua fraternitate jejuna*, and thus shows that, though differing somewhat from the Septuagint text as we have it, the African Latin Version agreed with it in inserting something about "fasting" here. *The God of heaven.* This is rendered by the Septuagint here, as generally, *θεός*. The probability here is that we have to do with no difference of reading, but rather with an objection to applying to God a title used for heathen deities. The title has a peculiar significance in the lips of those who, as Daniel, were educated as astrologers, and taught by those who regarded the sun, the moon, and the various planets as deities. Daniel and his fellows might thus believe in astrology, but maintain that the God of heaven, their God, used heavenly bodies as messengers to proclaim to those who could read the writing, the things that were coming on the earth. They might thus even give a certain limited subordinate power to the deities of Babylon; these deities were the servants of the God of heaven, who was also the God of Israel. There may be a reference to Jer. x. 11. *The gods that have not made the heavens and the earth, even they shall perish from the earth, and from under these heavens.* The God of Israel is called the God of heaven because he has made the heavens. This title is used before—in Gen. xxiv. 7, where Abraham uses it. It is characteristic of Biblical Aramaic, that the covenant title of God, "Jehovah," is never used. Before we leave this, we would observe that the Peshitta inserts *ὅς*, the sign of the genitive, before *she'mayya*, whereas the text before us uses the older form of construct state in the word for "God." Concerning this secret. A parallel passage illustrative of this is Amos iii. 7, "Surely the Lord God will do

nothing, but he revealeth his secret unto his servants the prophets;" also Dent. xxix. 29, "Secret things belong unto the Lord our God." Whatever was about to happen, Daniel and his friends knew it could only happen according to the purpose and plan of God. He, as he was the real actor, knew what he was about to do, and whatever revelation of that future had been given to Nebuchadnezzar in his dream, it must have come from the God of heaven; therefore to him do Daniel and his friends make their entreaty. Professor Bevan declares *ṛāz* (*rās*) to be a Persian word. Neither Winer, Fürst, nor Gesenius recognizes it to be such. Granted that it is Persian, is it not a possible supposition that it is derived from the Aramaic; not that the Aramaic word is derived from the Persian? Even on the supposition that this word was derived from the Persian, this is not extraordinary, when we learn the intimate relationship between the Median court and the Babylonian. *That Daniel and his fellows should not perish with the rest of the wise men of Babylon.* Does this mean that certain of the wise men had already perished? It seems almost necessary to maintain this from the meaning of *שְׂרָפָה* (*sh'ar*), "remnant." It seems at first scarcely natural to take this word as meaning merely "the other," yet the usage in Ezra is in accordance with this: Ezra iv. 9, "Rehum the chancellor and Shimshai the scribe, and the rest (*שְׂרָפָה*) of their companions." A further question may be raised—Does this prayer mean that the desire of Daniel and his friends was that, when the wise men of Babylon, under whose superintendence they had been taught, were slain, they should escape? Or does it mean that they prayed that "they with the wise men of Babylon should not be destroyed"? This wholly depends on the meaning to be attached to the word *עִם* (*im*), "with." As in English, this word admits of both meanings. As the word is common to Hebrew and Aramaic, we shall take our examples from Hebrew. Thus Gen. xviii. 24, "That be far from thee, Lord, to slay the righteous *with* the wicked." As example of the other use of the word, Gen. xxxii. 6, "Esau and four hundred men *with* him." Usage thus permits us to regard this prayer as intercessory, that these Hebrew youths prayed not only to be preserved themselves, but also that all the other wise men who shared their condemnation should also be preserved. This is the first record of concerted prayer. Of course, in heathen worship there was the caricature of this concert of prayer in the united shouting of the priests, say, of Baal. This is the earliest instance of that practice that has received such a

gracious promise from our Lord (Matt. xviii. 19), "If two of you shall agree on earth as touching anything they shall ask, it shall be done for them of my Father which is in heaven." We would not maintain, even in appearance, that multitude adds to efficacy with God. But when two or three are gathered together, there is an infection of earnestness, a community of enthusiasm generated, that makes each individual fitter to receive the answer. Yet, again, the more that join in a petition, the more it must be raised out of the grovelling region of selfishness. A man who has a purely selfish desire rising in his heart cannot ask his fellows to join him in supplicating God to grant his request.

Ver. 19.—Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision. Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven. The Septuagint adds that the secret was revealed "that very night (*ἐν αὐτῇ τῇ νυκτὶ*)."

This may be held to be implied in the Aramaic, but it is here explicitly stated. Further, the Septuagint speaks of the secret as "the mystery of the king." At the end of the clause the LXX. adds the word *ἐνσώμωτος*, "evidently." All these alterations imply additions to the text made by the translator. Theodotion, the Peshitta, and Jerome agree with the Massoretic text. There has been considerable discussion as to whether this revelation was made to Daniel by a dream. Hitzig assumes that the night-vision to Daniel was a repetition of that which had appeared to Nebuchadnezzar, and then proceeds to brand this as a psychological impossibility. Keil, Kliefoth, Kranichfeld, and Zöckler all declare against the identification of a night-vision with a dream. Keil and Kliefoth say in the same words, "A vision of the night is simply a vision which any one receives during the night whilst he is awake." And Kranichfeld says, "Of a dream of Daniel, in our present case there is not one word." Zöckler says, "Not a dream-vision, but an appearance (*Gesicht*) vision, which appeared during the night." They maintain that, though all "dreams" may be called "night-visions," all "night-visions" are not "dreams." It would be difficult to prove that this is the usage of Scripture. It is quite true that the distinction between a dream and a vision is that in the former the subject is asleep, while in the latter he is awake. It may, however, be doubted whether this distinction is always maintained by the Hebrew and Aramaic writers, even in regard to "visions" and "dreams" generally; and it seems to us impossible to prove it in regard to "visions of the night" and "dreams." In ver. 28 of the chapter before us, there seems no doubt that Daniel uses these words

as equivalent to each other, "Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these." While we agree with Hitzig that the revelation was to Daniel in a dream, we do not admit the *psychological* impossibility, save only in the pedantic sense in which it is said that no two people, however close they may stand to each other, see the same rainbow. Dreams are very generally the product of what the subject has experienced during his waking hours. Surely Hitzig never meant to assert that it was a psychological impossibility for two individuals to witness the same event. Certainly the improbability is very great that the sight of the same physical event should meet the eyes of two people in similar states of body, and produce on them precisely the same sort and degree of impression. That, however, is akin to the Hegelian pedantic statement, which asserts that we cannot go twice down the same street. Though it might even be admitted to be an impossibility in the only sense in which it can at all be admitted, yet still it is not self-contradictory. The self-contradictory is the only impossibility we can assert in the presence of the miraculous. Hitzig's objection to this is really that it was a miracle, and all the parade of giving the statement a new face by calling it, not a miracle, but a psychological impossibility, is only throwing dust in the eyes of others, perhaps of himself. Ewald does not see any psychological impossibility, and declares that the author meant to represent this at all events. Up, then, before the mind of Daniel rose the gigantic statue of the monarch's vision, and with the vision came also the divinely given certainty that this was what the king had seen. He needs, however, more than the vision: the interpretation of the vision is vouchsafed to him also. *Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven.* The LXX. rendering here joins the first clause of ver. 20 to this, "Then Daniel blessed the God of heaven, and having cried aloud, said." Theodotion, the Peshitta, and Jerome agree with the Massoretic text. As we have said above, Daniel returned thanks to God for his great goodness to him and his friends. Our blessing God does not increase Divine felicity, but it expresses our sense of this felicity, and we recognize it all the more readily when, as in the case of these Jews, it is exhibited in making us partakers of it. Hence blessing God and giving God thanks become in such cases one and the same thing.

Ver. 20.—*And Daniel answered and said, Blessed be the Name of God for ever and ever: for wisdom and might are his.* The Septuagint, having practically given the

beginning of this verse as the end of ver. 19, omits it now; hence it renders, "Blessed be the Name of the great Lord for ever, because the wisdom and the greatness are his." The fact that מְעַלְמָא (*min'almā*) "from eternity," is not rendered in this version, and that the adjective "great" is added in its place, indicates a difference of reading. Probably there was a transposition of מְעַלְמָא and מְבָרַךְ and the מן omitted.

Then מְעַלְמָא would be regarded as *status emphaticus* of the adjective עַלְמָא (*allim*). This is not likely to be a correct reading, as *allim* means "robust," "possessing the vigour of youth." Theodotion differs somewhat more from the Massoretic text than is his custom, "And he said, Be the Name of God blessed from eternity to eternity, for (the) wisdom and (the) understanding are his." This is shorter; the omission of the pleonastic formula, "answered and said," has an appearance of genuineness that is impressive. It would seem as if Theodotion had בִּנְיָא (*been'tha*), "understanding," instead of גְּבוּרָה (*giboorah*), "might." The Peshitta and the Vulgate do not differ from the Massoretic text. The first word of the Hebrew text of this song of thanksgiving has an interest for us, as throwing light on the question of the original language. לְהַמְלִיךָ has the appearance of an infinitive, but it is the third person plural of the imperfect; לְ is here the preformative of the third person singular and plural as in Eastern Aramaic as distinct from Western. This preformative is found occasionally in the Aramaic of the Babylonian Talmud, along with לְ, the preformative we find regularly in Syriac. In Biblical Aramaic this preformative is found only with the substantive verb; the reason of this, however, we have considered in regard to the language (see Introduction, p. xxiii.). Suffice it that we regard this as an evidence that Daniel was originally written in Eastern Aramaic. Professor Bevan's explanation, that the phenomenon is due to the likeness these parts of this verb have to the Divine Name, is of force to afford a reason why, in the midst of the general process of Occidentalizing the Aramaic, they shrank from applying it to this verb. That they had no scruple in writing it first hand, we find in the Targums; thus Onkelos, Gen. xviii. 18, לְהַמְלִיךָ. We might refer to other examples in the later Aramaic of the Talmud and other Rabbinic works. *The Name of God.* Later Judaism, to avoid using the sacred covenant name of God, was accustomed to use the "Name," in this sense. This may be noted that throughout this whole book, "Jehovah" occurs only in ch. ix. This may

be due to something of that reverence which has led the Jews for centuries to avoid pronouncing the sacred name, and to use instead, *Adonai*, "Lord." It is to be observed that all through Daniel the Septuagint has *Kópios*, the Greek equivalent for *Jehovah*, while Theodotion follows the Massoretic in having *Θεός*. *For ever and ever*. This is not an accurate translation, although it appears not only in the Authorized, but also in the Revised Version. The sound of the phrase impresses us with a sense of grandeur, perhaps due to the music with which it has been associated. When we think of the meaning we really give to the phrase, or of its actual grammatical sense, it only conveys to us the idea of unending future duration; it does not at all imply unbeginning duration. More correct is Luther's "vom Ewigkeit zu Ewigkeit." The Greek of Theodotion conveys this also, *ἀπὸ τοῦ αἰῶνος καὶ εἰς τοῦ αἰῶνος*. Jerome renders, "a sæculo et usque in sæculum." The true rendering is, "from eternity to eternity." It is quite true that the *αἰών* means primarily "an age," as does also *aión* and *sæculum*; it is also quite true that it is improbable that in ancient days man had definite ideas of eternity; even at the present time, when men strive after definiteness, they have no real conception of unending existence, still less of existence unbeginning. Still, it was used as having that meaning so far as men were able to apprehend it. As *aión*, it is used for "world." *For wisdom and might are his*. Wisdom is the Divine quality of which they have had proof now, but "might" is united with it as really one in thought. The fact that the usual combination is "wisdom and understanding" (see Exod. xxxi. 3; Isa. xi. 2; Ezek. xxviii. 4) has led the scribe, whose text Theodotion used, to replace "might" by "understanding." He might feel himself confirmed in his emendation by the fact that, while God's wisdom and, it might be said, his understanding were exhibited in thus revealing to Daniel the royal dream, there was no place for "might." What was in the mind of Daniel and his friends was that they were in the hands of a great Monarch, who was practically omnipotent. They now make known their recognition of the glorious truth that not only does the wisdom of the wise belong to God, but also the might of the strong. Further, there is another thought here which is present in all Scripture—that wisdom and might are really two sides of one and the same thing; hence a truth is proved by a miracle, a work of power.

Ver. 21.—And he changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings; he giveth wisdom unto the wise,

and knowledge to them that know understanding. In regard to this verse, Theodotion and the Septuagint only differ in this from the Massoretic text, that they omit the repetition of the word "kings." The Peshitta has a different sense in the middle clause. "He maketh (Peshitta, *ma'led*) kings and confirmeth (Peshitta, *ma'qem*) kings." The Syriac translators have evidently read *מְהַדֵּה* (*meh'deh*), "to remove," as *מְהַבֵּד* (*meh'bed*), "to make." The utter want of contrast in this reading condemns it. In regard to the Aramaic of this passage, the carrying on of the preformative ה, the sign of the haphel conjugation, is a proof of the early date of the Aramaic. In later Aramaic, ה gives place to כ, and כ disappears after the other preformative אִתְּלִי, not אִתְּלִי. *Changeth times and seasons*. Nebuchadnezzar was anxious lest the time in which he might make advantageous use of the information conveyed by the dream should pass away, and a new "time" be established. Not improbably Nebuchadnezzar, like most heathens, imagined that his gods were limited by some unseen power like the Greek Fate, and, however wishful they might be to be propitious to their worshippers, only in certain colloocations of the heavenly bodies could they carry out their wish. God, the God of heaven, the God of the despised Hebrews, he it was who arranged the times and the seasons, he made the sun to rise, he makes summer and winter, he leads out the host of the stars, alike the star of Nebo and the star of Marduk. The two words "time" and "season" are nearly synonymous. Perhaps the first is more indefinite than the other. Our own opinion is that the first has more the idea of space of time, and the latter more of point of time; but really they are almost synonymous. *He removeth kings, and setteth up kings*. In this there seems to be a special reference to the contents of the vision, which showed that in the time to come, not only kings but dynasties were to be set up and overthrown. The former clause regarded God as the God of nature. This looks upon him as the God of providence, by whom "kings reign, and princes decree justice." *He giveth wisdom unto the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding*. This address to God goes further. Daniel sees in the faculties and mental acquirements of men the manifestation of God. It is the inspiration of the Almighty that giveth understanding. All the power man has of acquiring knowledge, all the faculty he has for using that knowledge aright, all come from God.

Ver. 22.—He revealeth the deep and secret things; he knoweth what is in the darkness,

and the light dwelleth with him. The rendering of the Septuagint as it stands differs somewhat from the Massoretic text, "Revealing deep things and dark, and knowing the things which are in the darkness and the things which are in the light, and with him is a dwelling-place (*kard-luvis*)." There is doubt as to the exact force of this last word; the last element in it suggests "solution." This meaning seems to have been given to it generally; for Paulus Tullensis renders it *shari*, which means a "solution," but as it is derived from *sh'ra*, which means "to dwell," he retains the double meaning.¹ The reading of Kreyzig is decidedly to be preferred, omitting *ra* ("the things which") before "in the light," and *kai*, "and," after. The rendering then would be, "in light is with him the dwelling-place." This rendering harmonizes the LXX. completely with the Massoretic. The other versions call for no remark. There is difference here between the Q'ri and K'thib. The Q'ri reads *n'hora*, "light," a Chaldee or Western Aramaic form; the K'thib again is, *n'heera*, the Eastern Aramaic form. God is not only the God of nature, of providence, and of man, but also of revelation. He can make known to man what otherwise man could never know. He is the very Source of all light and enlightenment. We may compare this statement with that of Paul in 1 Tim. vi. 16; he speaks of God as "dwelling in light which no man can approach unto." It seems to us the words of the Old Testament song convey a loftier idea of God than does the Pauline statement—perhaps it is even loftier than the cognate phrase of the Apostle John (1 John i. 5), "God is light, and in him is no darkness at all." We may compare, in regard to this whole verse, Ps. cxxxix. 12, "The darkness hideth not from thee; but the night shineth as the day: the darkness and the light are both alike to thee," where *n'heera* is used as in the passage before us. Daniel ascribes to Jehovah all the powers of all the gods of Babylon.

¹ Liddell and Scott give as meanings, (1) "putting down of a government," "the disbanding of an army," "the ending of a war," "of life;" (2) "a resting," "a lodging," "a resting-place," "an inn." So also Schleusner and Stephani (*Thesaurus*). None of these meanings is suitable here. The question is whether we may press the meaning of "dissolution" so that it might refer to dissolving of doubts, or press the temporary dwelling implied in the loosing of burdens from beasts that bear them, to the permanent dwelling implied in the Massoretic.

Ver. 23.—I thank thee, and praise thee, O thou God of my fathers, who hast given me wisdom and might, and hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee; for thou hast now made known unto us the king's matter. The Septuagint renders, "Thee, O Lord of my fathers, I thank and praise, because thou gavest wisdom and knowledge to me, and now thou hast revealed to me what I entreated, in order to show the king concerning these things." There seems a slight difference of reading implied here. Theodotion and the Peshitta are practically at one with the Massoretic. Theodotion translates the relative *ni* as if it were "and," not, as in our version, "for;" and the Peshitta repeats the first personal pronoun. Daniel now particularizes his reasons for praise and thanksgiving. He addresses God as the God of his fathers. He appeals to him as the covenant God of Israel, who had led their fathers through the wilderness. God revealed himself to Jacob at Bethel as "the God of Abraham and the God of Isaac." So to Moses at the burning bush he declared himself "the God of Abraham, the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob." On the other hand, when Jacob approached God in prayer, he addressed him as "the God of my father Abraham, and the God of my father Isaac." God had shown kindness to his fathers: would he not also show kindness to their seed after them? *Who hast given me wisdom and might.* As Jacob in his prayer at Mahanaim (Gen. xxxiii. 9) not only pleads with God as the God of his fathers, but also as the God who had blessed him with his guidance before, so Daniel now further addresses God who had bestowed upon him "wisdom and might." When God has bestowed upon any one special faculties, he must presumably have a special work for him, and it is therefore reasonable to plead with God to give an opportunity for the exercise of these special powers. Here it forms an occasion of thanksgiving. We are apt to forget that our powers, mental and physical, our possessions and acquirements, are gifts of God's grace for which we owe thanks. The special reason for gratitude, however, follows—God has answered the prayer of his servants. *Hast made known unto me now what we desired of thee.* It is to be noted that Daniel attributes the answer not merely to his own prayer, but to the united prayer of his three friends as well. Their earnest desire had gone along with his own in calling down the Divine answer. Daniel, while giving thanks for the knowledge vouchsafed to him, recognizes the help his friends had afforded. *For thou hast made known unto us the king's matter.* Daniel assigns the reason here for his thanks.

giving yet more definitely. God had made known to him what the king had required.

Ver. 24.—Therefore Daniel went in unto Arioch, whom the king had ordained to destroy the wise men of Babylon: he went and said thus unto him; Destroy not the wise men of Babylon: bring me in before the king, and I will show unto the king the interpretation. The differences in the versions from this are slight. The LXX. has *ἐκαστα* instead of *σύνκρισις*, as if reading *לל* instead of *לללל*, an emendation due to the fact that the king had demanded from the wise men, not merely the interpretation, which, given the dream, they were willing enough to give, but the dream itself; only the more natural emendation would have been to have interpolated *חלום* (*hel'ma*), "dream," before "interpretation." Both the Septuagint and Theodotion omit the word representing the second "went." It is to be observed that "went in" and "went" are different words in the original, as in the Peshitta Version. The verbs *ללל* (*"lal*) and *לל* (*"zal*) have different ideas connected with them. The first means "to enter," of a place with a preposition; the latter has the notion of simple going. If we can imagine the body-guard of the king quartered in some part of the huge palace, then Daniel "went in" first to the quarters of the guard, and then, having got admission, "went" up to Arioch, who was probably endeavouring to occupy as much time as possible to delay the horrible execution, or perhaps escape the necessity altogether. It would seem as if Arioch had heard nothing of the petition which Daniel had presented to the king, and only knew that his delay had not been found fault with. It might seem by the introductory word "therefore" (*kol-q'bel-d'nah*) that the hymn has been an interpolation. It is quite true that it would most naturally immediately follow ver. 19. Yet we must bear in mind that the consecution of one part to another, which we have in our Western languages, is not so carefully observed in Eastern tongues. It may be doubted, moreover, whether *לללללללללללל* (*kol-q'bel-d'nah*) has so much a logical as a local or temporal significance. "Thereupon" would, perhaps, more correctly render this connective here. After he had finished offering up his praise and thanks to God, Daniel went to Arioch. As we have already said, it would seem that Arioch had a reluctance to set about the fulfilment of this horrible order, not that mere slaughter was a thing specially repugnant to him—he had taken part in too many campaigns for that to impress him much; but this was a massacre of the priests. All the reverence of his nature that during his lifetime had associated itself with those

who had solemnly sacrificed before each campaign, and taken the auguries, protested against this sudden and wholesale massacre. He has determined to fritter away time, in order to give his master opportunity to bethink himself. The mere political ill will that would be roused by such an attempt was formidable. We know that the Babylonian monarch Nabunahid really rather fell before the intrigues of the priests and augurs than before the arms of Cyrus. To him, thus waiting and procrastinating, comes Daniel. Although there is nothing said of it in the narrative, Daniel may have given him to understand that he hoped to be able to satisfy the demands of the king. The power Daniel had of gaining the favour and confidence of those with whom he came in contact, led to his being buoyed up by a certain hope in his procrastination, which would be strengthened by the fact that the fiery young king made no inquiry whether his order was being fulfilled. Still, it must have been with joy he saw Daniel appearing, and heard him say, "Destroy not the wise men of Babylon," especially when followed by the request to be brought into the presence of the king; thus he knew that Daniel could answer the king's question and tell him his dream, as well as the promised interpretation. If we take the Septuagint rendering as representing the original text, Daniel promised to tell the king "everything."

Ver. 25.—Then Arioch brought in Daniel before the king in haste, and said thus unto him, I have found a man of the captives of Judah, that will make known unto the king the interpretation. Save that the Septuagint has again *ἐκαστα* instead of *σύνκρισις* or *σύνκριμα*, and Paulus Tellenensis adds the adjective "wise" as a description of the man who had thus professed to satisfy the king, the versions agree with the Massoretic text. In regard to the Aramaic here, the use of the Eastern form of the haphel is to be noted—*han'el* instead of *ha'el*. These are to be looked upon as archaisms or Orientalisms, that have survived modernizing efforts of the pre-Massoretic scribes. We have already remarked on this as an Eastern peculiarity which survives in the Mandaitic and in the Babylonian Talmud. The careful way in which the Septuagint renders the particular *וְהָיָה*, omitted in the other old versions save the Peshitta, ought to be noted as a sign of the extreme carefulness of the Septuagint translator, and a reason why we should regard divergences from the Massoretic as generally evidences of a different text. It has been remarked by Archdeacon Rose that Arioch claims too much when he

asserts that he had "found Daniel." This is not exactly met by Professor Fuller's assertion that it was a mode of the court to ignore all "these captives," with something of the contempt with which the European in India regards those whom he without qualification denotes as "niggers." This, however, does not meet the case if the ordinary interpretation of the circumstances is right; then Nebuchadnezzar had not only seen Daniel in connection with this matter, but further, Arioch knew of it. The case of Abner and David before Saul, in 1 Sam. xvii. 35 should not be brought in in comparison with 1 Sam. xvi. 21, as the latter does not occur in the Septuagint. Unless there has been interpolation, the explanation seems to be that Arioch was not aware that Daniel had petitioned. It may be that Arioch wishes to disarm the king's wrath by not saying anything of Daniel being one of "the wise men" against whom the king's sentence had gone out; but it may also be regarded as a proof that Daniel and his companions had not yet passed out of the class of pupils into that of wise men. He says he is "of the sons of the captivity of Judah." The haste with which Arioch brings Daniel into the king's presence may be due to his own delight at having escaped a piece of employment he had no heart for. There may have been an element of anxiety—he had procrastinated, and the young king had made no inquiries; but it was not the custom of the conqueror to give orders and not to see that they were carried out, and disobedience to the orders of Nebuchadnezzar would mean instant death, possibly with torture. Every moment was fraught with danger, so Arioch's hastening of Daniel may have been due to his own sense of relief at escape from an impending danger. But more, this haste would give the appearance of eager diligence, if not in slaughtering the wise men of Babylon, at least in searching for one who could make good to the king their lack of service toward him. His haste might be intended to give the look at once of eagerness and diligence. All the motives may have combined.

Ver. 26.—The king answered and said to Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, Art thou able to make known unto me the dream which I have seen, and the interpretation thereof? The variations in the versions are here unimportant, save that the Septuagint interpolates "in the Chaldee tongue" before the Babylonian name of Daniel. It is also to be noted that here, as throughout, the Babylonian name of Daniel, in both the Greek versions, appears as Βαλτάσαρ, the same form in which they give Belshazzar. When Daniel is brought in before the king,

Nebuchadnezzar demands if he can fulfil his promise, and tell the dream as well as the interpretation. There is no indication that Nebuchadnezzar remembered anything of the youth who had done well in the examination held in his presence some months before. This certainly is confirmatory of Wieseler's hypothesis. That the king should have forgotten, however, is nothing extraordinary, for the occasions of this kind would be many. Nebuchadnezzar, in the case of the young Hebrew, does not question his willingness to tell him what he wishes, but only his ability. With regard to the wise men, he believed, or professed to believe, in their ability to do what he wished, and reckoned their refusal to answer him as due to obstinacy or treason. It may be that he has moderated somewhat the rancour of his ire, and is willing to recognize their ignorance as to dreams and such light furniture of the mind as not militating against their claim to knowledge in other directions, only for his oath's sake he must demand that the dream be told him by at least some one. It may be that there was a certain emphasis on the pronoun when Nebuchadnezzar demanded of Daniel, "Is there to thee the power to declare to me the dream which I have seen, and its interpretation?" Is there to thee, mere student of the sacred mysteries as thou art, alien as thou art, a hostage from a city whose king I overthrew easily? It certainly must have been strange to Nebuchadnezzar that what the soothsayers, astrologers, and magicians of the court, the highest, and reputed to be the most skilful of their respective guilds, could not do, this young Hebrew proclaimed himself able to perform. It may be observed that while in the narrative the author calls the prophet by his sacred name *Daniel*, "the Divine judge," here in the presence of Nebuchadnezzar, the court name he had received is introduced. To his friends, to his fellow-countrymen, he is Daniel; but as a court official he is Belteshazzar, or perhaps Belshazzar. It may be that there is intended to be conveyed to us that not only was he introduced into the royal presence as Belshazzar, but that the king addressed him, "Belteshazzar (Belshazzar), art thou able?"

Ver. 27.—Daniel answered in the presence of the king, and said, The secret which the king hath demanded cannot the wise men, the astrologers, the magicians, the soothsayers, show unto the king. The differences between this and the Septuagint are but slight and unimportant. To render it literally, the LXX. is, "Daniel, having spoken out in the presence of the king, said, The mystery which the king saw is not the showing of the wise men, the astrologers,

the sorcerers, the magicians." There seems to have been a confusion between *anah* ("to answer," and *anah* ("to cry out;" the latter word is unsuitable in the present connection. The change from *anah* to *anah* is unlikely to have been the result of any mistake in the writing of the original. It may have been the Greek scribe who misread *anah* into *anah*. Theodotion and the Peshitta present no peculiarities worthy of notice. Jerome translates *ashshaphim* by *magi*, as usual, following the Peshitta. It is to be observed that here again we have a list of the different classes of soothsayers, and the class of Chaldeans is omitted, as also those marked as *m'cashphim* in ver. 2; instead, occupying the same place in the catalogue, is *gazzin*. This may have been the original word, as evidently the real meaning was not known either in Egypt or Asia Minor, as both the LXX. and Theodotion transfer the word. The Peshitta translates this word by *asūphe*, in reality the corresponding one to the second word in the Chaldean. This would seem to show that the word had disappeared from Eastern as well as Western Aramaic. It is derived from *g'zar*, "to cut." Behrmann ('Das Buch Daniel') derives it thus, and says that it refers to the fact that those who studied nativities divided the heavens into *sectiones* or *segmenta*. This was precisely what the "Chaldeans" of classic times did; hence it is quite a possible thing that *Chaldeans* was inserted in some Greek translations, and got into the Aramaic from the Greek. The word does not seem to be used for "astrologers" in the Talmud. The occasion of Daniel's narrating the impotence of the other wise men in presence of the task set them by the king is that probably he recognized the accent of surprise in the king's tone. As if he said, "Yes, it is perfectly true, what none of these wise men could do, I, a mere youth, undertake to do." There is nothing of contempt for them in this, as is seen in the following verse. There may be a shade of rebuke implied to the king, who had demanded from men what they could not do. They had declared that only the gods could reveal this to the king. And what Daniel says is not in opposition to this, but confirmatory of it.

Ver. 28.—But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the King Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter days. Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these. All the versions are at one with the Massoretic text to the beginning of the last clause, which begins a new sentence. This last clause is omitted in the Septuagint. The clause is pleonastic; therefore, seeing it is

omitted by the Septuagint, we may consider it not genuine, but due to a case of doublet in the Aramaic copies. Some copies have the present clause here, without the opening clause of the next, and others without this, but having the opening clause of ver. 29. Then came a copyist, who, unable to settle which was the better reading, inserted both. *There is a God in heaven.* No nation in ancient times was so addicted to the study of the stars of heaven and to the future as were the Chaldeans. Here Daniel announces that the God of heaven, Jehovah, the God of oppressed Judah and conquered Jerusalem, was the God who ruled all the stars from which the Chaldeans derived the knowledge of the future they thought they had, and arranged for his own purposes all things that were coming upon the earth, and he could tell what no one on earth could do. And the reason of this he also makes plain—God had expressly sent the dream to Nebuchadnezzar in order that he might know what was to "be in the latter days." Ho, Nebuchadnezzar, was the first of the great imperial powers who ruled after Israel ceased to be so much a nation as a faith. After the Babylonian Captivity Judaism became a Church over against a heathen state. Hence to him with whom this new state of things began was this message given. It has exercised many why this revelation of the future was made to this heathen monarch. Yet we must remember that, though made directly to him, through his obstinacy, it arrived at the Prophet Daniel, for whom it was meant. Yet again, no one can read the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar and fail to observe how deep and unfeigned was his piety according to his light. He worshipped Merodach, and if, in his ascriptions of praise, we were to place "Jehovah" instead of "Merodach," these prayers and thanksgivings would appear almost as if borrowed from the Hebrew Psalter. God, who readeth the hearts of men, might well have seen such a heart in this conqueror that he might be honoured with a revelation. The phrase, "latter days," had a special reference in Jewish prophetic language to the times of the Messiah (Isa. ii. 2); hence we may assume that this vision would stretch in its revelations on to the times of the kingdom which the Lord would set up. It is unscientific to press this as meaning the absolute last time, as does Hitzig. It is not the future generally, as Hävernick. We must be led by the usage of prophetic literature. *Thy dream, and the visions of thy head upon thy bed, are these.* This clause, as we have indicated, is probably one of two parallel readings. There is probably no distinction intended between "dream"

and "visions of the head upon the bed." This is really to be regarded as a case of parallelism, in which one portion of the verse was balanced by the other. What shade of difference there is, is between the dream as a totality and the portions of it as seen.

Ver. 29.—As for thee, O king, thy thoughts came into thy mind upon thy bed, what should come to pass hereafter: and he that revealeth secrets maketh known to thee what shall come to pass. This verse is of somewhat suspicious authenticity, the renderings of the different versions show such a diversity of text. The Septuagint rendering is very brief, being merely a version of the last clause, "He that revealeth secrets (*μυστήρια*) showed that which behoveth to be." This has the appearance as if the translators here rendered the last word as an infinitive, taking *ἵνα* as not the preformative of the third person future, but as the sign of the infinitive. It is not necessarily so, because it may be that *δὲ* is regarded as included in *ἐπὶ* (*lehavē*). Theodotion is in closer agreement with the Massoretic, "O king, thy thoughts upon thy bed raised up what behoved to be after these things; and he that revealeth secrets hath made known to thee what behoveth to be." The Peshitta renders slightly differently, "Thou, O king, thy thoughts arose in thy heart on account of what should be in the latter days, and he that revealeth secrets made known to thee what shall be." Even Jerome, who is usually pretty close to the Massoretic text, differs a little here. "Thou, O king, didst begin to think upon thy couch what would be after these things; and he who revealeth mysteries sheweth thee what shall be." Paulus Tellenius has broken away from the Septuagint, supplying the clause omitted, not improbably from Theodotion, "Thou, O king, when thou layest upon thy couch, sawest all things which behoved to happen in the last days; and he who revealeth secrets hath showed to thee what behoved to be." Altogether, with the exception of the last clause, which is evidenced by all the versions, we doubt the authenticity of this verse. However, the interpolation, if we have a case of it here, must have been of old date, as is indicated by the archaic form *an'tah*, which becomes in the Q'ri *an't*. Whether an interpolation or part of the original text, the picture suggested is very natural. The young conqueror, who had already secured the whole of South-Western Asia to the river of Egypt, was occupying his thoughts in speculating what should come after him. He falls asleep, and the subject of his waking thoughts becomes the subject of his dreams.

Ver. 30.—But as for me, this secret was not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have more than any living, but for their sakes that shall make known the interpretation to the king, and that thou mightest know the thoughts of thy heart. The Septuagint Version is simpler, "But as for me, not on account of any wisdom in me above all men is this mystery revealed, but in order that it should be shown to the king it is revealed to me what thou thoughtest in thy heart in knowledge." The translator has read the preformative *נ* into *נ*. There is no reference to "those who shall show the interpretation." The text before him may have omitted the plural termination; consequently, the huphal was supplied. Theodotion, the Peshitta, and Jerome all agree pretty closely with the Massoretic text, but all make the verb translated "shows" singular, not plural, as does the Massoretic. Of course, it may be that this was due to rendering the sense, not the words, of the original; but Theodotion especially is more prone in any difficulty to slavish adherence to his original. His rendering is, "But as for me, not for wisdom which is in me beyond all living is the mystery revealed, but that the interpretation be made known to the king in order that thou mightest know the thoughts of thy heart." The Peshitta renders the latter clauses thus: "But that the interpretation may be made known to the king, and that thou mayest know what thou didst meditate on in thy heart." Jerome, after rendering *רַזָּא* (*raza*, "secret") *sacramentum*, proceeds, "Sed ut interpretatio regi manifesta fieret et cogitationes mentis tuæ seires." The fact that the last word takes the Mandaitic form *תִּידָא* (*tin'da'*) instead of *תִּידָא* (*tidda'*) indicates on the whole an Oriental origin. The use of the plural form, *גְּרוֹחוֹדִין* (*g'hōd'ūn*), is wrongly rendered, "for their sakes who shall make known the interpretation." The Revised Version is more accurate, "but to the intent that the interpretation may be made known;" and Luther translates, "Dass dem Könige die Deutung aufgezeigt würde." The use of the plural for the indefinite occurs elsewhere (Winer, § 49). The position Daniel takes up is one which does not separate him from the other *halmeen* of the court. He in effect says, "I am no wiser than the other sages who have been condemned to death, only the God of heaven can reveal what the king demands, and he has revealed it to me." The purpose of the revelation, "that thou mightest know the interpretation," is fitted to soothe his pride. The humility of Daniel has been remarked in reference to this verse. He puts himself behind the impersonal form, "in order that people may show the king

the interpretation." The reason why the interpretation was shown to Nebuchadnezzar might be really to humble him, to show him that his empire, splendid as it was, was only one in a succession, and that the whole system of world-empires would be overthrown before a kingdom set up by the God of the Jews.

Vers. 31.—Thou, O king, sawest, and behold a great image. This great image, whose brightness was excellent, stood before thee; and the form thereof was terrible. The Greek versions do not require notice, as they do not imply any difference in reading from the Massoretic text. The Peshitta is shorter, "Thou, O king, wert seeing, and, lo! a great image of beauty exceeding excellent, and it stood before thee." The opening clause of the next verse may be regarded as taking up the last clause of the verse before us. As to the Aramaic of the passage, it is to be observed that the same long form of the second person is used in ver. 29. The numeral 𐤁 (ḥad) is used in this verse very much in the sense of the English indefinite article which is used to translate it in the English versions. It is represented in the Greek Version by *μία*. The participle ܠܐ (lu), "behold," does not occur in the Targums; a cognate form occurs in Samaritan, *hala*. In Talmudic it occurs in a form like the Samaritan. This word occurs in ch. vii., varied by ܐܪܘ (arū), which is regarded as a phonetic variation. It may, however, be due to defective penmanship, having the top of the ܐ too faintly written. Its etymology is doubtful. No Assyrian root has been found from which it may be derived. The word for "image," ܐܘܢܐ (tzelem), occurs in the Palmyrene inscriptions, as the regular term for a memorial statue. Hence, unless reason can be shown to the contrary, we could assume, even though there had been no more, that the figure was like a statue of a man. The word for this, ܕܢܥܢ (diccēn), occurs only in Daniel; the corresponding word in Ezra is ܕܢܥ (dēn). The *n* sound is one that so readily slips away, that its presence as a final letter is a sign that the form of a word possessing it is in an older stage than that without it; hence we would argue that as ܕܢܥ (dēn) is older than ܕܢ (da) of the Targums, so ܕܢܥܢ (diccēn) of Daniel is older than ܕܢܥ (dēn). The word that is most interesting is ܐܘܪܝܐ (zivēh); it is rendered "brightness" in our version. It is recognized by Professor Bevan, on the authority of Delitzsch, as an Assyrio-Babylonian word, therefore affording an additional evidence of the Eastern origin of Daniel. Nöldeke would derive it from the Persian *zeb* (quoted

by Behrmann, but there is some mistake in his reference). This tendency to derive everything from the Persian is to be suspected. The long political connection between Babylon and the Aryan nations north and east of it might easily introduce words of such an origin into the writings of a Babylonian diplomat. Another derivation is from ܐܪܐ (zahah), but seems doubtful, as, although in Hebrew, there is no trace of such a verb in Aramaic. The only other word that merits note is ܐܪܐ (rēv), "appearance." Professor Bevan says it is the only appearance in Aramaic of a corresponding root to the Hebrew ܐܪܐ (rā'ah), "to see." Daniel, it will be seen, lays stress on the emotions which each feature excited, in order to recall, not only the dream, but something of the feelings with which Nebuchadnezzar had beheld it. With this dream of Nebuchadnezzar we might compare the dream of the seer of Assurbanipal, given by Lenormant ('La Divination,' p. 137), "The seer (*voyant*) narrated to Assurbanipal how the goddess Istar had stood before him seated in her chariot, surrounded by flame, with a bow in her hand" (see also Smith's 'Assurbanipal,' pp. 123, 124). It is unlikely that the colossal image was identified by Nebuchadnezzar with any one of the Babylonian gods; perhaps this was one of the elements of the terror excited by the vision, that he could not identify him. If he did make any identification, Daniel does not do anything to justify him in any such identification.

Vers. 32, 33.—This image's head was of fine gold, his breasts and his arms of silver, his belly and his thighs of brass, his legs of iron, his feet part of iron and part of clay. The versions present no occasion of remark, save that Theodotion has a doublet, *αι χειρες*, translating, "the hands, the breast, and the arms." The word rendered "fine" is really "good" (ܐܬܐ, *tab*). Naturally, there have not been preserved to us any composite images of this kind; gold and silver would certainly soon have found their way to the melting-pot after the fall of the Babylonian empire, had such a statue been erected in Babylon. Brass and iron were too precious not to follow in the same road. Among the Greeks, as we know, there were what were called "chryselephantine" statues, partly gold and partly ivory. In the description given of the Temple of Belus, we see a succession something akin to that in the statue, but it may be doubted whether we may deduce any connection between the two on that account. In the Book of Enoch the apocalypticist sees mountains of different kinds of metal—of gold, silver, brass, iron.

tin, and mercury, the first four coinciding with the metals in Daniel's vision. Ewald refers in a note to the possibility that this idea might be borrowed from Hesiod, but rightly dismisses it as improbable. As to the metals used, gold and silver were well known in ancient times, as also iron, though, from the difficulty of working it, later. What is here translated "brass" ought to be rendered "copper;" "bronze" certainly was known very early, but the whole use of the word, *עֹנֶן* (Aramaic), or *נְחָשׁ* (Hebrew), implies that it is a simple metal; thus Dent. viii. 9, "Out of whose hills thou mayest dig brass" (Hebrew, *נְחָשׁ*; Onkelos, *נְחָשׁ*). In this statue the progressive degradation of the material and situation is to be observed. The head, the highest part, gold; the shoulders, lower, silver; the belly and thighs, lower still, brass; the legs, lower yet, iron; and the feet and toes, lowest of all, a mixture of iron and clay. It is observed by Kliefoth that there is further a growing division. The head is one, without any appearance of division; the portion consisting of the breast and arms is divided, though slightly, for the chest is more important and bulky than the arms; the belly and thighs form a portion which from the plural form given to the word translated "belly," *מִכְתָּי* (*m'ohi*), suggests more of dividedness than does that above. The lowest portion, that forming the legs and toes, has the greatest amount of division. Kliefoth also refers to another point—that while there is a progressive degradation of the metal, there is also progression in degrees of hardness, silver being harder than gold, copper harder than silver, and iron hardest of all; then suddenly the iron is mingled with clay. There is not a new, softer material added to form a new fifth part; but there is a mingling of "clay"—clay suitable for the potter, or rather that has already been baked in the kiln, and therefore in the last degree brittle. In fact, there is a progress in fragility—gold the most ductile of metals, and iron the least so, then clay, when baked, more brittle still. There are many other successions that might be followed, which are at least ingenious. The idea suggested by the phrase, "part of iron and part of clay," is that there was not a complete mingling, but that portions were seen that were clearly clay, and other portions as clearly still iron; there was therefore the superadded notion of the imperfect union of the parts with the necessary additional weakness which follows.

Ver. 34.—Thou sawest till that a stone was cut out without hands, which smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay, and brake them to pieces. Practically, the versions are at one with the

Massoretic text in regard to this verse, save that the two Greek versions add, *ἐξ ὄρους*, "out of the mountain." Concerning the Chaldee text, we would remark that in the dual form *בִּידַיִן* (*biydayin*), the dual has disappeared in the Aramaic of the Targums. *Thou sawest till* implies some time of contemplation and wonder. The king saw this gigantic statue, not possessing the attributes of any of his national gods, and he looks on in his dream in wonder and awe. *Till a stone cut out without hands*. The Greek versions make an addition which seems necessary to the sense—"out of the mountain." This addition may certainly have been made from the later verse (ver. 45). The logical necessity, however, may have prompted this addition. On the other hand, the evidence of both the Greek versions agreeing in one addition has very considerable weight. It is not impossible that the word *מִתְּרָח* (*mitturah*), "from the mountain," had dropped from the manuscripts used by the Massoretes. In favour of the Massoretic text is the fact that the Peshitta omits the word. On the other hand, Jerome adds *de monte*. It may be noted, as at least a curiosity, that the Peshitta, instead of the *אֶבֶן* (*aben*), "a stone," gives *kēpha*, from which Cephas, the name of the Apostle Peter, is derived. As the monarch gazes at the huge image, he sees behind the image a mountain towering above the image, huge as it is. From this mountain he sees a boulder detach itself, as if it were being cut with chisel and wedge, but no hands are visible. Once set loose from the mountain's side, it came by bounds and leaps down the declivity, "and smote the image upon his feet that were of iron and clay." Every bound that the stone makes down the mountain is larger, and raises it higher and makes it strike the earth with more of force, till with a bound greater than any it had made before, it strikes the feet of the image, "which were of iron and clay"—mingled, yet separate—and at once they are broken in pieces: "utterly crushed" is the meaning of the word *דָּגַג* (*dug*). The Septuagint rendering is *κατέλεσεν*, "ground;" it occurs in Exod. xxxii. 20, of Moses grinding the golden calf to powder. Theodotion's word is not a correct rendering of the word; it is *ἐλέπτυνεν*, "beat into thin scales;" comp. Matt. xxi. (42) 44 ("the stone which the builders rejected"), "on whomsoever it shall fall, it will grind him to powder." It is to be observed that this outting of the stone out of the mountain took place after the fourth portion of the image was clearly visible. In the dream the catastrophe took place after the stone had been cut from the mountain and had bounded down its side.

A similar chronological succession may be expected in the events foreshadowed.

Ver. 35.—Then was the iron, the clay, the brass, the silver, and the gold, broken to pieces together, and became like the chaff of the summer threshing-floors. The versions are closer to the Massoretic than our Authorized Version, as they all give more prominence to כֹּחֶה (*lah'dah*), "at once." It is rendered "together." The LXX. renders *μαα*; Theodotion, *εισδρατ*; the Peshitta repeats the word; and Jerome renders *pariter*. Theodotion changes the order somewhat, for the sake of making it more symmetrical. The rendering of the LXX. is in some respects different from the natural sense of the Massoretic text, but not so much so as to require us to presume a radically different text: "Then the iron, and the clay, etc., became fragments, and they were smaller than the chaff of the threshing-floor." We have this verse also in the Itala, preserved to us in Tertullian, but it does not differ from Jerome seriously. It would follow naturally enough if the mighty image were so smitten on its weak and fragile feet, that it would come crashing to the earth; but more happened than this. As the monarch looked, in falling, the various parts of the image, as they fell in a heap, became broken, nay, triturated—they became as the dust or chaff of the summer threshing-floor. Summer is the dead time in the East; harvest is over by the end of June, and the threshing of corn then commences. All this huge statue was reduced to particles as small and light as the chaff that is beaten off the grain by the threshing instruments of those days—feet of oxen or wheel of cart. Chaff is a favourite symbol for lightness and worthlessness. In the first psalm the wicked are compared to chaff; so in Ps. xxviii. In Hosea, where he speaks (xiii. 3) of Israel's sins, he says, "Ephraim shall be like the chaff of the threshing-floor." Isaiah (xli. 15, 16) speaks of Jacob getting new threshing instruments to thresh the mountains, and make them small as chaff. It may be noted that the word here translated "chaff" only occurs here. The word does not appear in the Targums, instead of which is used מוֹץ (*mōtz*), the Hebrew word. In Syriac, again, in the Peshitta, it occurs frequently, as Ps. i. 4 and Isa. xl. 15—another sign, slight in itself, of the Eastern origin of the Book of Daniel. The fact that the word occurred in Daniel would have a tendency to preserve it if in use when Daniel was published, or introduce it if it were not. Yet, as we have said, it does not appear in the Targums. It does appear in Syriac, the language of a people who, as not Jews, would presumably not be familiar with

Daniel. The word for "threshing-floor," מִדְרֵי (*iddrēi*), is also one that does not appear in the Targums, but it does appear in the Peshitta. Jensen suggests an Assyrian etymology, but Brockelmann marks this doubtful; Lagarde suggests a Persian etymology, also marked doubtful. Whichever etymology holds bears out the Eastern origin of the book. The Targums represent the older Aramaic of Palestine. If Daniel were a book originating in Palestine, the Persian words appearing in it might also be expected to appear in the Targums. And the wind carried them away, that no place was found for them: and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth. The LXX. rendering is, "And the wind carried them away, so that there was nothing left of them, and the stone that smote the image became a great mountain, and smote the whole earth." The first portion of this is a fairly correct rendering of our present Massoretic text. On the other hand, the latter clause implies that the translator had before him, or imagined he had, not כֹּחֶה, but כָּחַ; not impossibly כָּחַ might be written without the silent א; thus, כָּחַ, as in the Peshitta. In that case the mistake might easily be made. Behrmann remarks on the vocalization of כָּחַ in this passage being the same as כָּחַ, but does not remark that it is written defectively in Syriac. The sense in the Massoretic text is much better than that implied in this reading. Theodotion's rendering differs in the first clause of this portion of the present verse, "And the abundance (πληθος) of wind carried it away, and place was not found for them: and the stone, when it had smitten (παράκτας) the image, became a great mountain, and filled the whole earth." The rendering "multitude" (πληθος) is due to reading הַכֹּחַ instead of הַכָּחַ. This form of the plural of the demonstrative pronoun is the commoner in Biblical Aramaic, but does not appear in the Targums nor the Peshitta. It is akin to the Mandaitic מַכְּחַ. Neither the Peshitta nor the Vulgate presents any peculiarities of rendering. All this mass that had formed the image, though it had been gold, silver, brass, and iron, yet was so ground down—had become reduced to particles so small, that the wind carried them away. So scattered were they that they collected in no special place, so that one could say, "This is the image." The figure is still that of the threshing-floor; the wind, blowing on the grain that is lifted up before it, carries away the chaff, but, search as one may, the chaff, once blown away, cannot be found. A more remarkable thing now takes place—the

stone that, bounding down the mountain-side, had smitten the image on the feet, so that it fell and became as dust, now grows apace, overtopping the utmost height the image had attained, overtopping the mountain from which it had been cut. Not only did it grow in height, but, as it increased in height, its base broadened till the whole earth was filled with it. There seems to be a reference here to Isa. ii. 2, "The mountain of the Lord's house shall be established on the top of the mountains, and shall be exalted above the hills; and all nations shall flow unto it." As the monarch gazes in his dream, the change is completed, the huge image, with its glittering head and gleaming breast, its polished thighs and legs of iron, its unseemly feet that inspired terror by its very appearance, had utterly disappeared, and its place was occupied by a mountain, huge but peaceful, on which the flocks might browse and trees might grow. It may be noted, though not as of importance, that the material of the mountain is most akin with that of the weak clay of which the feet of the image were largely composed. Such, then, is the dream which Nebuchadnezzar had seen, and which the prophet now presented once more before him. We must, however, glance at the picture presented by the reading of the LXX. To the translator the picture evidently present was that of a stone descending from the mountain, and increasing in momentum as it descends; but this stone further increases in size, till before its tremendous strokes and rebounds the very solid earth quakes.

Ver. 36.—This is the dream; and we will tell the interpretation thereof before the king. The various versions agree closely with the Massoretic text. It is scarcely a variation when the Septuagint has *ἐν*, "to," instead of *ἐνώπιον*, "before," that is to say, *ἐνώπιον* instead of *ἐνώπιον* (*q'dam*). Jerome must have read *q'dam* (*q'dam*), "before thee," as he renders *coram te, rex*; but that also is unimportant. Having finished telling Nebuchadnezzar his dream, Daniel now announces his intention of giving the interpretation. Commentators have noticed the fact that Daniel does not say, "I will give," but "we." The opinion of Professor Fuller is that Daniel here includes with himself his three companions; of Keil, Kranichfeld, Zöckler, and Behrmann, that he identifies himself with all worshippers of Jehovah; Aben Ezra makes the plurality by making him refer to himself and the Divine wisdom; Jephth-ibn-Ali makes its force lie in contrast; Hitzig makes it really the *pluralis excellentis*, and quotes in defence Gen. i. 26 and xi. 7, where it is God himself that

speaks. Had Daniel introduced the phrase, "thus saith the Lord," this opinion might have been defended. It may be that Daniel fell back on the methods and ordinary mode of address for an astrologer before the King of Babylon (see ver. 7). He does not wait for the king to acknowledge that this is the dream he had. Daniel at once proceeds with the interpretation.

Ver. 37.—Thou, O king, art a king of kings: for the God of heaven hath given thee a kingdom, power, and strength, and glory. The Septuagint renders the latter clause, "To thee the Lord of heaven gave the dominion, and the kingdom, and the might, and the honour, and the glory in all the earth (*ἐν πᾶσι τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*)." There appears here to be two cases of doublet; *ἀρχή* and *βασίλεια* are probably originally alternative renderings of *malcūtha*, and *τιμή* and *δόξα* double renderings of *yigara*. On this hypothesis there is only one Greek word for two Aramaic. We shall consider this later. Paulus Tellenius, in his translation of the Septuagint Version, draws the beginning of the next verse into connection with the final words of this verse as given here. The words, "in the whole earth," is a transference from the next verse. The rendering of Theodotion is, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings, to whom the God of heaven gave a strong and mighty and honourable kingdom," making thus *hisna*, *toqpa*, and *yigara* adjectives of *malcūtha*, but *malcūtha* is feminine, and, if adjectives, *hisna*, etc., are masculine. The Peshitta differs from the Massoretic in leaving out one of the terms, "Thou, O king, art a king of kings; God most high (*m'rima*) a strong kingdom and glory has given to thee." Of course, the same objection holds to some extent against this version as against that of Theodotion, but it is to be noted that there are not two words conveying the same idea of strength. As there was only one in the Septuagint, we are inclined to think that *toqpa* must have been an addition. Jerome's rendering is, "Thou art a king of kings, and the God of heaven has given to thee the kingdom, and might, and dominion, and glory." There seems to be a transposition here. The general scope of this verse and the next is given in Jer. xxvii. 5, 6. There is certainly high honour given to Nebuchadnezzar in this address, but, at the same time, he is warned that all his glory is bestowed upon him by the God of heaven. It is possible that Nebuchadnezzar interpreted the words as referring to Merodach, the god whom he specially worshipped, or regarded the God of heaven as only another of the gods many and lords many which, as a polytheist, he acknowledged. The title of the Babylonian king was *shar-sharani*, "king of kings," and

sharru-rabbu, "great king." Thus in this address the technical title is given him. The Babylonian monarchs assumed this from their Assyrian predecessors, as e.g. Ashurbanipal (Smith, 'History,' pp. 26, 73, 196). From the Babylonians it was passed on to the Persian monarchs. In Ezek. xxvi. 7 the prophet gives Nebuchadnezzar this title. As we find by the succeeding verse, the kingdom here is not mere royalty or kingship, but the special royalty of practically universal empire; that is to say, universal so far as the knowledge of the times went. Our rendering in the Authorized Version fails in accuracy, in not inserting the definite article, which is really implied in the sign of the *status emphaticus*. Luther makes the same mistake. Happily the Revisers have altered matters, and inserted "the," as does Behrmanu. The Greek Version and Peshitta are accurate in this. The word translated "power," חֵסְאָא (*his'na*), is consonantly present in both dialects of more recent Aramaic.

Ver. 38.—And wheresoever the children of men dwell, the beasts of the field and the fowls of the heaven hath he given into thy hand, and hath made thee ruler over them all. Thou art this head of gold. The Septuagint, if we take along with this verse the final clause of the preceding verse, has even more of that look of exaggeration which we can scarcely fail to be conscious of in the Massoretic, "In all the earth inhabited¹ by men, and wild beasts, and birds of the heaven, and fish of the sea, he delivered (all things) into thy hand to rule over all." The addition to the realm of Nebuchadnezzar of the dwelling-place of the fish of the sea is readily observed. Theodotion has the same addition, "In every place where the sons of men dwell, he gave into thy hand beasts of the earth, birds of the air, fishes of the sea, and appointed thee lord of all." One cannot but observe not only the presence of "the fishes," but also the fact that only the lower animals are given into his power. It may be that here, as in the LXX., the object is to render with slavish exactness the original—unobservant of the fact that the construction was irregular. Behrmann thinks the author had before his mind חֲשִׁלְתָּא (*hashaltak*), "has made thee ruler," and then changed the

construction. Something might be said for Moses Stuart's view that כְּלִי-כִּימָאָה should be translated "wherever," if there were any similar construction to be found. The rendering of the Peshitta agrees with the sense of Moses Stuart, "Every place where the sons of men dwell, the bird of heaven, or the beast of the field, he hath given into thy hand, and caused thee to rule over all of them." The change of order is to be noted. The Vulgate agrees with the Massoretic. The word for "dwelling" is an older form דִּמְרִין (*dareen*), instead of the more recent form, which is that read דִּמְרִין (*dayreen*). This copious insertion of the *κ* is an Eastern peculiarity. This assertion of Daniel must seem exaggerated to us, but we must remember the courtly form of address that was usual in Oriental courts, and that Nebuchadnezzar in all likelihood claimed this breadth of empire; so Daniel, in order to make way for the assertion he had already made of the king's dependence on One higher, gives him everything he claims. The addition of the sea to his dominion, although in it Theodotion supports the LXX., is due to a mistaken idea of the point of Daniel's statements. He adds, *Thou art this head of gold*. This is not, as Hitzig asserts, Nebuchadnezzar personally, but to him as the type of the Babylonian monarch. This was but natural, as of the duration of this monarchy his independent reign extended to the half. Before his advent as "king's son," the Babylonian Empire had to endure the assault of Egypt, and had to struggle for existence against it. With his advent began its glory, with his disappearance began at once its decadence. Only under Nebuchadnezzar was Babylon really imperial. The short reigns of his successors are proofs of an insufficient hand upon the reins. With all the tyrannical moods to which he was subject, and all the wild whirlwinds of passion which were liable to carry him away, Nebuchadnezzar, as presented to us here, was a splendid man—utterly unlike Epiphanes, we may remark in passing, with his low tastes and his cringing submission to Rome. His brilliance was that of Alcibiades; he had nothing of the dignity implied in the head of gold. Nebuchadnezzar had secured the love of this captive, as we see by the sorrow with which Daniel communicated to him his approaching madness. There is thus a reasonableness in making him, in especial, the head of gold.

Ver. 39.—And after thee shall arise another kingdom inferior to thee, and another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth. None of the versions presents any difficulties, or gives occasion for any

¹ "In all the earth inhabited." This clause is regarded by the Septuagint translation as belonging to ver. 37 (which see). We have united it here to the thirty-eighth verse, as the words are a translation of the opening words of this verse according to the Massoretic. Omitting this clause, it might be rendered, "of (ἀπό) men," etc.

remark, save the Vulgate, which inserts *argenteum*, as if reading קָדָשׁ . The word used, "kingdom," not "king," shows, without possibility of reasonable dispute, that in identifying Nebuchadnezzar with the head of gold, the reference is not to him personally, but to him as representing his dynasty. The next dynasty is said to be inferior, that is to say, nearer the ground אֲרָצָה (*ara'*), which is certainly true of the shoulders in relation to the head. Not only does the inferior metal imply inferiority, but the inferior position does so also. The metal is omitted here, but stated in the next clause, *Another third kingdom of brass, which shall bear rule over all the earth.* The metal is here referred to, but not the position; there is no need to say it is inferior—that is implied when it is said to be a kingdom of brass. We need only refer to what we have said above, as to the fact that "brass" here really means "copper." As the inferiority stated in the first clause is omitted in the second, so the statement made at the end, which grammatically applies only to the third kingdom, applies also to the second. It is only as, in a sense, bearing rule over the whole earth, that any monarchy comes into this statue at all. When we look at these two, we find certainly the two arms suggesting and rendering emphatic a twofoldness of some sort in this power. The fact that, in the description of the statue, the word translated "belly" (בֶּטֶן) is plural, suggests, along with the two thighs, the idea of fourfoldness. Faintly is this suggestion made, but the exigencies of the figure must be considered.

Ver. 40.—And the fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron: forasmuch as iron breaketh in pieces and subdueth all things: and as iron that breaketh all these, shall it break in pieces and bruise. The version of the LXX. differs considerably here, "The fourth kingdom shall be strong as iron, as iron which subdueth all things, even as iron cutteth down every tree." It is evident that the translator has read עֵץ (*'illan*), "a tree," instead of עֵלֶּעַן (*'illeen*), "these." The last clause is due to עֵלֶּעַן (*'et'ayroa'*) being written with the א : עֵלֶּעַן ; however, ו (*van*) is not unlike, in ancient Aramaic script, to ב (*kaph*), although ב (*lamed*) is not like ו (*lau*), yet the phrase עֵלֶּעַן would carry the reader over every obstacle. Theodotion differs less from the Massoretic, "The fourth kingdom is that which shall be as strong as iron, just as (ὡς ὁ σιδηρος) iron beateth small and subdueth all things, thus shall it beat small and subdue all things." It may be observed that the clause, "and as iron breaketh all these," is omitted from the

text. It certainly appears to be an addition, indeed, has the look of a "doublet." This view is confirmed by the fact that the Peshitta also omits this clause. The Peshitta rendering is, "The fourth kingdom shall be strong like iron, and even as iron crushes and bruises all, thus even it shall beat small and subdue all." The Vulgate rendering also omits a clause, "And the fourth kingdom shall be like iron, as iron beats small and subdues all things, it shall beat small (*comminet*) all these." For these grounds we feel inclined to regard the clause in question as an explanatory note, which has slipped into the text. Before we leave the consideration of the text, we must observe that the word for "fourth" assumes the Syriac, or Eastern Aramaic form, not the form in Chaldee, or Western Aramaic. That empire which was represented by the basest of the four metals, and occupied the lowest position in the figure, is that which is the most powerful. When we go back we find brass is the next in point of hardness and strength; it is the third, and of it, at all events, if not also of that which preceded it, it is said that "it shall bear rule over all the earth." The inferiority indicated by the metals and by the position occupied in the image, did not indicate inferiority in power or in extent of dominion. An interesting theory has been formed by Dr. Bonnar ('Great Interregnum'), that this degeneration was one of type. The monarchy as exhibited in Babylon, especially when the monarch was a man of genius, as was Nebuchadnezzar, was likest to the rule of the Almighty over the world; his authority was without limit, direct and absolute over every one subject to his sceptre. The Medo-Persian monarchy had much of the Babylonian absoluteness, but there were, if Herodotus is to be trusted, the peers of the crown, and, above all, there were the satraps, with their almost independent position in respect to the central power. The third, in our author's opinion, the Hellenic, had the monarchy limited, not only by numerous peers, as the king in Antioch was balanced by the kings in Alexandria and Pergamus, not to speak of the monarchs of Parthia, but also by the autonomous cities with the semblance of freedom. The fourth, the Roman, was yet further removed from the old Divine-right monarchy of the Babylonian type. At their first intercourse with the Jews the Romans were Republicans. Their first conquest of Judæa was made by Pompey, the general of the Republic. To the last the emperor, whatever his power, was still theoretically the first magistrate of a republic. The feet and toes of mingled clay and iron, he held, were modern constitutional monarchies—monarchies built upon demo-

cracy and the will of the people. All this is doomed to be overthrown by the coming of the Messianic kingdom.

Vers. 41-43.—And whereas thou sawest the feet and toes, part of potter's clay, and part of iron, the kingdom shall be divided: but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron, forasmuch as thou sawest the iron mixed with miry clay. And as the toes of the feet were part of iron, and part of clay, so the kingdom shall be partly strong, and partly broken. And whereas thou sawest iron mixed with miry clay, they shall mingle themselves with the seed of men: but they shall not cleave one to another, even as iron is not mixed with clay. The version of the Septuagint is worthy of notice here, "And as thou sawest (hast seen, *ἐώρακας*) its feet and toes were partly of potter's clay, and partly of iron. Another kingdom shall be divided in itself, as thou sawest the iron mingled with the miry clay, and the toes of the feet were partly of iron and partly of clay, part of the kingdom shall be strong, and part shall be broken. And as thou sawest the iron mingled with the miry clay, there shall be mixings (*συνμυγείς*) to the generation (*γένεσις*) of mankind (*ἀνθρώπων*), but they shall not agree nor be well affected one to another, just as (*ὡςπερ*) iron cannot be compounded with clay." It may be observed here that a clause is omitted from ver. 41, "but there shall be in it of the strength of the iron." In the forty-third verse the difference is due to *πρὸς* as infinitive of the verb "to sow," that is to say, the translator must have read *πρὸς* *λάμβαν* instead of *λῆν*. The addition of *ἀλλή* has had its origin in a false idea that the feet and toes of the image represented a new world-dominion. Theodotion renders, "Because (*ὅτι*) thou sawest the feet and the toes part of potter's clay, and part of iron, a kingdom shall be divided, and there will be in it from the iron root in like manner as thou sawest the iron mingled with the potter's clay. And the toes of the feet were partly iron, and partly clay, part of the kingdom shall be strong, and part of it shall be broken (being broken, *συντριβόμενον*); because thou sawest the iron mingled with the potter's clay, there shall be mixings with the seed of men: but they shall not adhere one to another, even as iron is not mingled with clay." Neither in Syriac nor Chaldee has *nitzab* the meaning "to be firm;" *nitz'bhah* means, in later Aramaic, "a seedling." Originally, however, it meant "to confirm," "to set up," "to strengthen," as the Hebrew *נָצַב* (*yatzab*) and *נָצַב* (*natzab*). This meaning had been lost sight of by the time Theodotion wrote, or possibly before the translation was made

which he revised. The Peshitta does not call for remark, save that it agrees with Theodotion in translating *נִצְבָּה* (*nitz'bah*) "root." Jerome renders it *plantarium*. This new development of the image is to be regarded, not as another empire, but as the outgrowth of the fourth kingdom. This is clear from the fact that there is no new substance introduced of which the feet and toes are wholly made up, but the iron is mingled with a new and inferior substance, potter's clay. The numerical mark "ten," which is to be regarded as the peculiar distinctive sign of the fourth empire, is in the toes. This last empire, whatever it may be taken to be, is one that splits itself up into approximately ten parts or sub-kingdoms. Further, there shall be a foreign element introduced which shall not harmonize with the original material. Professor Bevan is certain that the reference is "to the marriages of the Ptolemies with the Seleucids." Notwithstanding that Professor Bevan states this view as if it could not be doubted, it is evidently false. Both the Lagids and the Seleucids were Macedonians, and there was no natural incompatibility. If marriage is intended here, and if the fourth monarchy were the Hellenic, more sensible would have been the suggestion that it referred to the Hellenizing of South-Western Asia—the miscegenation of the peoples inaugurated by Alexander the Great, only it did not proceed very far. Further, it did not signalize the end of the Greek rule, but really the beginning of it. We admit certainly that the LXX translates in a way that suggests the marriage of a superior with an inferior race. But there is no reference in reality to marriage, but to the mingling of two distinct culture-elements, the infusion of barbarous races into the midst of a civilized; and the barbarians taking on some of the outward forms of civilization would represent better the thing indicated. But to take this as referring to the marriage of the Seleucids and Lagids is certainly as wrong as wrong can be, although it is held by Moses Stuart, Hitzig, Ewald, as well as Professor Bevan. Not one of them shows which, the Selucid or the Lagid, is "the clay," "the seed of men," and which the governing power or race that mingles with them. Yet the inferiority of the clay is an essential element in the symbolism. Hoffmann's idea, that there is reference to the marriage of the Emperor Otto II. and the Russian grandduke Wladimir with the daughters of the Byzantine emperor, is equally far-fetched. Certainly the intrusion into the Roman Empire of the Germanic tribes on the one side, and of the Arabs and Turks on the other, is an interpretation much

closer to the real meaning of the symbol. A good deal can be said for Dr. Bonnar's theory, that it is the effort of monarchy to rest on democracy. As to the number, *ten*, it is not to be made absolute; it may be more than ten or fewer than ten. All that is necessary is that the number be considerably more than four, and not so numerous as to suggest an indefinite multitude. The fact of "the toes" occupying the same portion of the image, seems to signify that those ten divisions were simultaneously existing. What is symbolized is clearly a state of matters not unlike what was in Greece after the defeat of the Persians, and before the Macedonian domination—a number of separate states forming part of one system. Such, to a certain extent, was the empire of the Diadochi, or successors of Alexander, only they were not generally more than four, five, or six—mainly four, the Seleucids, the Lagids, the Attalids, and the Antigonids. Such was the state of matters under the Holy Roman Empire, when what are now the six great powers were gradually separating themselves off. A similar state of matters existed at the same time among the Mohammedan powers, which acknowledged a certain suzerainty in the Caliph of Bagdad, but warred with each other with great freedom. While we have said that there is an appearance of simultaneity given to these monarchs or dynasties, candour compels us to acknowledge that they may be successive. We would not desire to anticipate what we say below in a special excursus on the four monarchies of Daniel; yet we may be permitted to indicate two senses in which the number *ten* may indicate Rome. There were *ten* emperors to the capture of Jerusalem, and the end of Judaism as a civil power, and the consequent independence of the Church from the trammels of Judaism. Further, a fair case might be made out for the different magistrates that exercised authority, more or less supreme, in Rome—consuls, prætors, dictators, *magistri equitum*, *censores*, *tribunes*. All these were replaced by the emperors. We merely indicate this, as we shall consider the subject more at large below.

Vers. 44, 45.—And in the days of these kings shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom, which shall never be destroyed: and the kingdom shall not be left to other people, but it shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever. Forasmuch as thou sawest that the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands, and that it brake in pieces the iron, the brass, the clay, the silver, and the gold; the great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter: and the dream is certain, and the interpretation

thereof sure. The Greek versions differ from the Massoretic text only in the order in which the materials of the statue are recorded. These are arranged in the reverse order in which they are first mentioned, that is to say, we have first the clay, then the iron, and so on, to the gold. This is the order followed by Jerome. On the other hand, the Peshitta follows the Massoretic order. The reason for the order adopted in the Septuagint, Theodotion, and the Vulgate is evidently a symmetrical one, and therefore more likely to be the result of emendation than the somewhat haphazard order of the received text. It is, however, not impossible that the similarity of sound has led to *kaspa*, "clay," being brought out of its proper place at the beginning of the list and placed in juxtaposition with *kaspa*, "silver." Ewald thinks that the order of the Greek versions is to be preferred. Professor Bevan is doubtful, and refers to the order of the metals in ch. v. 4, which begins with "gold" and ends with "stone." *In the days of these kings*. This must refer to the kings who made up the last dynasty, especially the kings of the sub-dynasties represented by the ten toes. If the traditional interpretation is correct, these days are still future. It is not impossible that all the dynasties of the vision are implied, and that the kingdom of heaven is preparing during the whole period; only the natural meaning is that we have assumed. *Shall the God of heaven set up a kingdom*. It may be noted that, while in the rest of this chapter the Septuagint renders this title, *Kύριος τοῦ οὐρανοῦ* or *Κύριος ὁ ὑψίστος*, here the rendering is, *ὁ Θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ*. This is a clear statement of the Messianic hopes of the Jews on one side—a Messianic kingdom and Messianic times. This new kingdom is on a different plane from those that preceded it, which go to make up the mysterious image. It is explained to be from the direct interference of the God of heaven that this new kingdom is intruded upon history. When we look at the material, it is inferior to all that had gone before—inferior even to the fire-baked clay of the potter, which formed the toes of the image. This way of representing the Messianic kingdom would have appeared inadequate to an ordinary Jew. Waiving the fact that he regarded the Messianic empire to be another such as the empires of Assyria and Babylonia, only greater, the Jew would certainly have declared that the Messianic kingdom of heaven was a precious stone, not an ordinary piece of rock that goes to build up the framework of the mountains. It is impossible to deny that it is strange that the symbol should be thus a less precious material than even that

of the lowest and weakest kingdom of the worldly system of dynasties. When we look at a metal, how homogeneous it is! With rocks, again, begins individualism. The more precious metals, with their extreme ductility, seem to be further removed from this individualism than the baser, such as copper and iron, and clay is still less removed than iron. But simple rock is furthest removed of all from metallic homogeneity; the grains that compose it, unlike the chemical atoms of the metal, are visible to the naked eye. The process of degradation, which had proceeded through kingdom after kingdom, had now reached its lowest point. Wherever the setting up of this Messianic kingdom is placed, whenever it is held as occurring, it is certain it fits most naturally the Christian Church. The old civilization, represented by the Assyrian monarchy, had only one free man in the state, and that was the king. The Persians had nobles whose power rendered the king's supremacy less absolute than it had been in the Assyrian days. In the days of Greek and Roman supremacy the freedom of citizenship was, even in the republics, possessed only by a few, the rest were slaves. Still, the freedom was much more widely spread than in the Persian and Assyrian monarchies; only the Church, the kingdom of heaven, made of slaves citizens. It is the very acme of individualism. Looked at from without, the kingdom of heaven was a thing to be despised—a thing for freedmen and slaves, for poor workmen and peasants. In the Assyrian form of government the king was the state; so the royal metal, gold, is used. In the Persian the nobles rule; so we have silver. In Greece it is the free citizens, therefore the artistic but less noble metal, copper, or, perhaps, its composite form as bronze, is used. In Rome, in imperial times, it is the soldiery, and therefore iron is the metal that symbolizes them. Shall we step over the intervening centuries of retrogression, and see in the clay the modern mercantile and manufacturing interests? To the ordinary eye of the world, there is a progressive degeneracy here. The lowest point is reached; not even the rich, not to speak of the noble and learned, but the poor and the ignorant, form the kingdom. Another contrast in the symbol is that these metallic empires remained stationary; they reached a limit, then could go no further—not growth, but stationariness, is represented by their symbol; but this stone cut out of the mountain "grows," and ceases not till it has filled the earth. Further, the kingdoms which went to build up the dream-statue endure only for a time; this rock-built kingdom is an ever-

lasting kingdom. It is not limited either in extent or duration. This, again, suits only the Church of Christ; fitted and intended to fill the earth, it also has an unending duration. The world itself may end, but the Church does not. We do not mean to assert that Daniel foresaw this distinctly; the very idea of the prophetic office implied that the speaker often did not know the full import of his own words. *It shall break in pieces and consume all these kingdoms, and it shall stand for ever.* The silent, disruptive influence of Christianity is exhibited in regard to slavery, which was the foundation of the ancient state. Without opposing slavery, to appearance, it laid down principles which rendered slavery impossible. The supreme dignity it gives to the individual, as bearing the image of God, affirms the claims of democracy, and so affirms them that the modern state must disappear. *Forasmuch as thou sawest the stone was cut out of the mountain without hands.* Nothing could be more silent or unobserved by the men of the world, or more unlikely to form the beginning of a new world-power than Christianity. If Judaism was regarded as "the mountain of the Lord's house," then this new kingdom was cut from it, as Christianity was from Judaism. *And that it brake, etc.* The reason why Nebuchadnezzar had seen all this—the growth of this kingdom, the way it destroyed all other kingdoms—was now to be made known. *The great God hath made known to the king what shall come to pass hereafter; or, as it ought to be rendered, a great god.* The word, as observed by Professor Bevan, is not in the *status emphaticus*; see Ezra v. 8, אלהא רבא (*elaha rabba*). Daniel thus recognizes the fact that, to his heathen master, all that in the first instance he can convey to him—the only idea he can give him—of the greatness of Jehovah is that he is very great, not that he is the solely Great One in the universe (see Behrmann). Zöckler, Ewald, Keil, and Kraichfeld assert that the fact of the words "great god" (*elaha rab*) being in the absolute, not the emphatic state, is due to the elevation of poetic language. In the first place, this is not poetry, and, in the second place, neither of these writers gives any example of such a change of construction taking place. *Made known to the king.* Why was it to "the king"? One object secured by making this revelation known to Nebuchadnezzar himself was that it secured its publicity. Had the vision been made known to Daniel himself, he could not have announced that the empire of Babylon should pass away, without running the risk of being condemned for treason. The king's action had made

both dream and interpretation perforce public in a way they could not otherwise have been. *What shall come to pass hereafter: literally, which shall be after these things.* This does not mean in the immediate futuro, but after the state of matters at present existing—the domination of the world by great powers after the system of great world-empires has passed away, then will the Lord's kingdom be set up. *And the dream is certain, and the interpretation thereof sure; or, literally, to bring out the emphasis, certain—established—is the dream, and sure—faithful—the interpretation.* This is not a mere assertion of the fact that he, Daniel, had given an exact account of what the king had seen in his dream, and a correct interpretation of its import; of the first the king was the best judge. It is rather an argument: "The account of the dream is correct; from this learn that the interpretation is sure."

Ver. 46.—Then the king Nebuchadnezzar fell upon his face, and worshipped Daniel, and commanded that they should offer an oblation and sweet odours unto him. The Greek versions render in such a way that we are almost obliged to recognize an act of idolatrous worship. Jerome, too, distinctly says, "Nebuchodonosor . . . Daniele m adoravit et hostias et incensum præcepit ut sacrificarent." The same idea is conveyed by the Peshitta, but less definitely, from the fact that *qorban* means a "gift" as well as an "oblation;" though the gift is usually a consecrated gift. In the Aramaic of the Bible we have certain phrases used for "sacrifice;" several of these are here employed: it is true all of them have the possibility of being used in a somewhat lower meaning. The mere "falling down before Daniel upon his face," when the person who did it was Nebuchadnezzar, is extraordinary, and can only be explained by the idea of worship. When we find the word קָרַב (*q'rad*) used immediately after, it is very difficult to refuse to believe that the Greek Version and Jerome are right when they translate the latter word προσκύνησε. The word occurs repeatedly in the following chapter, invariably as "worship." The corresponding Hebrew word occurs in the second chapter of Isaiah, in the sense of "idolatrous worship" (Isa. ii. 20). It certainly does mean "to bend." Had the word thus stood alone, we could not have been certain that it meant "worship;" but when it follows the extreme act of prostration to the earth, "worship" must be meant. The separate terms, *minhah*, *niholân*, *ynassakâh lah*, might, taken separately, mean "gifts" and the "bestowment of gifts;" but, taken together, it is impossible not to

regard the action as one of sacrificial offering. It is true *minhah* means "a present," as when Jacob sends a present to Esau (Gen. xxxii. 13); but, in that connection, *nāsak* is not used. It is quite true that the burning of sweet odours was a common enough thing in entertaining guests whom it was desired to honour, but the term *neehōheen* was not given to the aromatic woods so used. People sometimes, even at present, scent their rooms by burning aromatic woods, but they never in such cases call them *incense*. But from the fact that the old Greek version and Jerome read *hostias*, *hostias*, the doubt seems forced upon us that the reading here has been altered, and that the true reading was *deehēen*—not *neehōheen*—this is a change that could with difficulty be imagined as occurring accidentally, but readily enough might happen from the desire to defend Daniel from the charge of allowing idolatrous worship to be offered to him. The instance referred to as parallel—the homage which Josephus relates Alexander the Great gave to Jaddua—is not quite on all fours with the present case. We are, in the first place, expressly told that it was "the name" of Jehovah, engraved on the *petalon* on the front of the priest's mitre, that Alexander worshipped (προσκύνησε τὸ ὄνομα). In the next place, we have no notice of sacrifice or incense being ordered to be offered to the high priest. It is not correct to say that *nasak* of necessity means "pour out an oblation," to the exclusion of the more general meaning of "offer sacrifice." The corresponding word in Arabic means "to sacrifice" (Behrmann). Behrmann says, in regard to this, truly, "As to Porphyry later, so to the author and to the first readers of this book, it would have seemed indecent if Daniel had allowed himself to be honoured as a god." This would have been true had the author been a contemporary of the Maccabees. The tide of feeling that led Peter to refuse the prostration of Cornelius, and Paul and Barnabas the sacrifices at Lystra, would have prevented any one inventing such a scene. It is perfectly true the worship was probably directed to the Divine Spirit as resident in Daniel, rather than to Daniel himself; few except the lowest and most degraded of heathen worshipped idols in any other way—the divine spirit, the deity, was the real object of worship, whose sign they were, and who resided in them. We must bear in mind that Daniel had been brought up in an idolatrous court, perhaps, also, he had to submit, on pain of suffering the fate that befell Paul and Barnabas when they refused the worship of the people of Lystra. We must lay stress on the very different relationship to idolatry and its worship implied in Daniel

thus suffering sacrifice and incense to be offered to him, from that subsisting in the time of the Maccabees. No writer of that period would have written a sacred romance in which he represented a servant of God receiving idolatrous honours. The attitude of later Judaism is exemplified by Jephthah-ibn-Ali, who says that though "Nebuchadnezzar commanded that sacrifices be brought to him as to a god, he (Daniel) does not say that he brought them to him. Most probably Daniel prohibited him from doing so."

Ver. 47.—The king answered unto Daniel, and said, Of a truth it is, that your God is a God of gods, and a Lord of kings, and a Revealer of secrets, seeing thou couldst reveal this secret. The versions do not exhibit any important variation from the Massoretic text. We must observe the plural form of the pronoun "your," implying the Hebrew nation as a whole, or at all events the three youths along with Daniel. It must be noted that the titles are not in the emphatic state, but are simply absolute, implying that Nebuchadnezzar simply placed the God of heaven, the God of Daniel, in his pantheon, as one of the superior gods. The historical difficulty that some have seen in Nebuchadnezzar making this confession to God, and yet straightway framing a golden image, is due to a failure to understand the attitude of a polytheist to his gods. To the heathen his god is a person he is afraid of, much more powerful than he is himself, able to do him much ill, or, on the other hand, able to bestow upon him much good, but able to be deceived, cajoled, and flattered. In worshipping his deities the heathen feels that any breach of sacred etiquette in regard to any deity is far more certain of bringing down the vengeance of the aggrieved power than any crime, however heinous. He would be most potent in prayer who could go over all the deities of the pantheon, and give to each his or her appropriate title. Thus the Hindus tell tales of fakirs whose power over the gods was due to this. One of the forms of this religious etiquette was to address each deity as if he were the supreme god who alone deserved worship. Lenormant ('Les Premières Civilizations,' ii. 159) gives an address to the god Hourki, or Sin, in which he is called "prince of the gods of heaven and earth, the good god, the great god, father of gods and men, the lord who extends his power over heaven and earth." In the same work (p. 178) there is an address to *Marduk* (Merodach), the favourite deity of Nebuchadnezzar, in which he is called "god of gods, king of heaven and earth." A little further on in the same work (p. 184) Nebu is called "the supreme intelligence,

scribe of the universe, who bears the supreme sceptre, the interpreter of the celestial spheres." In p. 189 Nergal is addressed as "great prince of the greatest gods, who has brought up the greatest gods." In his 'La Magie,' p. 175, he gives an address to *Silik-mulu-ki*, regarded as an Accadian name of Marduk, in which he is called "god of gods." In his 'Hibbert Lecture,' pp. 97—104, Professor Sayce, on the contrast between the religion of Babylon and that of Persia in this respect, says that Nebuchadnezzar calls Merodach "lord of all," yet declares him the "son of the gods." The same titles are given to Merodach and to Samas, and yet Samas is distinct from Merodach—he is his comrade in the struggle with the assailants of Oris, the moon-god.¹ At the same time, we must observe the limitations of Nebuchadnezzar's praise—it is simply as the Revealer of secrets that he praises and honours the God of Daniel.

Vers. 48, 49.—Then the king made Daniel a great man, and gave him many great gifts, and made him ruler over the whole province of Babylon, and chief of the governors over all the wise men of Babylon. Then Daniel requested of the king, and he set Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, over the affairs of the province of Babylon: but Daniel sat in the gate of the king. In the Greek versions there is not much to be observed. The Septuagint renders the last clause of ver. 48 "chief and ruler (*ἀρχοντα καὶ ἡγουμένον*) of all the wise men of Babylon," reading *us'gan* instead of *signeen*. Theodotion's is a fairly accurate rendering of the Massoretic text, as is also Jerome. The Peshitta renders this clause, "He made Daniel head over all the mighty men (*rabiheela*), and over all the wise men of Babylon." The translator must have inserted, or found before him inserted, the preposition *by* ('*el*'), "over," between *rab* and *signeen*, evidently a false reading, due to ignorance of the form Babylonian and Assyrian titles assumed. The word *us'gan* or *us'gan* was originally maintained to be Persian. Hitzig connects it with an Arabic root, *us'gan*, but the true derivation is now found to be *shakun* (Assyrian), "governor." It appears in Hebrew in Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the deuterio-Isaiah, as well as in Ezra and Nehemiah, showing the unlikelihood of any Persian derivation. Hitzig appears to regard Daniel as made the king's regent over the whole empire of Babylon; but this is not at all the meaning of the words. We must not be led away to

¹ Compare 'Inscription of Tiglath-pileser,' 'Records of the Past,' N.S., i. 92; and also 'India House Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar,' N.S., iii. 112.

believe that all this promotion befell Daniel at once; the statement here is summary, and includes many steps, and perhaps several years. Even at the utmost of his exaltation, he is not represented here as being made the regent of Nebuchadnezzar, as Hitzig would maintain. It is really only the province of Babylon, if we may not restrict the meaning of the word *m'deena* even further, and regard it as equivalent to "city." We admit that this restriction of significance is not supported by the versions, but the fact that in so many cases we have traces of Syriac influences in Daniel, and that *m'deena* means in Syriac "a city," renders this supposition not an impossible one. The precise limits of the province of Babylon in the days of Nebuchadnezzar cannot be settled. In later times, it consisted mainly of the territory between the Tigris and the Euphrates, south of the *murus Medius*, with some territory between the latter river and the desert (Professor Rawlinson). It may be that the satrapy of Babylon was of considerably less extent. The word *hashleet* means "to cause to rule." This would be made true by making Daniel overseer in any department of the government of the province. It is not necessary to maintain that Nebuchadnezzar made Daniel satrap of Babylonia; at the same time, *shalef* is the title given to the satrap of Babylon. M. Lenormant thinks there must be an interpolation when Daniel is said to be set over all the governors of the wise men in Babylon. His arguments are founded mainly on the belief that the castes of astrologers, soothsayers, and magicians—all that were included in the class of *hakmeen*—were hereditary, a thing which has not been proved. A difficulty has been urged by Lenormant that Daniel, as a zealous Jew, could not become head of a college of idolatrous priests. While there may be some force in this, one must beware of testing the actions of a Jew of the sixth century B.C. by criteria and principles applicable to one of later times. At all events, this militates strongly against the idea that the Book of Daniel was written in the age of the Maccabees. When we see Daniel thus, a youth of probably two or three and twenty, promoted ultimately to be over the province of Babylon, and to be one of the king's most trusted councillors, Ezekiel's saying, which places him between Noah and Job (Ezek. xiv. 14), becomes natural. Daniel had already been some years in the king's privy council before Ezekiel was carried into captivity. We do not know how long after the beginning of his prophetic work we are to date the prophecy of the fourteenth chapter—it may have been eight or nine years after. But even if it were only six

years, Daniel would by this time have been for eleven years a member of the privy council of the Babylonian monarch, and possibly for a considerable portion of that period governor of the province of Babylon. At any rate, Daniel would bulk very large in the eyes of the poor Jewish captives. Though contemporary, he was so far removed from his fellow-countrymen in social position, that his goodness and greatness would be subject to similar exaggeration to that which happens to heroes of a long-past age. A better argument may be drawn from the fact that *sagan* is always a civil title. The insertion of the word *hakmeen* might easily be due to some scribe who thought that as Daniel was one of the wise men, head of them would be more likely than head of the civil governors of the province, and placed it as a suggestion of what ought to take the place of *signeen*; a copyist following, inserted it in the text. If we compare this chapter with the sixth, we find Daniel one of three who were to receive the accounts of the various governors. Daniel was thus, if we may apply to his office a title drawn from our own political usage, secretary of state for Babylonia. It is characteristic of Daniel, that having been made rich and great by the king, and having received many gifts at the hand of the king, does not satisfy him; he entreates favour for his friends also. Hitzig's objection that Daniel would have the appointment of his subordinates, would only be valid if Daniel had been made satrap. If his *shalefship* extended merely to some one department of governmental work—and that seems to follow from the last clause of this verse—it is unlikely that he would have this power. Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego are set over the "business" (*'ebedta'*) of the province of Babylon. This word, in Targumic Aramaic, is very generally used of constructions where labour is employed. We may regard their position as one something like being members of a labour bureau. Nebuchadnezzar was a very great builder, so much so that almost all the bricks that have been got in Babylon are stamped with his name. While his Ninevite predecessors record in their inscriptions their campaigns, the kings they conquered, and the cities they sacked, the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar are almost entirely occupied with the various structures—temples, palaces, ramparts, and canals—which he had caused to be made. These buildings would need perpetual surveying. Further, as a great military genius, roads and canals would also be important objects, in the carrying out of which captives would be employed. And the products of this enforced labour would have to be surveyed carefully. This seems

more probable than that Daniel got these three friends appointed to do the work he himself was appointed to. The only plausible suggestion against this would be that Daniel desired that his friends be set jointly over the province of Babylon instead of himself, and, for his own part, he preferred to remain in the gate of the king. We know that those who wished to undermine a favourite in an Eastern court, frequently intrigued to get him promoted to a governorship, and then poisoned the mind of the king against him. On the other hand, the fact that Daniel had his province in Babylon, and would always

be near the king when he was in his capital, rendered the implied precaution needless. *But Daniel sat in the gate of the king.* The gate of the king was the gate of his palace or the entrance to the central court from which all the apartments branched off. In the gate the kings of the East acted as judges over their people; in the gate the king held councils. Hence to sit in the gate of the king conveyed the twofold idea of being the king's representative on the throne of judgment, and of being the counsellor of the king—member of the privy council, to employ a modern term.

HOMILETICS.

Ver. 1.—*A king troubled with bad dreams.* In accordance with the wide cosmopolitan interests with which the Book of Daniel is concerned, we are introduced thus early to the troubles of the Babylonian court. The most striking feature of the book—its apocalyptic character—is first shown in the dreams of a heathen king. Let us notice—

I. NEBUCHADNEZZAR AT THE HEIGHT OF HIS PROSPERITY IS TROUBLED WITH BAD DREAMS. In the previous chapter we saw the king triumphing over the Jews. He is now only in the second year of undivided supremacy. Yet the first glimpse we have of his court reveals the king in trouble. 1. *No prosperity* of external circumstances can secure the peace of mind which is essential to true happiness. Success in battle cannot ward off the invasion of bad dreams. Wealth and power cannot command the luxury of sleep. 2. *High rank* is especially subject to restless anxiety. Scripture more than once refers to the sleeplessness of great men (Esth. vi. 1; Eccles. v. 12; ch. iv. 18). On the other hand, sleep is regarded as a boon (John xi. 12), and a gift of God to "his beloved" (Ps. cxvii. 2).

II. THOUGH NEBUCHADNEZZAR IS A HEATHEN KING, HIS DREAMS ARE MESSENGERS OF DIVINE REVELATION. Nebuchadnezzar is the victorious enemy of "the people of God," who has sacked the city of Jerusalem, robbed the temple of its sacred treasure, carried the flower of the nation captive, and entirely broken its ancient independence; and now he reigns over his vast domains as a cruel tyrant (ver. 5). With this man God opens up mysterious communications. 1. Thus *revelation is not confined* to prophets, nor to Jews, nor to good men. God has not deserted the heathen world. He has not deserted bad men (Gen. vi. 3). 2. Nevertheless, *this revelation is imperfect*. It is in a dream—the lowest form of revelation (Joel ii. 28). The dream is so shadowy that it is forgotten on the king's awaking. The interpretation is beyond the power of the dreamer. This lowest form of revelation vouchsafed to a bad man is dim, vague, perplexing, and troubling; and the dreamer experiences it as a passive subject. It needs the higher revelation enjoyed by a true prophet—a good man in living active communion with God—to make it intelligible and profitable. Thus there are scintillations of Divine light in the darkness of heathendom; but these do little more than make the darkness visible and increase the terrors of its superstition. They call for the interpretation of the fuller scriptural revelation (Acts xvii. 23).

III. THOUGH THERE IS AN ELEMENT OF REVELATION IN NEBUCHADNEZZAR'S DREAM, THIS ONLY GIVES HIM THE GREATER TROUBLE. It is plain that the king regarded this as a dream of more than ordinary import (ver. 2), and therefore it caused him sleepless anxiety. His trouble would arise from various sources; viz.: 1. *The sense of mystery*. The dream was gone. When present it was unintelligible. Thus a partial revelation may often bring only trouble. Perhaps if we knew more of the unseen world we should only be able to discern enough to fill us with dismay. 2. *The apprehension of future calamity*. Possibly the king saw enough to recognize a portent of future woe. It must be too often the case that a revelation of the future will bring

only distress. We desire to pierce the veil of futurity. It is by God's mercy that it is impervious to our sight (Matt. vi. 34). 3. *The timidity of an evil conscience.* An evil conscience peoples the unseen world with terrors. The Divine and the future are to it both clouded with apprehension.

Vers. 2—18.—*Character revealed by trial.* Critical moments are tests of character. In this incident the leading features of three distinct classes of character are clearly revealed.

I. THE CONDUCT OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR REVEALS THE EVIL CHARACTER OF TYRANNY.

1. It is *selfish*. Though the charge of a vast empire is entrusted to him, the king exercises his irresponsible power of life and death simply for his own convenience. 2. It is *unreasonable*. Nebuchadnezzar not only asks for the interpretation, he demands the recovery of his forgotten dream. Whenever great authority is not balanced by an equivalent intelligence, the result must be some such issue of most unreasonable commands. 3. It is *cruel*. For failing to meet the king's preposterous demand, the Chaldeans are to be hewn in pieces. Even those junior members, such as Daniel and his three companions, who were not consulted, are to suffer the same fate. Thus the isolation of supreme rank and irresponsible power tends to destroy that sympathy which is dependent on the feeling of fellowship. 4. It is *suicidal*. In the madness of his disappointment, the king is about to kill the man who subsequently proves to be his best friend. Selfishness is often blind to its highest interest. Cruelty reverts on the head of its author.

II. THE CONDUCT OF THE CHALDEANS EXPOSES THE WEAKNESS OF PRETENSIONS TO MAGICAL POWER. If the dream had been given, these men would have offered an interpretation, though probably one of Delphic ambiguity. But when the demand is for the exercise and test of a distinctly supernatural faculty, they fail. We may note, in reference to the pretensions to second sight of such men and their modern successors, that: 1. They fail before the crucial test which plainly requires *supernatural* powers. They are too vague for this. 2. They are of no *practical* interest. Trivial secrets may appear to be revealed, but mysteries of serious importance remain unsolved. 3. Instead of *increasing religious faith*, they *discourage* it. The Chaldeans say that what the king requires can be done only by "the gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh," thus implying that these gods make no revelation to men, and have no contact with them. Contrast their *godless* divination with Daniel's higher power of divination, which he attributes solely to the revealing grace of his God.

III. THE CONDUCT OF DANIEL EXHIBITS THE EXCELLENCY OF DEVOUT WISDOM UNDER SEVERE TRIAL. 1. It has immediate *recourse to prayer*. Daniel does not pretend to solve the mystery by the force of his own wisdom. He at once invokes the help of God. In the method and object of his prayer his action is a model of devout wisdom. Thus (1) he associates his three companions with him in his prayer, and shows his faith in the efficacy of united prayer (see Acts ii. 1; xii. 5; Jas. v. 14); (2) his prayer is to the point, asking for special help in special need; (3) it is reasonable,—Daniel asks for deliverance from threatened death, but only by receiving power to fulfil the king's condition; he does not look for a miraculous escape, but for light in the matter of the king's dream. 2. Devout wisdom finds its *greatest strength in the greatest trial*. If it had not been for the king's savage threat, Daniel might have been long in developing his gifts and realizing his mission. The danger brings him out of obscurity, and compels him to exercise the Divine faculties which are entrusted to him. If we have the right spirit in us to appreciate the opportunities they afford, we shall often find that the extremities and emergencies of life are, under the providence of God, the very means by which his best gifts and graces are made to fructify. Their greatest excellency is in their capacity to shine brightest under the hardest trials.

Vers. 19—23.—*Divine might and Divine wisdom.* We have here a model of the highest form of worship—a prayer which is wholly adoration and thanksgiving. The importance of this is emphasized by the circumstances. Daniel's life is threatened; he has just received the Divine assistance by which he can give the king his dream and secure his own escape; yet he stays to utter a full expression of praise for the greatness and goodness of God, with the sentence of death still hanging over him. For

the most part, if people find scant time for prayer, they have still less for praise (Phil. iv. 6). It is well to rise from the receipt of Divine mercies to the worship of the Divine excellences out of which they flow. Thus Daniel, having received a special Divine inspiration, at once contemplates and adores the might and wisdom of God which it reveals. Consider the manifestation of these two Divine attributes in the present instance.

I. MIGHT. The earliest Semitic name for God was "the Strong One," and the idea of the might of God lies at the root of the scriptural conception of his nature. He is not only revealed as glorious in being and wonderful in thought, but he is always seen to be active, working, exercising power. He is not a Platonic supreme idea, nor an epicurean Divinity, far off and unconcerned about us, but a living energizing Presence. Here we see: 1. Divine might is manifested in *human affairs*. "He changeth the times and the seasons: he removeth kings, and setteth up kings" (ver. 21). God is spoken of in the present tense. He created the world in the past (Ps. cii. 25); but his power is still manifested in maintaining the life of the world (John v. 17). His hand is seen in the fields of nature (Ps. civ.); it is equally present in human life. God is the greatest factor in history. 2. Divine might is most apparent in *times of change*. "He changeth the times and the seasons." It is present at all times, but it is evident in the crises of history. The volume of water in the stream is the same while it flows quietly as when it breaks into a torrent; but the roar and flash of the torrent appeal to our senses with a vehemence of their own. 3. Divine might is strikingly evident in *overruling the greatest human powers*. "He removeth kings, and setteth up kings." The old pagan tyrants thought to set their will up as a god, but they were made to feel at times that there was a "King of kings" above them. The greater the powers that are made to bow before God, the more stubborn their self-will or the more blind their ignorance, the more fully is the power of God revealed in overruling them. 4. Divine might is especially revealed in *overthrowing the evil to establish the good*. Creating power is greater than destructive power. If certain kings are removed, other and better kings are to be set up. Destruction is not the end of the exercise of God's might; it only prepares the way for fruitful creative energies.

II. WISDOM. 1. This is seen in the *Divine actions*—first in the process, by the arrangement that makes "all things work together;" and then in the result which is aimed at, because it is seen to be the wisest end. Power without wisdom would be brutal, and therefore wisdom is needed, not to make up for the deficiency of power by its adaptations and contrivances, but to direct power to its best exercise. 2. This wisdom is seen in the *Divine bestowal of it upon men*. Daniel traces human wisdom up to the Divine: "He giveth wisdom unto the wise" (Exod. xxviii. 3; Deut. xxxiv. 9; Eph. i. 17). In direct opposition to the godless magic of the Chaldeans (vers. 10, 11), he tells Nebuchadnezzar that "there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets" (ver. 28). We may learn from this that revelation is the result of inspiration; i.e. it is received through the gift of Divine wisdom; it is not flashed upon us apart from spiritual experience. It is the opening of the eyes to see truths which were in existence before, but which were unrecognized for want of a Divine wisdom to discern them.

Ver. 22 (last clause).—*Divine omniscience*. God knows what is darkness to us, because in him dwells the eternal light which penetrates all darkness. This supreme knowledge is essential to his perfection. Without it infinite power and perfect goodness could only issue in fearful disasters to the universe; and therefore the order and progress of all things bear witness to its existence. Consider—

I. THE FACT OF THE DIVINE OMNISCIENCE AND WHAT THIS IMPLIES. 1. The knowledge of God *comprehends* all things. None are too great for its grasp, none too small for its notice. The regions of the telescope and of the microscope come equally under its notice (Job xxviii. 24; Luke xii. 6, 7). 2. It *penetrates* the deepest mysteries. Our most secret thoughts are known to God, and he knows us better than we know ourselves (Ps. cxxxix. 1, 2; Heb. iv. 13). 3. It *reaches forward* to the whole future. God's knowledge of the future can be to some extent explained on two grounds. (1) His perfect knowledge of the present must carry with it the knowledge of the future as far as the present contains the germs of the future (Acts xv. 18). (2) His eternal

nature is not limited by our conditions of time, so that he sees all things, not in succession, but in one immediate view (Exod. iii. 14; 2 Pet. iii. 8).

II. THE PRACTICAL INFERENCES TO BE DRAWN FROM A CONSIDERATION OF THE DIVINE OMNISCIENCE. 1. It should lead to *sincerity*. The hypocrisy which may seem to help us in our relations with men is useless before God. The really important question is, not—What does the world think of us? but—What is our character in the sight of God? because our life and all its destinies depend on him (Eccles. xii. 14). 2. It should strengthen our faith in the *providential care* of God. He must know better than we know; therefore it is foolish to fear and wrong to complain. We must even expect that, with his supreme knowledge, he will not act just as we should act with our very imperfect knowledge (Job xxxiv. 33). 3. It should encourage our hope in the *ultimate well-being* of the universe. No one would commence a work if he knew it would end in failure. No benevolent pessimist would create a universe. Before he made the world, God foresaw the fall of man; before he sent his Son, he saw how sadly he would be rejected. If he so acted, knowing all the future, it must have been because he knew that, after all the sin and sorrow, righteousness and peace would finally triumph, so that the ultimate blessedness of existence should amply compensate for all its earlier misery (Isa. liii. 11). 4. It should lead us to seek our *highest knowledge in him*. All true discovery comes by revelation. "He revealeth the deep and secret things." In his mind are the archetypal ideas of all things. The knowledge of God is the highest knowledge.

Vers. 31—45.—*The image and the stone.* The king's dream as interpreted by Daniel shadows forth the history of successive monarchies, and the final overthrow of them by a greater unearthly kingdom. On the face of it it teaches the broad lesson that history is made by higher destinies than the will of kings; that it is determined beforehand according to a Divine scheme. The character of the successive monarchies, and the part they take in the general order of events, is expressed by the appearance of the various parts of the image. The character and missions of the later victorious kingdom is more vaguely revealed in the description of the mystic stone, unhewn by human hands, which destroys the image, and grows to a mountain filling the whole earth and lasting for ever. Notice—

I. THE CHARACTER AND DESTINY OF THE OLD WORLDLY MONARCHIES. The image represents one monstrous, incongruous, materialized human form and nature. So there was a certain continuity in the history of the successive monarchies, and yet no real harmony and organic unity such as characterizes the progressive civilization of Christendom. In them humanity was degraded by reliance, not upon just institutions, but upon material force. They afford a terrible evidence of the paralyzing, deadening effects of mere power uninfluenced by political enlightenment and moral character. 1. Their aspect was *brilliant but terrible*. (Ver. 31.) There was a barbaric splendour about these old pagan empires, but behind the pomp and glitter, brutal cruelty, injustice and selfish tyranny, ran riot. The king was not a father to his people, but a master of a world of slaves; the misery of the nations subdued and crushed by his unscrupulous ambition was mournful beyond description. 2. Their glory was destined to constant *deterioration*. The first kingdom is the head; the others are lower, and, like the less honourable members of the body, of inferior dignity. The lessening value of the series of minerals (gold, silver, brass, iron, and clay) suggests the same idea more plainly. In the last the deterioration has gone so far that the unity of the central government is lost (ver. 33). The progress of humanity is linked to moral character and true religion. Where these are absent, nations are either stationary or retrogressive. In our own day the progressive races are, in the main, the Christian. 3. Their supremacy was *temporary*, and they were all subject to *final disintegration*. One kingdom arises after another (ver. 39). The last is the most violent and destructive, and contains the seeds of decay from its origin (ver. 42). The whole image is destroyed by the mystic stone. History shows how these monarchies were corrupted by luxury and overthrown by newer ambition. There is nothing stable in unjust power. Where great resources are not directed by high principles, they are often squandered by a self-indulgent prodigality which brings its own ruin. A Divine retribution awaits all such gross abuses of power.

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new."

II. THE NATURE AND MISSION OF THE NEW UNEARTHLY MONARCHY. The mystic stone symbolizes one kingdom which is to destroy all the old tyrannies and rule in their stead. This prediction is being fulfilled by the "kingdom in heaven" which Christ founded and is now maintaining among us. 1. It is *unearthly in origin*. The stone is not hewn "with hands" (ver. 34). Christ's kingdom is not of this world (John xviii. 36; Rev. xxi. 2). 2. It is *aggressive in action*. Christ is the "Prince of Peace," and he came to bring peace on earth, yet not by allowing evil to go on unmolested, but by first making war on it and overcoming it, and only establishing his peace after complete victory over evil (Matt. x. 34). 3. Though small at first, it is destined to become *universal in extent*. The stone becomes "a great mountain, and fills the whole earth" (ver. 35). So the grain of mustard seed grows into a great tree (Matt. xiii. 31, 32; see also Isa. ii. 2, 3; Micah iv. 1). Christianity began in the manger at Bethlehem and the upper room at Jerusalem, but it has grown immensely since then, and it shows increasing signs of vitality, encouraging our faith in its destiny to conquer the whole world (1 Cor. xv. 25; Eph. i. 21, 22). 4. It is *everlasting in duration*. "It shall stand for ever" (ver. 44). All earth-born powers are subject to decay. The kingdom of Christ is eternal because (1) its King is changeless (Heb. xiii. 8); (2) it is based on the eternal principles of Divine truth (1 Pet. i. 23); and (3) the fruits of its rule will be always beneficial (Rev. xxii. 5).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—13.—*The revelation lost*. "My spirit was troubled to know the dream" (ver. 3). Since the word "and," at the beginning of this chapter, links it with ch. i. 21, *i.e.* Daniel's public life with Daniel's preparation, it may be well here to notice what his preparation had been. 1. At home, and the associations of Jerusalem. 2. Knowledge of previous revelations (see ch. ix. 2). 3. Moral victory at a crisis of history. 4. Experience of life at one of its great centres—Babylon—the court. As indicating the difference between Ezekiel's standpoint and that of Daniel, note Ezekiel dates from the years of the Captivity—for him, in comparative obscurity, the years dragged on wearily—Daniel, by the reigns of kings in whose court he was. Daniel's experience grew with the years, and he became increasingly fit to receive political revelations—revelations as to the rise and fall of empires.

I. THE DISCREPANCY. Between ch. i. 5 and ch. ii. 1. Occasion might well be taken from this to insist upon one or two wholesome truths in reference to Biblical interpretation. 1. *The discrepancy looks at first sight glaring enough*; *i.e.* as to the dates. Still, with our idea of the sacred writings, we should be justified in believing: 2. *That some explanation would be forthcoming*, if we knew all the facts. Of the propriety of this assumption, we shall have a striking illustration in the recent clearing up of the special critical difficulty of ch. v. 3. One might fairly conclude that *Daniel is quite as reliable an historian as any other author*. 4. The seeming discrepancy is *clear evidence that Daniel, and none other, is the writer*; for these two dates would never have been admitted in a form apparently contradictory, coming so close to each other as to challenge attention, if the author had been an impostor. Daniel writes straightforwardly the truth, unconscious of the possible misconstruction of his words. This unguardedness of style is a sure sign of the credibility of a living witness, and of the genuineness of any book. 5. *There are several explanations forthcoming*, one specially credible (see Exposition). 6. *Our feeling in relation to discrepancies real or apparent, will depend entirely on our moral attitude in relation to revelation*. The believer will treat them lightly; the captious and unbelieving will make the very most of them (see Alford on receipt of one of Colenso's volumes, in 'Alford's Life').

II. THE PREPARATION. There were subjective conditions of the dream which argue a certain nobility in Nebuchadnezzar. Dreams grow out of waking thought; and, though this dream was supernatural, we may well believe it was naturally conditioned. The mood of the king created a certain receptivity for Divine revelation (ver. 29). 1. *The cares of empire weighted his soul*. 2. *His mind projected itself into the far future*. (Ver. 29.) 3. Thoughts of present responsibility and visions of the future were entertained. To all, such high thoughts come at some time or other; but not all entertain

them. We may drown them in frivolity, or quench them by intoxication. When God comes to a soul with thoughts worthy of its nature, it is for the soul to open wide its portals and let the glory in. About this young conqueror there was a certain grasp and elevation of mind.

III. THE DREAM. Here, at present, we ignore its contents; we are supposed, indeed, not to know it: and consider only generally whether, and to what extent, the dream may become the article of Divine communications to man. In a complete discussion, we should have to cite the following testimonies: Those of: 1. *Psychology*. The nature and origin of dreams should be elucidated, with the view to a just estimate of the testimonies which follow. Sufficient will be found for homiletic purposes in Dr. Smith's 'Bible Dict.,' art. "Dreams." 2. *Scripture*. These inductions seem valid: (1) "That Scripture claims the dream, as it does every other action of the human mind, as a *medium through which God may speak to man*." (2) "That it lays far greater stress on that Divine influence by which the *understanding also is affected*." In dream, the imagination is in the ascendant; the reason, dormant. (3) That dream as a medium of Divine communication is *inferior to prophecy*. (4) That dreams, therefore, were granted: (a) To the *heathen* rather than to the covenant people of God. (b) To the latter only during their *earliest and most imperfect individual knowledge* of him. (c) Only in the *earliest ages*, and less frequently as the revelations of prophecy increase. (d) Almost invariably *require an interpreter*. These last four points are all illustrated by the dreams in the Book of Daniel. 3. *Experience*. The reference here is to that modern experience, of which we may be either the subjects or the observers. Even in a Christian civilization like ours, the superstitious regard for dreams is so common, that the following truths may well be insisted on: (1) That dreams *should never for us stand in the place of revelation*. (2) Should be disregarded entirely, *when contravening the truth "as it is in Jesus"*. (3) That God may see fit by dream to *prepare the mind* for the future. (4) That there seems well-authenticated instances in which the *coming event has been imaged in dream*. Surely he who made the soul can have access to it by night or by day, directly or mediately, as he will. In the application of these truths to our own life, the greatest spiritual wisdom will be necessary.

IV. THE SEARCH. We do not agree with Keil, that the king remembered the dream, and was intent on testing the value of the interpretation by making the interpreter tell also the dream itself; nor with the reasons he assigns for that interpretation. We believe that the dream was gone from memory, yet leaving behind such an impression that the king would recognize it on its being described, and also leaving behind an idea of its tremendous import, and a conviction that its origin was Divine. Here note: 1. *The mission of oblivion*. "God sometimes serves his own purposes by putting things out of men's minds, as well as by putting things into their minds." By the king's forgetfulness Daniel came to be honoured, and in him the God of Daniel. 2. *The adaptation of Divine revelations*. From ch. ii. 4 to viii. 28 the language of the book is Chaldee; as though God would throw open the revelation through Daniel to the people of Babylonia as well as to the Jew. After ch. viii. the language reverts to Hebrew, for the communications are then chiefly for Israel. This adaptation one instance of what obtains universally. 3. *The infirmities of even noble minds*. There were many elements of greatness about Nebuchadnezzar; but all shaded by: (1) *Superstition*. Seeking for light where no light could be found—from the magi of various grades. (2) *Unreason*. Demanding both dream and interpretation. A certain sort of wisdom might interpret; but only the omniscience of God could recover the dream. (3) *Cruelty*. Many instances besides that in this chapter.

V. THE FAILURE. (Ver. 11.) Observe: 1. *The error into which exalted intellect may fall*. "Gods" imply polytheism. 2. *The truth which may shine through error*. The magi were aware: (1) Of the omniscience that is essential to Deity. (2) Of the limitation that belongs to the creature. The flesh is a veil that hides from us much of the spirit-world.

VI. THE DOOM. Cruel as was the edict on the part of the king, there was, nevertheless, a sort of rough justice on the part of God's natural government of the world, in consigning to punishment the practitioners of imposition and traders on the superstitious fears of men. "They sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain" suggests *how oft the innocent are caught in the consequences of the sin of others*.—R.

Vers. 14—30.—*The dream found.* "Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision." In this section Daniel is the principal actor; and as he moves through the successive scenes of this part of the sacred drama, his character shines like the light, and may illumine for us the path of life. We shall, therefore, keep him prominent throughout. Observe Daniel—

I. IN THE SHADE. 1. *The position.* Although Daniel had been trained for distinguished services, pronounced by the king to excel all the magi (ch. i. 20), he was forgotten by the king, ignored by his fellows of the magian college through jealousy, only discovered to share a common ruin. This was a picture of the trials of his whole career. Daniel the eminent had to contend with the jealousy of the mean. This spirit begot the attempt to cast his companions into the burning fiery furnace. Years after it throws him to the lions. So now the captain of the king's guard "sought Daniel and his fellows to be slain." 2. *The moral attitude.* Daniel was ever animated by a sense of duty, and more by a readiness to serve those who either neglected or opposed him. 3. *The providential call.* At the critical moment God, in wisdom and love, supervened and intervened; broke the meshes of the confining net; and called the saint out into that ministry for which he was intellectually and spiritually fit, and also morally ready.

II. AT THE KING'S GATE. 1. *The calm spirit of Daniel.* There was much to exasperate in the whole situation. Cruel death was impending. But Daniel lived high above events in a serene heaven of the soul, and was, therefore, prepared to come down into the incidents of life, and act with the best effect. 2. *His use of means.* To act well in great emergencies requires the coolness of spiritual wisdom. Daniel: (1) Had conference with Arioch. (2) Sent a respectful message to the king. (We understand that Daniel did not go himself, till later, actually into the presence of the king, but sent in the request by the proper officer.) 3. *His success.* This may be attributed especially to three causes, note specially the last: (1) The king's remembrance of Daniel. (2) The awakening of a great hope in the king's breast. (3) *The hearts of men are in the keeping of God.*

III. WITH HIS OWN COMPANY. 1. *The prayer.* Here observe: (1) Daniel *did not delay.* He lost no time. He did not go to consult with the magi, whether there was anything in their art, in their books, that might be of use in the matter. With some men prayer is the last resort instead of the first. (2) Resolved to *make the difficulty a matter of prayer.* (3) *Fell back into the soul-fellowship* to which he belonged (ver. 17). (4) Secured the power of *united supplication.* In *the prayer itself* the following specialities are suggestive: (1) It kept prominent the exalted supremacy of God. (2) It appealed to his "mercies." (3) It went upon the principle of committing all that troubles us to God. (4) It concerned a great public interest. But (5) one in which the private safety of the petitioners was involved. 2. *The prevalence.* The all-important fact is that the prayer *was answered.* The answer was revealed either in a dream, or more probably in a waking vision of the night; and the vision was no doubt accompanied by a clear attestation of the truth of it. Can any one doubt the possibility of such revelation, who has realized to himself the nearness of the Eternal to the human mind? 3. *The praise.* This was: (1) *Instantaneous.* Daniel did not wait till he had verified the dream by audience with the king. As soon as ever he received the mercy, he was ready to praise. (2) *Full.* Matthew Henry puts it well. (a) Daniel gives to God the glory of what he is *in himself.* (b) Of what he is *to the world of mankind.* (c) Of this *particular discovery.* (3) *Sympathetic.* Friends were associated in the praise, as in the prayer.

IV. IN THE KING'S CLOSET. Here we have Daniel, the living representative of what a true prophet should be. He is not only a type of him whom technically we call a prophet, but of every one who is for God the mouthpiece of vital truth to man. Before the king: 1. *He sinks himself.* (Ver. 30.) 2. *He forgives personal adversaries.* (Ver. 24.) 3. *He is forward to put down all that exalts itself against God.* (Ver. 27.) 4. *He has a sense of the moment of his message.* (Vers. 28, 29.) 5. *He glorifies God.* (Ver. 28.)—R.

Vers. 31—33, 37—43.—*The universal world-powers.* "Thou, O king, sawest, and behold an image, one and grand" (ver. 31). Seize first the imagery of the dream.

1. A grand *unity* loomed before Nebuchadnezzar. "Behold an image, one and grand" (Chaldee, ver. 31). Four empires represented, not by four figures, but *one*. Symbol of human power at its highest, that of universal empire, but separate from God. Same spirit and genius in all four. A common thing to represent empire by the human figure; e.g. Britannia. The colossal imagery of the dream the reflection of the magnificent scale of objects in Babylon. But: 2. *A diversity*. (1) In *form*; for after the head, the human form is double, in the toes tenfold. (2) In *substance*: gold, silver, etc.; the diversity constitutes a successive deterioration. 3. *Destruction*. For a time the image stands. At length there rushes through the air, self-detached, a stone, as instinct with life; it smites, destroys, pulverizes, and instantly the image is *gone*—nothing is left on the wide Assyrian plain but the stone, which then grows to be a mountain, a whole mountain region, filling the field of view, grand, beautiful, with its varied vegetation, from that of a tropical clime to the eternal snow. So complete was the displacement.

I. THE WHOLE. Observe respecting the ancient world-power: 1. *Its unity*. One image. One universal empire. One *in alienation* from God. This need not have been. Civil government is of God, may be a reflection of Divine government, rooted in Divine principles, administered in the fear of God, directed to the good of humanity, and so to the glory of God. The government of this world may be one *in alliance* with God. 2. *Its majesty*. Empire like this has a majesty of its own, even though alienated from God. Just as intellect or genius may. Man was made in the image of God, in this matter of dominion over men and also over nature. Of all forms of dominion, rule over a nation (much more of nations) is of God. (1) The *idea* of civil government is of God. Government must be. It is of the Divine will. Not some particular form, e.g. monarchical, republican, etc.; but government in essence. (2) So its *realization*. Government of some kind is an everlasting fact, perpetuated in the providence of God. Empire has then intrinsic majesty. Much more when in alliance with God. 3. *Its weakness*. All things human deteriorate, *unless redeemed from corruption by the saving power of religion*. The life of all that lasts is of God. It would be interesting to trace, if that were possible, the gradual deterioration of heathen religiousness, from the purer Chaldee form to the Roman degradation. As life declined, so the strength of empire went down.

II. THE PARTS. 1. *The head of gold: Babylon*. (1) *The empire itself*. (a) First in order of time (first *universal* empire). (b) Possessed certain unity (head). (c) Characterized by intelligence. (d) Magnificent (gold). (For illustration, see Rawlinson's 'Manual of Ancient History,' p. 35.) (2) *Its relation to the kingdom of God*. Note the pressure of the all-directing hand on these heathen world-kingdoms. Babylon: (a) Cured, by the Captivity, Israel of idolatry. (b) Prepared the world for unity under the Roman empire, and so prepared for the Advent. 2. *The breast and arms of silver: Medo-Persia*. (1) *The empire*. Silver less value and power of resistance than gold. So Persia inferior to Babylon. Not in extent; but *greatness is never to be confounded with bigness*. (For vivid picture of real state of Persia, see Eber's 'Egyptian Princess.') (2) *Relation to Divine kingdom*. The Church returned healed from the Captivity. Second temple built. Persia an instrument for raising the dormant energies of Greece, which became, under Alexander, the universal empire, and spread Greek culture, civilization, and speech everywhere, and so prepared the way for the coming of the Lord. 3. *The belly and thighs of brass: Greece*. (1) *The empire*. None other than Greece; for: (a) Greece succeeded Persia, and, like it, was a universal monarchy. (b) Is named in the same order (ch. viii. 20, 21). (c) Brass armour marked the Greeks; their soldiers were the "brazen-coated." (2) *Relation to the Divine kingdom*. The service of Greece to Christ's kingdom was vast. Let the following brief sentences and phrases be suggestive: Alexander no vulgar conqueror; a fusion of East and West his object; hence, colonization, intermarriages of races, foundation of seventy cities; the idea, one brotherhood of humanity. Oriental thought blended with Hellenic culture. As a part of this plan, first dispersion of the Jews; and so everywhere a synagogue, the Septuagint, and Hebrew (*i.e.* true) ideas of God, sin, the Saviour. Influence of the Alexandrian school on early Christianity. 4. *The legs of iron: Rome*. (1) *The empire*. This was indeed Rome, and not the empire of Alexander's successors; for: (a) To omit Rome frustrates the design of the image to exhibit in succession the great empires

which preceded the Advent. (b) Rome existed at the Advent, not so the empire of Alexander's successors. (c) Compare fourth beast (ch. vii. 7, *et seq.*). (d) The symbolic imagery is strikingly close to the reality of Rome. (2) *Relation to the Divine kingdom and the Advent.* Under the shield of the prevalent Roman law, Jesus was born, lived, and was crucified. Hence Gentile with Jew nailed him to the tree. The Crucifixion was marked by publicity. Rome destroyed city and temple, broke up the Jewish Church, and scattered the nation.

The most prominent suggestions of this exposition are: 1. *The almightiness of God's subordinating power.* All things—interests, men, nations, kings—bend before it. 2. *The way in which hostile powers serve his purpose.* Often unconsciously, and in spite of their own intention. 3. *Christ the Centre of history.* To him, before the Advent, all things tend; and since, from him all things date. The greatness of the Lord Jesus. Imagine Christ taken out of the history of man!—R.

Vers. 34—36, 44, 45.—*The everlasting kingdom.* "And the stone that smote the image," etc. (ver. 35). We shall assume, what is certain, that the "stone" is the image of the kingdom of the Son of God.

I. ITS CHARACTERISTICS. 1. The mediatorial action of the Son of God is of *the nature of kingly rule.* (1) *Over souls*, willing or unwilling. (2) *Within the Church.* (3) *In the world of men.* (4) *Over the spirit-world.* (5) *Even over the universe of matter.* (See and weigh the meaning well of Eph. i. 22, 23.) 2. *The kingdom was supernatural in its origin.* Here may well be discussed the now present doctrine that the Christ was the creation of his time. Set over against it the truth that Christ was a descent and intervention of the supernatural and of *the Divine.* Not one, nor all combined, of the ordinary secondary causes can account for the establishment, extension, perpetuity of the kingdom. "Without hands." The result of eternal counsel, founded by the Son of God, perpetuated by the Spirit of life. 3. *Insignificant in its commencement.* The stone is clearly meant to be small—anyway, small compared with the mountain. Note: Humanly speaking, the Lord belonged, indeed, to a royal house, but in decay and obscurity; was poor; hidden for thirty years in a hamlet on the wilds; no powerful friends; no political connections; of no special learning; the character and calibre of his first helpers; slow progress of the kingdom. To human view, in the stone, nothing; to the Divine, all potentiality. 4. *Destined to universal prevalence.* Notwithstanding 3. (1) *Look at the vision.* (a) The kingdom began by the destruction of the hostile (vers. 34, 35). The world-powers fell before it. Note: *The nothingness of the mightiest human power in collision with the kingdom of God.* (b) Goes on by displacement. Man-created universal empires give place to one God-created. Observe: The great empires of antiquity were unconscious prophecies of the universal kingdom of Christ. There has been no universal empire since, nor ever will be. Neither to Great Britain nor to the United States will universal sway be given, but to Christ. (2) *Is the vision true?* That the stone will become the earth-filling mountain may be argued from: (a) *The aggressive character of the gospel.* (Illustrations on the largest scale, showing how Christ is occupying every part of the earth, may be found in 'The Foreign Missions of Protestantism,' by Christlieb: Nisbet and Co., 2s. 6d.) (b) *Past achievement.* The tide recedes, only to advance again. Discouragement is local—at the most temporary. (c) *Prophecy.* Think! In olden times a dream. A prophetic interpretation. After the lapse of more than two milleniums we, from our watch-towers, mark the ever-growing fulfilment! 5. *Everlasting.* The kingdom has stood for nineteen centuries, although every form of hostile force has tried to displace and destroy. Force, physical and intellectual, has done its worst. Philosophy, science, ridicule, persecution. *The empire of Jesus is the greatest fact on our planet to-day.* Over the highest minds of the noblest races. No empire, political or intellectual, can compare with it. There are great powers on earth, but not one to vie with this, to which they are all subordinated. In this the promise of the future. Time is on its side; the Eternal too (see Phil. iii. 21, especially in the Greek).

II. ITS SUGGESTIONS. 1. *We ourselves must submit to it.* Nearer, closer, than any earthly rule, it presses on us. We can no more evade it than we can the civil government under whose shield we abide; not so effectually. Neutrality impossible—the vainest dream! 2. We shall then share the benedictions of this gracious mediatorial

rule. 3. We can, must, labour for its extension. With sword as well as trowel (Noh. iv. 18). 4. We shall then share the day of the final triumph. (Isa. liii. 11.) 5. And enter with the Lord on that sabbatic repose which follows the long ages of conflict. That eternal sabbath closes the prospect in the sublime, successive relations of God (see George Steward's 'Mediatorial Sovereignty,' vol. ii. 520—525).—R.

Vers. 46—49.—*The soul in the presence of great mercy.* "Then the king made Daniel a great man" (ver. 48). The revelation of the dream and its meaning was a very large benediction to the king, for it lifted great anxiety from his mind; to Daniel and the three, for it saved their lives. The closing verses of ch. ii. present to us the moral effect of the amazing Divine disclosure.

I. THE MORAL ATTITUDE OF THE KING. 1. *Entire cessation from self.* No trace of that self-consciousness which was so striking a characteristic of the king. Self had become nothing. Self had been swept out of consciousness by the overwhelming benediction which flooded his soul. 2. *Gratitude to the human instruments.* To Daniel the king gave: (1) Greatness. (2) Enrichment. (3) Power. (a) The viceroyalty of a province—Babylon. (b) The chancellorship of the magi. To Daniel's friends, administrative offices under Daniel in his province (see the Chaldee, vers. 48, 49). 3. *Homage to the Divine.* The ideas of the king were of this kind, that there were many gods, but among them the God of the Hebrews was supreme, through Daniel shone his clear manifestations. Accordingly, to Daniel he offered incense, etc. Distinguish here between the false form and that which was true in spirit. Through the polytheistic cloud the king looked in the direction of the true and eternal Sun—God. He did not, could not, rest in mere secondary causes. He attributed the mercy to the Divine cause. Lessons: 1. *Some omit all gratitude to men.* 2. *Others withhold devout thankfulness to God.* Let the noble king—noble in all the mist that blinded him—in these things be our teacher.

II. THE DEMEANOUR OF THE PROPHET. 1. *A moderate estimate of self.* Even as an instrument, the benediction had not come wholly through him; he was mindful of his companions, the common danger, their sympathy, their united prayers. 2. *Gratitude to friendly helpers.* Pleads to the king for them. 3. *A consciousness of a real greatness that only God could give.* "The king made Daniel a great man." We may argue from all we know of the elevation of the prophet's character that, whilst not ungrateful for the king's kindness, he estimated that elevation at its true value. He must have known that there was a greatness, not of earth, of the spirit, which only the Lord of spirits could give. Such consciousness quite consistent with humility. "Thy clemency hath made me great."—R.

Vers. 1—13.—*The failure and discomfiture of falsehood.* As every drop of water on the surface of the hills has a tendency to flow towards the ocean, as every step of the racer moves towards the goal, so every event in every kingdom points toward the establishment of Messiah's empire. The exile of the Jews, though apparently a retrograde movement in the spiritual machinery; the special education of Daniel and his companions; the heathen monarch's dream; the discomfiture of the magicians;—all these, and like events in Babylon, were so many lines of influence leading on to the advent of Messiah. God is no respecter of persons, no respecter of places, and if there be a more pliant disposition in the King of Babylon than in the King of Israel, the God of heaven will reveal his will to Nebuchadnezzar, and use him in moulding public events. Consciously or unconsciously, all conquerors and all captives are working out the purposes of the universal Lord.

I. THE GREAT MONARCH'S DISTRESS. 1. For even kings are not exempt from trouble. Yea, their very elevation exposes them to winds of adversity, from which those escape who dwell in the sequestered vales of private station. As in nature, so in human life, there is a marvellous system of compensation. We look at the external palaces of princes, and are too ready to envy their privileged estate; but could we look within their breasts, we should be prone chiefly to pity them. "The sleep of a labouring man is sweet," but the pillow of royalty is thickly sown with prickly cares. 2. Most probably, outward circumstance combined with inward fear to produce this ominous dream. By admitting a natural element in human events, we do not exclude the

supernatural. Both elements are under Divine direction. Everywhere God engraves the spiritual upon the natural. The laws and processes of nature and of human life God uses so far as they serve his particular purpose, and when they fall short of fitness he introduces the higher element of miracle. If Nebuchadnezzar already saw the development of military strength in other royal courts, it was impossible but this knowledge would make a corresponding impression upon his mind, and it would be wanton blindness on our part to exclude this from our investigation of the truth. It is equally certain that an influence from God moved upon the monarch's mind—arranging (it may be) the materials of the imagery, impressing his imagination with the portentous meaning of the vision, and partly effacing the recollection from his memory. 3. With stupendous condescension, God accommodates himself to the infancy of the race. He who tempers the wind for the shorn lamb, simplifies his lessons to the weakness of our understanding. To the inquiry, "Why should God make known his will to men through dreams?" it is a sufficient reply that he found this method the most suitable to the capacity of man in the childhood of his intelligence. During the hours of sleep, the soul is more free from the disturbance of outward events; the *will* does not play so dominant a part over the movements of thought; the predilections and propensities of the inner man are unveiled. Men have an intense longing to know the future. We cannot doubt that the same God who has given us a faculty for acquiring all the past *could* have given us a faculty for foreseeing the future. Some potent reason has prevailed with him to hang an impenetrable veil over our untraversed life. Yet some of the grand outlines of the future have gradually been revealed. Our character forecasts our future fortunes. Practical obedience to the will of God is the best telescope through which we may discern our distant weal. Our real destiny is not wrapt in night. But Nebuchadnezzar was mainly concerned about his dominion and his dynasty; hence his inward distress produced by the midnight vision.

II. THE IMPOTENCE OF HUMAN QUACKS. 1. It must be granted that these Babylonian magicians had attained to knowledge and craft beyond the ordinary attainments of men; but (as is frequently the case) their knowledge fed their vanity; they imposed on themselves the belief that this knowledge gave them access to the secrets of the unseen world, and they sought to impose on others the conviction that they could foretell coming events. Knowledge does not always ripen into wisdom—does not always bear the fruits of humility and truthfulness. These men were deceivers and self-deceived. They made a market out of the ambition and fear of kings. 2. *Inflated conceit*. They imagined that their skill was the measure of universal attainment. Failing themselves to decipher the problem, they plead, "There's not a man upon the earth that can show the king's matter." The usual plea of weakness: "What I cannot do, no one else can do: let us yield to the inevitable." This is the sophistry of modern sceptics, who prefer to style themselves agnostics. Because they fail to unravel difficulties in nature and in the universe, they rush to the conclusion that the matter itself is inexplicable. "A little child shall lead them." 3. *A crucial test*. The monarch, unreasonable and unscrupulous as he may seem, brings their boasted knowledge to a real test. Whether these magicians did or did not accurately interpret dreams or forecast the future, the king had never known. He had been compelled to take their pretensions wholly upon trust. The oracular deliverances had been delightfully ambiguous—were capable of wide significance. No guarantee had ever been furnished by these magicians of their honesty. Now a favourable opportunity occurred for testing the skill of these boasted diviners. If their scientific calculations allowed them to descry the future, much more should it enable them to read a page of the recent past. If their popular deities gave them skill to interpret the meaning of a dream, much easier was it for these deities to give their servants power to revive in a man's memory the loss of a dream. If they could not accomplish the *lesser* task, it was vain to pretend they could perform the greater. It was therefore only just that the king should sharply rebuke them in the words, "Ye have prepared lying and corrupt words to speak before me."

III. THE HASTY VERDICT OF THE KING. 1. See the *violence* of carnal passion. Haste and impatience are always conspicuous signs of weakness. His expectation of escape from mental disquietude had been awakened by the pretentious arts of these magicians, and, this expectation having collapsed, disappointment added another

ingredient to his cup of trouble. If he had only given himself time to recover from this mental disturbance, time to reflect upon his responsibility as arbiter of human life, time to perceive his own folly in pandering aforesaid to the pretensions of those men, he would have gained a reputation for wisdom, and have rendered the world a service by exposing the hypocrisy of sorcerers. 2. His verdict was *excessively severe*. The penalty of death was the severest he could inflict upon his subjects, and if this penalty was enforced on *every* occasion, even when no public injury was done to the state, he confounded all degrees of crime, and encouraged men, who had transgressed in lesser matters, to become desperate inflictors of mischief. When men know that their offence is trivial compared with other forms of guilt, and yet have to endure the heaviest sentence of doom, they will often lend themselves to some desperate project of vengeance. 3. His verdict was *indiscriminate*, and involved both the righteous and the wicked. Not content with inflicting capital punishment on the offenders, he decrees that their "houses shall be made a dunghill." By such a vindictive deed, innocent women and young children would have been plunged into suffering and disgrace for no fault, and without any advantage to the state. Moreover, the arbitrary decree required "that *all* the wise men should be slain." This included Daniel and his comrades—yea, all men of intelligence and wisdom, though they had made no pretence to magical art. By a blind act of ungovernable passion, the king would have stripped his court of every ornament, and his government of its best supports. A passionate man usually maims his own face. Nebuchadnezzar would have defeated his own purpose—cut off his only chance of having his dream interpreted—if his vindictive and unscrupulous command had been executed. What vile deeds have royal hands frequently performed! How does the cry of innocent blood from a myriad battle-field rise to heaven against them!—D.

Vers. 14—23.—*A specific remedy for human distress.* The immoderate anger of the king had only aggravated his trouble without bringing a remedy. Uncontrollable temper is suicidal. It robbed Nebuchadnezzar of his kingly dignity, of the use of reason, of the power of memory. For the time being he had forgotten that, in all matters of practical wisdom, he had found Daniel to surpass all other state councillors. Now he was on the point of staining his conscience and his throne with wanton cruelty, with the waste of life, with the most precious blood that Babylon held.

I. IT WAS A CASE OF REAL EMERGENCY. The terror of the king, caused by his midnight scare, had only an imaginary foundation. Natural cheerfulness was enough to drive that spectre of evil out of the royal chamber. He might have laughed it out of existence. But now a real distress impended over Daniel and all the wise men of Babylon. It was not merely a fear of future disaster; reputation, property, life, were in imminent peril. The royal edict had gone forth for their summary destruction. The executioner was already preparing the murderous weapons. Before another dawn the die might be cast—the deed be beyond recall. Daniel's anxiety was awakened as much for others as himself. With his devout trust in God, death was not to him draped in sable gloom. There were worse evils, in his regard, than violent death. To die in defence of truth; to die in vindication of God's cause, was a noble deed. But *others*, not so prepared for the tremendous change, were included in the peril. Eternal shame would cover the king. The foundations of the throne might be sapped. The fortunes of God's people might sink into a yet deeper night. Israel's prospects might suffer a blacker eclipse. The mind of Daniel would be impressed with the folly of putting trust in man. The king had, not long before, shown him special favour—had expressed both regard and friendship; yet *now*, Daniel is condemned to death unheard, unjudged. More fickle than the vernal sunshine is the ephemeral smile of royalty. "Put not your trust in princes."

II. THE TRUE ORACLE SOUGHT. Whether the magicians and sorcerers adopted any measures to avert the approaching calamity, we are not told. Possibly they were paralyzed with fear, and could only hide their heads in cowardly shame. Now the worth and power of true piety emerge into the light. In the darkest hours of trouble, religion shines in brightest colours. There was: 1. *An exercise of preventive prudence.* However imperative be the duty of prayer, there are other duties which must not be neglected. The want of practical prudence often robs prayer of its efficacious issues,

The wise general will dispose his forces *well* on the battle-field before he makes an onset. Daniel's first step was to stay the hasty execution of the edict. He calls into exercise his well-disciplined wisdom. He uses his acquired standing in the realm to secure delay. He overlooks no point of precaution. He employs his just influence with the king to gain a temporary respite. He does not attempt to reason with the monarch in his angry mood—that would be a foolish enterprise. He moderates his demand so as to bring it within the compass of a possible success. Prudence is a step towards greater acquisitions. 2. *There was united supplication.* Daniel's heart was not excited with selfish ambition to secure the honour of a triumph for himself. He solicited the aid of his companions in this holy task, and addresses them by their proper Jewish names, which names reminded them that *theirs* was an accessible Deity. "Union is strength" in prayer, as much as in toil. The lack of humility, or earnestness, or perseverance, in *one* may be supplied or may be promoted by *another*. Combined fervour has special promises of success. "If two of you shall agree touching any matter in my kingdom, it shall be granted unto you." 3. *There was strong confidence in God.* In a spirit of calm and unquestioning confidence, Daniel assured the king "that he would show the king the interpretation." Already Daniel knew that in some way the response would come. Unbelief might have whispered into his ear that Jehovah had never yet answered such a request as this. Where, in the range of Jewish history, had it been recorded that the God of heaven had disclosed to *one* a dream which had lapsed from the memory of another? But faith would reply, "That objection is not to the point. There *must* be a first occasion, on which God will reveal his will to men *on any matter*. Let *this* be the first instance of its kind. The request I make is not *in itself* wrong or improper. It is not hostile to the purity of God's nature. It does not spring from a selfish or carnal motive. My success will bring honour and homage to the true God. My petition *must* succeed. Has not Jehovah said, by the mouth of David, our model king, 'Call upon me in the day of trouble: I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me'?" 4. *There was becoming humility in the posture of their souls.* "They desired *mercies* of the God of heaven." Daniel and his fellow-suppliants presented no claim. They abandoned themselves to the abounding mercy of their God. In a word, they confessed personal unworthiness, and approached the heavenly throne as culprits suing for *mercy*. This is men's only chance of success. For, wanting all personal merit, they have no opportunity of feigning a false merit in Jehovah's presence. With a glance of his eye he strips the veil of pretence from every suppliant, that while he rewards the contrite, he may dismay the proud and the hypocrite. "He requireth truth in the inward parts." The poor in spirit, he enriches; the boastful rich, he empties.

III. THE ORACULAR RESPONSE OBTAINED. "Then was the secret revealed unto Daniel in a night vision." In what particular way this desired knowledge was imparted is not said. This is not important. Possibly the dream or vision of the king was reproduced before the imagination of Daniel, with the further disclosure of its signification. But whatever was the *modus operandi*, it was *done*. Ascertained fact overrides all pre-assumed difficulties. The same God who permits us to have dreams at all can surely repeat the shadowy spectacle; and if he is the sovereign Lord of men, he can certainly make known to intelligent minds his purposes respecting the future. "With God nothing is impossible." 1. *The mode of deliverance resembled, in form, the cause of distress.* A dream was the occasion of Nebuchadnezzar's alarm—the occasion of the wise men's peril; a night vision was also the method of relief. Jacob's carnal struggle with Esau was his sin, and also his ground of anxiety; Jacob's midnight struggle with the heavenly stranger was the source of his triumph. Serpents had bitten with death the Hebrews; by gazing on a brazen serpent, they are healed. The fruit of the forbidden tree was the occasion of sin; the fruit "of the tree of life is for the healing of the nations." "By man came death; by man came also the resurrection from the dead." 2. *The outcome was gratitude and gladness.* "Then," without any lapse of time—"then," while the sense of benefit was fresh, "Daniel blessed the God of heaven." His faith was furnished with an additional proof that Israel's God was a real and living God; that he was accessible to the prayers of men; and that he was a Refuge in every hour of need. It is a blessed necessity that drives us to the throne of grace. As the frosts of winter prepare the soil for a more prolific harvest, so trouble, if rightly used,

is pregnant with blessing. Now it would be known all through Chaldea, that while the heathen oracles are dumb, the heavenly oracle is ever vocal. The false systems of human invention are covered with shame; the system of God's truth receives new honour. In that hour of anguish, Daniel learnt new lessons in heavenly wisdom—obtained fresh discoveries of the Divine goodness—discovered new methods in the Divine procedure. Now he learns that "God giveth wisdom to the wise, and knowledge to them that know understanding." They that use their capacities shall enlarge them. The man who trades with his ten talents shall gain ten more. He who sows in prayer shall reap in praise.—D.

Ver. 23.—"*Special blessing demands special praise.*" The state of mind which generates fervent prayer generates also joyous praise. Success in prayer is a fitting occasion for exuberant delight. 1. *The basis of sacred praise is gratitude.* "I thank and praise thee." Inward insensibility of feeling and forgetfulness of past favours are deadly enemies to praise. When gratitude opens the inner fountains of feeling, the crystal waters of praise freely flow. Thankfulness is the parent of song. 2. *God the proper Object of praise.* God, in his own nature and excellence, is deserving of the best music of the heart. The unchangeableness and faithful love of God are fitting materials for praise. The covenant mercies of God should be celebrated in praise. "God of my fathers." 3. *New blessings received are new occasions for praise.* No mental possession is of human origination. Our wisdom is a gift from God. Our power to influence others for good is a talent entrusted to us by God. Answers to prayer should be occasions of hearty praise. The pathway to the Divine favour has been found. New revelations of God's will should start afresh our powers of music. "Oh, praise the Lord!"—D.

Ver. 24.—*A good man becomes both king and saviour.* The actual king in the empire is not always the man who wears a diadem and occupies a stately seat. An astute statesman is often the real monarch. The poor man who, by his sagacity, delivered the city, was the veritable conqueror. The true servant of God becomes a king among men. See, for example, Joseph in Egypt, Moses in the desert, Samuel in Israel, Daniel in Babylon. Nebuchadnezzar was, at this moment, a captive, bound fast in the fetters of fear. Daniel was a real sovereign, directing the act of state officers, and moulding the destinies of the nation.

I. HERE ARE MARKS OF A TRUE PROPHET. "I will show unto the king the interpretation." To prophesy is not merely to foretell remote events: to prophesy is to disclose the unknown—to unveil mysteries. False prophets are a curse; a true prophet is an immeasurable blessing. Guesses at truth are untrustworthy, deceptive, perilous. Real revelation is a safe anchorage for the soul. Science soon reaches the end of her tether; she enjoys a very limited range. Revelation has to do with the infinite and the absolute—with all the secrets in the universe. To unfold the mysteries of human life, one by one, is the mission of God's prophets. "I will show the interpretation."

II. HERE ARE SIGNS OF KINGLY RULE. Nebuchadnezzar "was angry and very furious;" he had lost command over himself. Daniel had learnt the art of self-conquest. Nebuchadnezzar had commanded his officer to slay the wise men. Daniel, though one of the doomed, countermands the order. The magicians supposed that their lives were at the disposal of the monarch. They really were, by God's ordination, at the disposal of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar was a captive to dreadful apprehensions; feared a conspiracy; immured himself in the palace. Daniel walked abroad; breathed the sweet air of liberty; and wielded a power more mysterious than any enchanter's wand. Nebuchadnezzar had said, "Let there be war!" Daniel said, "Peace, be still!" The king had said to Arioch, "Unsheath thy sword, and slay!" Daniel countersaid, "Put up thy sword into its sheath, and spare!" The king had said to the wise men, "Die!" Daniel said instead, "Live!" And the voice of Daniel prevailed.

III. Here we have, in type and emblem, A REAL SAVIOUR. It is easy enough to destroy; it is difficult to save. A child may set a city on fire; ten thousand men may be impotent to save it. A madman has destroyed in five minutes what human genius had taken years to create. The fiat from Nebuchadnezzar's lips had been, "Destroy!"

destroy all the wise men of Babylon!" But Daniel had issued another mandate, "Destroy *not!*" and Daniel's word prevailed. A strange foreshadowing *this* of another event. Five hundred years later Herod commanded the massacre of all the infants in Bethlehem; yet *One* of the innocent babes was spared to become the Saviour of the world and Herod's Judge. No mercy "rejoices against judgment."—D.

Vers. 25—30.—*Needful preparations to receive Divine revelation.* Subjective conditions of mind are requisite for objective truth to enter. Common light cannot penetrate walls of stone or iron shutters. The electric force will only circulate along proper conductors. And if material forces demand suitable conditions in which to perform their active mission, so much more does the spiritual force of truth require that the mind of the recipient shall be sensitive, candid, impressible. Such was the gross, unspiritual state of some populations in Palestine, that even Jesus could not do his mighty works among them. Daniel proceeds to prepare the soil for the seed.

I. PREJUDICE MUST BE DISARMED. The anger of the king had been so greatly excited by the impotence and the imposture of his wise men, that Daniel perceived it best to forego his privilege of entering the monarch's presence at will. It was better to take the circuitous route of a formal introduction, as if he were a stranger. Hence the marshal of the court precedes the Hebrew prophet, secures the monarch's attention, and introduces Daniel, not as one of the royal college of sages, but simply as a Jewish captive. The former credulity of the king had given place to utter scepticism. So men's minds oscillate between the points of easy, groundless belief and obstinate prejudice. No vice so frequently assumes the air of respectable propriety as this vice of prejudice. It serves as a thick fog to shut out from the mind the clear light of heavenly truth. "There's none so blind as those who will not see."

II. INQUIRY MUST BE AWAKENED. "Art *thou* able to make known the dream?" Inquiry is the natural state of the human mind. It is its sense of hunger—the putting forth of its prehensile organs to obtain food. To the spiritually inert nothing will be revealed. Sincere desire for wisdom will impel us to interrogate every possible teacher, and to say, "Art *thou* able to add to my stock of knowledge?" The true philosopher or prophet will often appear in very modest garb, as did Daniel; but the spirit of the learner is a spirit of humility—'tis the spirit of a child. Remote as the antipodes is the temper that asks, "Can any good thing come out of Nazareth?" "Every one that *seeketh* findeth." We may often find through a dependent—through a despised slave—what we cannot find ourselves. Nebuchadnezzar, with all his royal gifts, could not find an interpreter. Arioch, the captain of his guard, greets him with the news, "I have found him!" A little captive maid in Naaman's kitchen could direct her master where to find a cure for his leprosy.

III. TRUST IN FALSE PROPHETS AND IN FALSE SYSTEMS MUST BE DESTROYED. Side by side with the growth of true faith must proceed the destruction of a false faith. The pompous monarch had rested his faith in the magicians and soothsayers, *without sufficient reason.* He had very likely prided himself on the superhuman wisdom of his counsellors. Yet what guarantee had he that they had ever spoken truth? Had he ever examined their credentials? ever put to the test their real capacity? If not, he was simply the victim of self-imposed credulity. The institution of sorcery was ancient and time-honoured, but none the less was it false and corrupt. If the king would not take the pains to examine the pretensions of these magicians, he deserved to be deceived. A Heaven-sent teacher is an incalculable treasure; a false prophet is a poisoned cup—a wolf in sheep's clothing. "Try the spirits, whether they be of God." No human authority is self-originate; we must know the source whence it sprang. "Cease from man, whose breath is in his nostrils."

IV. RECOGNITION OF GOD MOST BECOMING IN MEN, ESPECIALLY IN TIMES OF PERPLEXITY. "There is a God in heaven." Nor is that heaven far removed. "In him we live and move and exist." Even the magicians had confessed that there were invisible deities: "The gods, whose dwelling is not with flesh." Why did not the king in secret prostrate himself before these, and entreat their aid? If we believe in God, we shall recognize him, honour him, and use him in seasons of need. The true God does not love to see us grope in darkness; he longs to give us light. Our mental capacities preach to us this truth. He "revealeth secrets." "The secret of the Lord

is with them that fear him." The secrets of nature he reveals to the patient investigator; and if we will inquire at the portals of the heavenly kingdom, we shall know, by gradual disclosures, the secrets of the invisible world. Even our inner selves we do not accurately know, until God unveils to us the mystery. Daniel was sent to the king, that he might know the workings of his own heart.

V. GENUINE HUMILITY IS A MARK OF GOD'S SERVANT. "This secret," said Daniel, "is not revealed to me for any wisdom that I have." Natural endowments of intellect often puff men up with vain conceit of themselves; but the enlightening grace of God's Spirit develops their humility. "The meek will he teach his way." Having revealed to suppliants their own nothingness, their absolute dependence on the heavenly source, he unveils to them all truth that ministers to happiness and purity. The mysteries of his kingdom he hides from the boastful wise and prudent, but reveals them unto babes. The messenger of Divine truth will divert the attention of men from himself to his Master. Like John the Baptist, he accounts himself only as a "voice," and announces that One mightier and worthier cometh—the true Light and Life of men. Humility is a pre-requisite for Divine employment.

VI. WE MUST RECOGNIZE THE NEED OF VICARIOUS MERIT. It is noteworthy that Daniel disclosed the reason why God vouchsafed this revelation to the king. It was *not* done for the sake of the king, nor for the sake of the magicians, nor for the sake of the empire, but for the sake of the Jewish suppliants. It would be galling to our pride sometimes if we knew to what human mediation we were indebted for Divine blessing. The prayer of some bed-ridden saint has brought down the treasures of heavenly rain upon the Church. For the sake of Paul the prisoner, the lives of all on board the imperilled ship were saved. For Joseph and his brethren's sake, famine was averted from the Egyptians. Yet these are but faint and imperfect types of that grand scheme of mediation which God has provided for the redemption of the world; and for Jesus' sake, mercy flows in a full stream to men; for Jesus' sake, heaven is opened to all believers; for Jesus' sake, prayer is heard and the Holy Ghost is given. We, too, can be mediators for others; and it may yet be said that for our sakes, and in response to our intercessions, dark minds are enlightened, a world is blessed. Christ the High Priest puts a censor into our hands, and asks us to fill it with the fragrant incense of spiritual prayer.—D.

Vers. 36—43.—*Human sovereignty.* In a proper sense of the words, every dream is prophetic. Else on what ground are we to conclude that the dreams of Joseph, Pharaoh, Abimelech, Pilate's wife, were prophetic; and others not prophetic? Dreams are revelations of dominant ideas and habitudes of mind: they disclose features of moral character; they are reminders of an unslumbering Judge; they serve in some measure to forecast the future. The powers of heaven and of hell lie close about us in our sleep.

I. HUMAN SOVEREIGNTY IS DERIVED FROM GOD. If God had so pleased, he *might* have placed all men on a level. The principle of co-ordination, instead of subordination, was possible. Some genera of animals seem to have the instinct of subordination to rule among them; others, not. This ambition for rule is, in its original and unselfish character, an endowment from God. Strength, influence, will, power, kingly glory, all proceed from God. What have we of any value that we have not received? Fools men are to be inflated with pride, because another has lent them some possessions *in trust*. As well may a steward of a lordly estate give himself airs while his lord is absent. As well may the horses yoked to a treasure-van arch their necks and shake their manes because they draw behind them costly metals! Earthly honours are not unmistakable evidences of God's favour towards us. He sometimes puts a crown on our heads, that it may lacerate us with its hidden thorns—gives us a sceptre, and chastises us therewith.

II. SOVEREIGNTY, IN SOME FORM, IS GIVEN TO EVERY MAN. It was given to every man to have dominion over the beasts of the field and over the fowls of the air. On every man is imposed the duty to rule himself—his appetite, temper, passions, speech. The loftier part of his nature is divinely commissioned to rule the lower. "Better is he that ruleth his own nature, than he that taketh a city." Our wise and successful government of ourselves forms a course of training which shall fit us to govern others. This truth may well be printed in letters of gold, and set up where we can read it.

daily. According to our present loyalty will be the extent of future award. "Be thou ruler over ten cities; . . . be thou ruler over five cities."

III. HUMAN SOVEREIGNTY DOES NOT NECESSARILY IMPLY THE POSSESSION OF THE NOBLEST QUALITIES. The Chaldean sovereignty is represented by gold; the Persian, by silver; the Grecian, by brass; the Roman, by iron. One man, though ill-fitted for the post, may reign by virtue of hereditary succession. Another reigns by reason of his superior sagacity. A third reigns by virtue of real strength of character. A fourth reigns by reason of successful intrigue, or as the result of violent and unscrupulous war. Might is often mistaken for right. One throne is based on law; another rests on bayonets. Qualities and principles very inferior *intrinsically* often come to the surface, and dominate in human affairs. The dross rises to the top; the virgin metal keeps in obscurity. A Herod is on the throne; Jesus dwells in a stable! The silver is preferred to the gold, yea, the brass takes the place of both. Yet this is only a temporary displacement.

IV. SOVEREIGNTY BASED ON HETEROGENEOUS ELEMENTS COLLAPSES. Iron and clay are both useful in their place; but it was never intended that they should be fused into a unity. A short-sighted monarch frequently vacillates between three or four discordant principles, and, though fortune may, for a time, seem to favour him, yet he never succeeds. *Now* he insists on royal prerogative; *then* he concedes to selfish prudence. To-day he uses physical power; to-morrow he yields to fear. "A kingdom divided against itself cannot stand." True principle, consistently adhered to, triumphs at last.—D.

Vers. 44, 45.—*The establishment of a permanent kingdom.* It is worth while to note the period in which this new kingdom was destined to arise. "In the days of these," *i.e.* Roman, "kings." God had chosen to defer the visible manifestation of his kingdom until men had learnt the folly and the crime of attempting to do without him. We of this age are permitted to see the exact fulfilment of these words. Verily our God is a God of truth.

I. OBSERVE THE FOUNDER OF THIS NEW KINGDOM. When it was said, in a previous part of this chapter, that the God of heaven had given to Nebuchadnezzar a kingdom, it is not meant that God was the only Person taking part in the elevation of that monarch. Human interests and ambitions exercised their power. Possibly Satan instigated the evil passions of some of the statesmen of that day. But all the events were under the controlling will of God. He allows human and Satanic activity, but only within a limit imposed by his own will. On the other hand, the founding of this new kingdom is *exclusively his work*. From first conception to final completion, the work is God's. The heavenly principles on which it is founded are of his origination. The God of heaven hath done it: who can withstand? "The kings of the earth set themselves, and the rulers take counsel together, against the Lord, and against his anointed. But he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh; the Lord shall have them in derision."

II. ITS MYSTERIOUS MANIFESTATION. It was a stone cut out of the mountain without hands. The process of founding this empire is new and unprecedented. Into its constitution no form of human policy enters. It was a part of a mountain—a small part—mysteriously detached from the solid whole. By virtue of its own innate energy it grew and spread until it became a mountain also. Herein is symbolized the fact that Christ's kingdom on the earth is a part of heaven itself; it shall gradually grow into the likeness of heaven itself. There shall be a new earth, in which dwelleth righteousness.

III. ITS IMMUTABILITY. "It shall not be left to other people." In other words, no change of dynasty shall occur. Our King Emmanuel shall reign for ever. As he possesses an unchanging priesthood, so he holds an unchanging royalty. No change in its principles, or in its laws, or in its modes of aggression, shall be permitted. They are perfect in design from the very commencement. Nor, in the best sense, shall the true subjects in this kingdom be changed. Christ hates divorcements. "Having loved his own, he will love them to the end." Once Christ's, we are Christ's for ever. In removing us from the visible kingdom on earth, death, as our King's officer, does but convey to the higher province—the metropolis of the kingdom, *viz.* the invisible.

IV. ITS ALL-CONQUERING POWER. It shall be ravaged by no other kingdom; it shall vanquish *all*. Its victories may be slow, but they are sure. No weapon that is formed against this empire shall prosper. The nation that will not serve King Jesus shall perish. The powers that assail the Church of Christ shall be broken in pieces as a potter's vessel. During the past eighteen centuries this has been the tale of history. The two-edged weapon of Divine truth has triumphed. The testimony of infidel and adversary is this: "The Nazarene has conquered." It is a bloodless warfare, and ends in abiding victory.

V. MARK ITS PERPETUAL DURATION. The elements of which this kingdom is composed are indissoluble and imperishable. They are righteousness, truth, love, peace. The King himself is eternal and immortal, "without beginning of days, and without end of life." To all his subjects he gives immortal youth. "They shall never perish." Hence there is nothing in this empire that is pervious to decay. Once more will God shake heaven and earth, to the end that what is frail may perish, and that the "things which cannot be shaken may remain." This is a kingdom which *cannot* be moved. "For he *must* reign, until he hath put all things under his feet." It is a decree growing out of the roots of absolute and eternal necessity.—D.

Vers. 46—49.—*The kingly worth of a good man discovered.* As surely as God lives, the Author of all real goodness, loyalty shall become, in due time, royalty. Faithful devotion to him shall be honoured in the presence of monarchs and mighty men. The man who bows in lowly homage at the feet of the Eternal shall by-and-by see others at his feet. "Before honour is humility."

I. THE PROPHET'S SUCCESS. Daniel had proceeded, with honest fidelity, to declare to the king the truth entrusted to his keeping. He had not flattered Nebuchadnezzar with glittering and delusive hopes. He had held out no prospect that the Chaldean kingdom should be permanent. Nevertheless, the Chaldean king felt that there was an authority and a majesty in the *truth*, vastly superior to his own. He bowed before it. The previous discovery of the magicians' falseness had prepared his mind to value truth; hence he prostrated himself before the visible representative of heavenly truth, with that abject mode of prostration common in his court. The truth from the prophet's lips had produced that inward sense of personal littleness which accorded with reality. The homage he rendered to God's message was, according to the customs of the age, *fitting*. There was more of kingly nobleness in Daniel than in Nebuchadnezzar; and the monarch, in his way, foresaw the day when the sons of God shall be manifested in royal power. But it was *not* fitting that the homage due to the Master should be given to the servant; and, though the narrative leaves Daniel silent here, doubtless he disclaimed all right to such adulation, and directed it to be given to the Divine Author of truth. Publicly did the heathen monarch confess that Jehovah was God above all other gods—King over all other kings. It was no slight change wrought in the convictions and temper of the monarch, when he thus cast obloquy on Chaldaea's deities, and confessed the power of Israel's God. This was the success which Daniel had sought.

II. THE PROPHET'S REWARD. Although Daniel declines to accept the homage which was due only to the unseen God, he does not fall therefore in the monarch's esteem: he rises higher still. Then the candid honesty of the man compels him to forego worldly advantage, that he may be loyal to truth and to God. Such a man is worthy of large and implicit trust. The interests of the empire can be entrusted to no better hands. He shall stand next to the king; he shall be king in *all* but the name! No human sovereign can *make* Daniel a great man. He was *great* already, moulded and fashioned into greatness by a Divine hand. Such intrinsic greatness the world could not give nor take away. Outward signs of greatness, however, the king conferred. He gave him riches; he gave him rule; made him prime minister of state. The king had learnt by experience that no expense spent on Daniel had been waste. His nourishment and education of Daniel for three years had proved most remunerative outlay. Amply had he been repaid. And now gratitude and interest alike prompted him to confer all possible power upon this right noble man. Never could the title be better conferred—"most excellent," or "right honourable." He "sat in the gate" to direct the administration and to dispense justice. This was the "sublime porte" of Babylon.

III. THE PROPHET'S SELF-FORGETFUL SPIRIT. He has but one request to make of the king, and this request was not for himself, but for others. Having been highly exalted, he seeks gifts for men. Nowhere does the nobility and magnanimity of the man come more into view than here. His sudden elevation to rank and riches and rule have not spoil him. In him lurks no ambitious pride. He has no thought of invidious rivalry. He is unwilling to enjoy his honours alone. In that hour of unexpected triumph he does not forget his fellow-captives who had joined their prayers to *his* in the hour of exigency. It may seem a bold petition: it may imperil his reputation with the king. To ask that the native Chaldeans—the officers who had gained illustrious honour by the conquest of Jerusalem—should be displaced to make room for three obscure and captive Jews: truly, this was a large request. Does not Daniel jeopardize all his gains by this daring proposal? Come what will, he will serve his nation, he will serve his God. And if, by sagacious foresight, he can diminish the oppressions of his countrymen, or pave the path for their return to Palestine, *he will do it*. The sacred fire aglow in his heart is revealed. Self is obliterated. To do good to Jew and Gentile alike—*this* is his sweet ambition! O man, “beloved of God,” thy name shall be embalmed in fragrant remembrance.—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER III.

VERS. 1—30.—THE GOLDEN IMAGE, AND THE FIERY FURNACE.

Ver. 1.—Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image of gold, whose height was three score cubits, and the breadth thereof six cubits: he set it up in the plain of Dura, in the province of Babylon. The Septuagint Version is full of redundancy and interpolation, “In the eighteenth year King Nebuchadnezzar, who ruled cities and countries, and all those dwelling (in them) over the earth from India even to Ethiopia, made a golden image; the height of it was sixty cubits, and the breadth of it six cubits, and set it up in a plain within the boundary of the province of Babylon.” The reason for translating *Dura* “boundary” is natural enough, for the word means something approximate to this. Theodotion begins in the same way, giving the date “the eighteenth year;” the place is *ἐν πεδίῳ Δαυαρᾶ*. As for the rest, it is in agreement with the text of the Massorettes. The Peshitta follows a text that must have been identical with the Massoretic, as also does the Vulgate. The date inserted into the Greek Version is improbable. At that time, if we take the chronology of 2 Kings xxv. 8, Nebuchadnezzar was engaged in the siege of Jerusalem. Jerusalem was taken in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, after a two years’ siege. In Jer. lii. 29 we are told, however, that Nebuchadnezzar took eight hundred and thirty-two captives in his eighteenth year, and the difference between Babylonian and Jewish chronology suggests that the eighteenth year of Jer. lii. may be

the nineteenth of 2 Kings xxv.¹ Against this is the fact that the month of the year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar is given (2 Kings xxv. 8), and this implies the adoption of the Babylonian chronology. It is certainly not to be expected that Nebuchadnezzar would traverse the long distance that separated him from his capital merely to erect a statue or obelisk. At the same time, we are told (Jer. lii. 29), as we have mentioned above, that in the eighteenth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar took eight hundred and thirty-two persons captive. This may be that he sent these prisoners by a convoy, for it is clear that a larger number of captives were taken when Jerusalem was captured than eight hundred and thirty-two. They may have been taken during the progress of the siege, in sallies, etc. The number of prisoners taken in the seventh year of Nebuchadnezzar does not suggest the great numbers that are implied in Ezekiel to be dwelling on the Chebar, otherwise we might be inclined to regard these differences from the received chronology as due to a different mode of reckoning. Even though the date given in Jer. lii. 29 were the date of the capture of Jerusalem, it is not at all likely that the capture of an obscure city in the hill country of Judæa was an event on account of which a special thanksgiving would be given. The description of the empire of Nebuchadnezzar in the Septuagint is borrowed

¹ This passage, Jer. lii. 28—30, is omitted from the Septuagint, and therefore is of doubtful authenticity. Although it may not be by Jeremiah, it may give correct information.

from Esth. i. 1. In regard to this image, the statement that it is "golden" does not mean that it was solid gold, any more than the golden altar (Numb. iv. 11) was entirely of gold (Exod. xxx. 1—3; xxxvii. 25, 26); that it was an "image" (*tsalem*) does not necessarily imply that it was a statue in the form of a human being. In Ezek. xvi. 17 there are references to *tsalmee zakar*, which seem naturally to be *phallus* images. Hegel's opinion ('*Ästhetik*') was that the obelisk was really a modified *phallus* image. If that is so, then the proportions of this *tsalem* are not extravagant for an obelisk. Moreover, these numbers, "sixty" and "six," are evidently round numbers, their mnemonic character maintaining their place. The real numbers might be anything near the number given; instead of "sixty," the real number might be not much over "fifty" cubits, and the "six" cubits, the number given as the breadth, might be, without intentional deception, seven or eight cubits. The proportion, at all events, in the extreme case of fifty and eight cubits, would not be extraordinary, even for a statue. It might be a gilded statue on a lofty column. One other note may be added: 6 and 60, multiplied together, give 360, the number of the days in the Babylonian year. The division of the circle into 360 degrees is probably due to this Babylonian division of the year. In the plain of Dura. There are several places in Babylonia which may be identified with this (Schrader, '*Keilinschriften*,' 430). While it may be outside the wall of the city, this Dura may also have been within it; the Septuagint rendering favours this—*ἐν πεδίῳ τοῦ περιβόλου*. It is remarked by Professor Fuller that districts within the city of Babylon have at times "Dur" as part of the name. Thus, "in Esarhaddon's inscriptions, Durusuanna-ki is that part of Babylon which is elsewhere called Imgur-Bel, or wall of Babylon." This would confirm the view—Quatremere's—that Dura was within the city wall. Archdeacon Bose ('*Speaker's Commentary*,' *ad loc.*) refers to Oppert as having found near a spot named Duair the pedestal of a colossal statue, but gives no reference. On the flat plains of Mesopotamia, this obelisk of a hundred feet high would be seen for nearly thirteen miles in every direction, and the gleam from its gilded top would be visible even further. What was the occasion of this image being set up? We have no means of even conjecturing. Certainly it was not merely to seduce the Jews again into idolatry. From the way Marduk (Merodach) is glorified in the inscriptions of Nebuchadnezzar, the probability is that it was erected in his

honour. Bishop Wordsworth ('*Com. Daniel*') thinks the statue was of Nebuchadnezzar himself, and quotes Lenormant ('*Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne*,' i. 237, trans. i. 486). Lenormant, in the passage referred to, quotes an inscription in which Nebuchadnezzar calls himself "the begotten of Marduk." From this Lenormant comes to the conclusion that, like Caligula in later times, Nebuchadnezzar demanded worship to be given to himself as a god. But when we turn back in this same book ('*Manuel d'Histoire Ancienne*,' vol. i. p. 484, Engl. trans.), we find a number of statements of a similar kind which invalidate the emphasis which Lenormant would give to this. He calls *Bilit Larpanti*, "the mother who bore me;" *Sin*, "who inspires me with judgment;" *Shamash*, "who inspires my body with the sentiment of justice;" and so on. In saying he was begotten of Marduk, it is not as claiming the personal possession of the characteristics of divinity that Nebuchadnezzar made this statement, but as regarding himself to be the special instrument and favourite of the gods—a posture of mind quite compatible with the deepest and most real humility. Hippolytus and Jerome maintain the same view as Lenormant on *a priori* evidence. There is no contradiction between Nebuchadnezzar's ascription of praise to Jehovah as a God of gods and a Revealer of secrets, in ch. ii. 47, and his erection of this image to Merodach. That Jehovah was a God of gods did not prevent Merodach being that also, and even greater.

Vers. 2, 3.—Then Nebuchadnezzar the king sent to gather together the princes, the governors, and the captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, to come to the dedication of the image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up. Then the princes, the governors, and captains, the judges, the treasurers, the counsellors, the sheriffs, and all the rulers of the provinces, were gathered together unto the dedication of the image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up; and they stood before the image that Nebuchadnezzar had set up. The Septuagint is greatly interpolated, "And Nebuchadnezzar, king of kings and ruler (*κυριεύων*) of the whole inhabited earth (*τῆς οἰκουμένης ὅλης*), sent to gather together all nations, peoples, and tongues, governors and generals, rulers and overseers, executors and those in authority, according to their provinces, and all in the whole inhabited earth, to come to the dedication of the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up." The word denoting the "inhabited world" is one used first of the Greek world (*Funeral Oration of Demosthenes, τῆς οἰκου-*

μενῆς τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος), then of the Roman world as distinct from the barbarian (Polybius, i. 4. 6, τὸ τῆς ὄλης οἰκουμένης σχῆμα); in this latter sense it is used in Luke ii. 1. The phrase, "nations, peoples, and tongues," is one that occurs with great frequency in Revelation, and also the above phrase, τῆς ὄλης οἰκουμένης. This is an indication of the use made by the Apostle John of this version of Daniel as distinct from the Massoretic text. It may also be observed that the phrase, "all in the whole inhabited earth," is placed as equal to "all the rulers of the provinces," which makes it at least possible that a misreading of the original text has occasioned the exaggeration in this particular clause. In the third verse the order is different, and to some extent the names of the officials are different also; *σατράπαι* is left out, and *τύραννοι* appears in its stead, though not in the same place. Further, there are persons mentioned "great in authority." This variation may be due to an uncertainty in the mind of the translator as to the exact equivalent in Greek for the Aramaic terms. It is to be noted that "the inhabitants of the whole earth" disappear from this repetition. The last editor of the Greek text may have had two renderings before him, and drew from the one the second verse, and from the other the third. Theodotion's rendering, while in closer agreement with the Massoretic text, yet differs from it to some extent, appearing to make the latter half of ver. 2 explanatory of the former, which contains the more technical designations. In ver. 3 there is a change in the order of the terms, as to some extent a change in the terms. In the Peshitta there are evident traces that the translator had not understood the technical meaning of the terms here used. The list given is "great men of might—lords, rulers, *Agardaei*, *Garabdae*, *Tarabdae*, *Tabathae*, and all the rulers of the province." These mysterious names, that seem those of tribes, have no existence elsewhere. It is singular that these words, if they are in their original shape—which they seem certainly to be—and to appearance of Persian origin, were unintelligible to one writing on the Persian frontier at most three centuries after the critical date of Daniel. The Parthian Empire retained much of the Persian character. How was it that words of Persian meaning had disappeared there, and still remained in use, or at least still continued to be intelligible, in Palestine? The probability is that the names have undergone so great change in course of transcription that their original form can no longer be recognized. The Vulgate does not call for remark. The names of these different grades of officials are (as we now have them)

DANIEL.

some indubitably Persian, as *ahashdarpan*; others unmistakably Assyrian, *sagan pehah*; and there are some that have no recognized etymology, as *tiptlayē*; but there are none that are even plausibly derived from Greek. Yet this class of words is precisely the class where the influence of the language of the military governing nation would be manifest. The fact that while the Massoretic text has eight classes of rulers who are summoned, the Septuagint has only six, throws a suspicion on the whole list. The LXX., however, adds, "all those in the whole earth (*πάντας τοὺς κατὰ τὴν οἰκουμένην*)," which may be the result of misreading of *kol shiltoni m'deen-atha*, or it may be a rendering of it, referring back to the classes already enumerated (*ἄρχοντας* being understood, omitting the *van*). In Theodotion and Jerome there are seven classes. Only in the Peshitta are there the same number of classes as in the Massoretic. The Peshitta has as this first class *rabai heela*, used in the New Testament, e.g. Luke xxii. 4, of "chief captains." It is possible that *rabuti*, or some derivative from it, was in the original text here, and this was changed into the better known *satrap*. *Sagan* does not call for remark; as said above (ch. ii. 48), it is derived from *shakun* (Assyrian); the Hebrew equivalent appears in Jer. li. 23 and Ezek. xxiii. 6, and elsewhere. *Pehah* is also Assyrian in origin, also elsewhere used in Scripture. *Adargazrayya* seems a compound from *adar* and *gazar*, "to divide." Fürst would make this word mean "astrologers of the god Adar." Professor Bevan would derive it from *endarzgar*, a Persian word meaning "counsellor"—"a word which was still in use under the Sassanians." That the word had any connection with this is disproved by the fact that in the Peshitta it is rendered *Agardaei*. If the word in question had survived from the Achæmenids to the Sassanids, its meaning would necessarily be known to the Peshitta translator, whose date held between the periods of these two Persian dynasties. A Persian word of the date of the Achæmenids to have survived to the age of the Sassanids, must have been known in the intervening Parthian period. A similar difficulty occurs in regard to the next word, *gdabrayya*—the Syrian translator has simply transferred it. The simplest interpretation is that it is a variation on *gizbarayya* (Ezra vii. 21), and means "treasurers," which is still in use in the Syriac of the Peshitta, e.g. 2 Kings x. 22. The question is complicated by the fact that the word which occupies the same place in the similar list in ver. 27 is *had-dabrā*. When we turn to the Peshitta for that verse, there is another word, *raur-*

H

bona. The Septuagint, by rendering $\phi\lambda\omicron\iota\varsigma$, shows that their reading was *habereen*. All this proves how utterly futile it is to build anything on the presence of late words in Daniel. The presence of early words, from the nature of the case, is more significant. Old and unintelligible words would never be inserted in place of new and intelligible, though the reverse process might readily take place: דָּרְבָרַי (*d'hab-rayyā*) is rendered usually "judges," and is generally derived from the Pehlevi; but if דָּרָה (*dath*) means a "firman," a "command," or "decree," in Aramaic, then the addition *bar* in Persian is rendered less certain. Here, again, the Peshitta translator was unaware of the meaning of the word, and renders by the mysterious word *tarabdae*. The last class mentioned is the *Tiphthae*. This term seems to be omitted in the three Western versions; at least there are only six names of ranks of rulers given in these versions, and this is a seventh. Of course, it may be that some name earlier in the list is explanatory and added later than the time when these versions were made. The Peshitta has the word *Tabathaei*, which has all the appearance of a national name. The word *Tiphthae* assumes in the K'thib a Syriac form, which, as we before remarked, is an indication of the original dialect of the book. Notwithstanding what Professor Bevan has asserted, something may be said for the conjecture that it is connected with *afiā*, "to advise." But in the extreme doubt in which we are in regard to what the text precisely is, it is something like waste of time to do more than chronicle opinions. This feeling of uncertainty is increased by the fact that, as above mentioned, the two lists in the two verses before us do not agree in the three Western versions. The list in ver. 27 purports to be the same as that given here, and differs from it greatly. All that we may assume is that there were assembled different classes of the officials of the Babylonian Empire. The reading should not be *m'deenatha*, "of the provinces;" but *m'deento*, "of the province;" the officials that were assembled were those merely of the province of Babylon. We would maintain this, although the versions are against it, because there would be no difference in the original unpointed text.

Vers. 4, 5.—Then an herald cried aloud, To you it is commanded, O people, nations, and languages, that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king hath set up. The Septuagint rendering is, "And the herald proclaimed to the multitudes, 'To you it is announced, peoples and countries, nations

and tongues, when ye hear the sound of the trumpet, the pipe, the harp, the sackbut, and psaltery, of chorus, and of all kinds of music, that ye fall down and worship the golden image which King Nebuchadnezzar set up." It is clear that the Septuagint translator rendered מַלְאָכִים as "host," and translated כָּ as if it were לָ. The balanced cadence of the next clause seems more natural, if due to the Aramaic source than to the Greek translator. The musical instruments are also arranged in the same cadenced fashion, broken to some extent by *συμφωνία*. Theodotion is, as usual, in closer agreement with the Massoretic text, but omits *συμφωνία*. The Peshitta in the fourth verse agrees not only word for word, but we might almost say syllable for syllable, with the Massoretic text. In the fifth verse it omits *p'santerin*; instead of *sabka*, it has *kinora*, which is usually regarded as the Hebrew equivalent of *κινδρα*; instead of *συμφωνία*, it has *tziphonia*, which suggests a different etymology. It is true Strack ('*Neu Hebräische Sprache*') points out that *p* has a tendency to become *x* before syllables with the *γ* sound or at the end of words, but this is neither of these; the syllable with *x* is the first, not the last, and there is no *d* or *t* sound in the word. Jerome is in strict verbal agreement with the Massoretic text. We shall have to devote a short excursus to the names of the musical instruments which occur here. In eagerness to find proofs of the late origin of the Book of Daniel—of its origin in the times of the Hellenic domination, *karoza* was derived from *κάρυξ*; that etymology is universally abandoned now. *O people, nations, and languages*. It ought rather to be *peoples*. Bishop Wordsworth remarks on the resemblance which this phrase bears to that used of the mystical Babylon in Revelation (xiii. 7; xvii. 15), and adds that she also "commands them to fall down and worship the image which she has set up." In regard to the following verse, the sculptures of Nineveh prove the prominence given to music in all important occasions, as the celebration of a triumph or the dedication of a temple. The names of the musical instruments are not so generally preserved. It was most likely when the rays of the morning sun smote the golden tip of the obelisk, that there came the burst of music which was to serve as a signal for all the multitudes to fall down and worship. The image was looked upon as the sign of the god it represented; it received the worship meant for him.

Ver. 6.—And whoso falleth not down and worshippeth shall the same hour be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. The only difference between the Septuagint and

the Massoretic text is that instead of rendering, "shall be cast," it is put in the plural active, "they shall cast him." There may have been a difference of reading—*יִשְׁלְחוּ* instead of *יִשְׁלֹחֵהוּ*. It is, perhaps, more probable that it is simply that the translator preferred this construction to the one which would have resulted from a more literal translation. Theodotion, the Peshitta, and Vulgate agree with the Massoretic. *In that very hour.* It has been suggested by Professor Fuller that the way the shadow fell would enable them to fix the hour. This, however, is giving an exact astronomical meaning to what had only a rhetorical significance. The word *sha'a* is very vague; it means "time" in general, it means "any short interval of time," from some days to a moment. *Shall be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace.* The word *אֶשׁ* is of uncertain derivation; it is found in both dialects of Aramaic. It occurs in the Targum of pseudo-Jonathan, in the story of the death of Haran and the preservation of Abraham, which seems distinctly imitated from the events related here. In Smith's 'Life of Asshurbanipal,' we find this punishment more than once resorted to, e.g. pp. 163, 164. Professor Bevan maintains, in answer to Lenormant's appeal to this as a proof of the author's accurate knowledge of Babylonian methods of punishment, that this is derived from Jer. xxix. 22, Zedekiah and Ahab, "whom the King of Babylon roasted in the fire." Only the action implied by the verb *אָלַח* (*qalah*) is not complete burning, as that implied in the punishment before us, but rather the more cruel torture of slowly burning. The word is used of "parched corn" (Lev. ii. 14; Judg. v. 11); it is used also of the heat of fever (Ps. xxxviii. 8). There is no verbal indication that the author of Daniel was at all influenced by this passage.

Ver. 7.—Therefore at that time, when all the people heard the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and all kinds of music, all the people, the nations, and the languages, fell down and worshipped the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up. The Septuagint renders, "And at that time, when all the nations (Gentiles) heard the sound of the trumpet, the pipe and harp, sackbut and psaltery, and every sound of music, then all the nations (Gentiles), tribes, and tongues, fell down and worshipped the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up." The last words, *κατέναντι τούτου*, evidently belong to the beginning of the next verse. It is possible *ἔχον* is due to another reading, but may also have been the result of a desire for iation. Theodotion does not differ from

the Massoretic text. The two Greek versions agree with the Massoretic in omitting *συμφωνία*. The rendering of the Peshitta is, "In the hour when the nations heard the voice of the horn, and flute, and lyre, (*qithra*), and harp (*kinnor*), and pipe (*ziphonia*), and all kinds of music, all these peoples, nations, and tongues, fell down and worshipped the golden image which Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up." It is to be noted that *kinnor*, its Shemitic equivalent, here again follows *qithra*, and that *psanterin* is again omitted. Jerome, in opposition to the Massoretic and the Greek versions, inserts *symphonia*. In regard to the Massoretic text here, as in the fifth verse, we have *qathros* instead of the *qithros* of the K'thib; in this, the K'thib agrees, as generally, with the Eastern instead of the Western form the word assumes. Professor Bevan compares the use of *קָתֵר* here with that in the Palmyrene inscriptions (Vogüé 15). *Zemara* is said by Keil to refer only to song; but Fürst, Gesenius, and Winer apply the word to instrumental music. It may, as a matter of fact, be either; if it be a chorus of voices, it is then equivalent to *συμφωνία*. This verse simply chronicles the obedience that was at once and unquestioningly rendered to the command of Nebuchadnezzar. The obedience of these Gentiles served to bring out into clearer relief the steadfastness of these Jews, or, what appears to the king and his courtiers, their obstinacy. Not impossibly, their resistance to the king was emphasized by their remaining standing amid the crowd of those prostrate officials.

Ver. 8.—Wherefore at that time certain Chaldeans came near, and accused the Jews. The Septuagint is in this verse closer to the Massoretic than is Theodotion. The latter has nothing to represent the *קֹל־בַּיִל דְּנָחַל* (*kol-q'bayl d'nah*) of the original, which appears in our versions as "wherefore." The Septuagint renders *κατέναντι τούτου*. The Peshitta also has omitted "wherefore;" in the next clause it is slavishly accurate, giving the peculiar turn of the phrase in the original, "*chalu qartachun*, "to devour pieces of them." It occurs in the Syriac of Luke xvi. 1; it is in the Targum of Ps. xv. 3. The Vulgate presents no points worthy of notice. It is evident that "Chaldean" is here used in its ethnic sense of the nation, not in its professional sense as of the alleged class. We must remember that "Chaldean" is not equivalent to "Babylonian." As we have seen, the Chaldeans were intruders in Babylon, and to them Nebuchadnezzar belonged. It was but natural that native-born Chaldeans, who reckoned themselves to be of the same kin as the king, objected to have their

rights postponed to a set of Jews. The fact that the three friends are not named, or in any way designated, but the whole Jewish race is referred to, shows that the purpose of these Chaldeans involved the whole Jewish people, and that they singled out Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego simply as test cases. Their elevation to positions of such trust might well have caused jealousy of them.

Vers. 9-12.—They spake and said to the King Nebuchadnezzar, O king, live for ever. Thou, O king, hast made a decree, that every man that shall hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, shall fall down and worship the golden image: and whoso falleth not down and worshippeth, that he should be cast into the midst of a burning fiery furnace. There are certain Jews whom thou hast set over the affairs of the province of Babylon, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego; these men, O king, have not regarded thee: they serve not thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up. The differences here between the Septuagint and the Massoretic are slight. Only, it may be observed, that in the repetition of the decree to the king, *συμφωνία* does not occur. Instead of saying, "they serve not thy gods," it renders, "thine idol they do not serve." Further, the word *עֲבֵדָתְךָ* ("beedath"), translated "business," is omitted, probably implying the omission in the original text of *עֲבֵדָתְךָ*. Theodotion's Version is considerably briefer in regard to the ninth verse, as it omits "answered and said," and "Nebuchadnezzar;" otherwise it is in closer agreement with the Massoretic text, only it too omits *συμφωνία*. In the Peshitta we find a variation in the ninth verse; its rendering begins, "And they said to Nebuchadnezzar the king." As before mentioned, in the list of instruments *psalterin* is omitted, and *kinnor* appears; otherwise the agreement is close with the Massoretic text. The Vulgate agrees with the Peshitta in its rendering of the ninth verse, but, unlike the Greek Version, inserts *symphonia*, and unlike the Peshitta, inserts *psalterium*. As to the Aramaic text, the most noticeable thing is the fact that in the K'thib, instead of *סִמְפֹּנְיָא* (*sumphonia*) there appears *סִיפֹּנְיָא* (*siphonia*). The twelfth verse has this peculiarity in it, that it is the only case where *רַ*, the sign of the accusative, so frequent in the Targums, occurs in Biblical Aramaic. In the inscription on the Hadad Statue at Sindschirli, line 28, we have *רַח* (*v-th-h*) as the sign of the accusative; as in the case before us, it serves for the oblique case of a pronoun. The adulatory address with which these Chaldeans begin is quite in

accordance with Eastern usage. The point of the accusation against these three officials was that, being officials, they did not confirm by obedience the solemn decree of the monarch. Further, if this statue or obelisk were erected to Marduk (Merodach), whom Nebuchadnezzar specially worshipped, and whom he regarded as his special protector, the element of treason against the state might be implied in this refusal to give due obeisance to the tutelary god of the Babylonian Empire and its sovereign. The politics and warfare of that period proceeded on the assumption that the gods directly interfered in the affairs of the nations. Any slight done to the national god would—as it was believed—be avenged on the nation who had suffered it to pass unpunished. They summoned deities to leave cities they were besieging, and tried to persuade the inhabitants that even their god was on the side of the besieger. Thus Sennacherib (2 Kings xix. 22) asserts that Jehovah must be offended with Hezekiah, and Pharaoh-Necho claimed to Josiah that he went at God's command to fight against Assyria (2 Chron. xxxv. 21). According to heathen notions generally, Chaldean and Babylonian included, some very slight inadvertence might vitiate a sacrifice, and change it from being a propitiation to the gods to an offence to them. If an inadvertence might thus be maleficent, much more direct disrespect such as that shown by these Jewish officials. But the accusers lay stress on another side of the matter. Nebuchadnezzar had set them over the affairs of the province of Babylon; but he had set up the golden image. There was thus an element of personal disrespect hinted at, made all the more heinous that the element of ingratitude was also present. But how is it that Daniel is not introduced into this narrative? Why was it that he was not attacked rather than his friends? It may be argued that this is another tradition, and that the union of Daniel with the three friends is due to that dovetailing of which so many traces are found—or alleged to be found—in the Pentateuch. But the editor who did the dovetailing in the present instance, did more than dovetail—they are introduced at various points in the narrative of the preceding chapter. Why did he not complete his work, and explain why Daniel was absent? If it is a work of imagination, it is necessary to account for the absence of Daniel; even if it is the result of editorial labour, still the absence of Daniel has to be accounted for or explained away. This would press heavily on one writing in the days of the Maccabees. On one chronicling events as they occurred, this might easily be passed over, because

at the time every one in Babylon would be perfectly aware why Daniel was not there. The absence of all reference to Daniel in this chapter is an indirect proof of the antiquity and genuineness of the book of which it forms part. The reasons for Daniel's absence may easily be imagined. He might have been sent on official duty to a distant province of the empire, or, though this is not so likely, his presence at this festival might not be required. A prosaio but possible solution of Daniel's absence might be illness. If he were known to be incapacitated by sickness from taking part in any public function, the Chaldeans would not damage their case by referring to him.

Ver. 13.—Then Nebuchadnezzar in his rage and fury commanded to bring Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. Then they brought these men before the king. The Septuagint differs from the Massoretic in translating *הָמָא* (*hama'*) as a verb, and therefore rendering, *θυμωθεὶς ὀργήν*, "infuriated with rage." Theodotion is in close agreement with the Massoretic, as also the Peshitta, with this difference, that the Syriac repeats the preposition, in which it is followed by Jerome. The word translated "brought" presents some grammatical difficulty: the word is *הָיִיתָ* (*haythayoo*). The form seems active, but the meaning is passive. Professor Bevan suggests a difference of vocalization. The accusation of those who desired to devour these Jewish councillors was successful in its immediate aim. Nebuchadnezzar is filled with rage and fury against those who, having been the creatures of his favour, had yet dared to do despite to his authority. It might even be that their unheard-of want of courtesy to the monarch would also be regarded as discourtesy still more flagrant to the god to whose honour the statue or pillar had been erected, and this dedicative feast instituted. He commands the criminals to be brought to him. Fierce and furious as Nebuchadnezzar is, fanatic as he is for the religion of his fathers, he is yet just. These officials, however disrespectfully they have acted, have yet a right to be heard in their own defence. They are sent for by the monarch, and in due course they come. It is not impossible that Nebuchadnezzar, with all his rage and fury, was yet shrewd enough to see envy behind the accusation; it is because these men are Jews, and have been highly advanced, that the Chaldeans are ready to bring accusations of impiety against them.

Ver. 14.—Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said unto them, Is it true, O Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, do not ye serve my gods, nor worship the golden image which I have set up?

The Septuagint rendering here is, "Whom when he saw, Nebuchadnezzar the king said to them, Wherefore, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, do ye not worship my gods, and before the golden image which I have set up do ye not prostrate yourselves?" There seems to have been a difference of reading here. The first words must have been read as *בהון עליהון* (*behon 'alehon*), and the mysterious word *הָיָא* (*haz'da*) had occupied a position before, not after *אמר*. The word *הָיָא* in the aphel in Syriac means "to look steadily." This interpretation of the word shows that the translator had before him a document in which Syriac meanings might be expected. Theodotion renders the last clause, "If truly (*εἰ ἀληθῶς*) Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, my gods ye do not worship, and before the golden image which I have set up ye do not prostrate yourselves?"—a construction that shows a slavish following of the Aramaic. The sense here is really the same as that of the Authorized Version. The Peshitta renders the opening word of this latter portion of the verse, "in truth"—a rendering with which Jerome agrees. Professor Bevan suggests another reading, *הָיָא*, followed by Behrmann. Unfortunately, the meaning of *הָיָא* is very doubtful. The common rendering is "of set purpose." So First, Gesenius, Winer, among lexicographers, and Bertholdt, Ewald, Aben Ezra, Wordsworth, among commentators; Keil, Kliefoth, Krähnfeld, hold it to mean "with evil intent." It is suggested also that it may mean "in mockery." The reading suggested by Professor Bevan and supported by Behrmann is not to be thought of; they appeal to Theodotion, but when this word occurs in the previous chapter (ver. 5), Theodotion translates *ἀπέστη*, which makes it evident that *הָיָא* (*azda*) did not mean "truth" to him. More may be said for the Peshitta, only that, though *azda* does seem to mean "truth," the translation is not the same in ch. ii. 5 and the present verse. If there is to be a change of reading, that indicated by the Septuagint translation is preferable. The Septuagint translator has had *הָיָא* before him, and there is no evidence that Theodotion had not. The change in the arrangement of the words is a simpler variation than any other, and it retains the word in its Syriac meaning; otherwise we should be inclined to follow the lexicographers, and translate "of set purpose." If we take the view of this word indicated above, then we may imagine Nebuchadnezzar looking steadfastly on those youths who had dared to oppose him, hoping, it may be, to see them shrink from his gaze, as he had seen so many of the kings he had conquered do.

If this is correct, it gives a point to what the youths begin their answer with in ver. 16. If we take the more common rendering, we see the generosity of the king. Full of rage and fury as he is, he will give them an opening to say that it was of inadvertence that they failed to obey his decree. This is fully borne out by the next verse. If Nebuchadnezzar was full of fury at the crime against the gods, he yet was careful that the envy of the Chaldeans should not hinder him from giving the Jews who had been accused to him a chance to defend themselves. This mental fairness it was which, despite his outbursts of capricious rage, drew the affection of those about him to Nebuchadnezzar.

Ver. 15.—Now if ye be ready that at what time ye hear the sound of the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music, ye fall down and worship the image which I have made; well; but if ye worship not, ye shall be cast the same hour into the midst of a burning fiery furnace; and who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands? The differences between the Septuagint and the Massoretic text are not great. The last clause is rendered, "but if not, know." It inserts the epithet "golden" after "image." The insertion of "know ye" makes the sentence run more easily, but it is not to be accepted. Here, as before, "midst" is omitted. Theodotion is very close to the Massoretic, but agrees with the Septuagint in its omission of "midst" and its insertion of "golden." The Peshitta is in yet closer agreement with the Massoretic text, save in regard to the musical instruments—*p'santerin*, as in the other cases, being omitted. It seems clear from this that the festival of the dedication of this new idol of the Babylonian king occupied several days. Nebuchadnezzar, willing to save those Jews, is ready to condone their first failure to obey his command if, probably at the sunrise of the following day, they were willing when they heard the sound of the musical instruments to fall down and worship this golden image which he had set up to the honour of his god. The latter clause does not seem in perfect harmony with the tone of the earlier part of the verse. There has been no reference in the conversation as reported to any other god to explain Nebuchadnezzar's demand, "Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" Moreover, there is in the beginning a desire apparent to give these Jewish officials a way of escape, but in the last clause there is contempt as well as anger expressed. The fact is that while the simple structure of Shemitic lends itself to direct narration, the reader is not to suppose that, though

speeches are reported in the *oratio recta*, they any more record or claim to record the *ipsissima verba* than if the speeches had been recorded in the *oratio obliqua* of more Western tongues. The presumption is that merely the main heads of the conversation are recorded. These very jolts and leaps are in themselves indirect evidences of the truth of the document with which we have to do. It would have been easy to insert a question and answer to bridge over the hiatus. Only one recording facts would be regardless of this. The attitude of mind expressed by these last words of Nebuchadnezzar are natural to a heathen, and especially to monarchs of the Assyrian type. Sennacherib's words of defiance (2 Kings xviii. 33) are quite in the same line, "Hath any of the gods of the nations delivered his land out of the hand of the King of Assyria?" The capture of Jerusalem by his arms was regarded by Nebuchadnezzar as a demonstration that the God of Israel was inferior to the gods of Babylonia. To Nebuchadnezzar this belief would not in the slightest degree contradict his previous declaration (ch. ii. 47), that this same God was "a God of gods, and a Lord of kings." He might be great as a Revealer of secrets, but not in might to deliver—in that he was clearly inferior to the gods of Babylon, as the events of recent campaigns had abundantly proved. It is this declaration, with the idea behind it of the limitation of Jehovah, that gives the event narrated in this chapter its importance.

Ezcarius on the Musical Instruments in this Chapter.

The names of the musical instruments which occur in the fifth, seventh, tenth, and fifteenth verses of this chapter are supposed to afford a demonstrative proof of the late date of Daniel. Thus Canon Driver, by no means an extreme critic, declares that, while "the Hebrew and Aramaic permit" a late date, these Greek words "demand" that the date of Daniel be placed as late as the period of the Syrian power. The words in question are—*qathros*, *p'santerin*, *sumphonya*. The first of these, *qathros* (*qathros*), appears to be transferred from the Greek *κίθaris* (*κίθαρα*), from its resemblance to the older form, *κίθaris*, which occurs in Homer; we may deduce that the word, if borrowed from the Greek, was borrowed at an early period. Canon Driver would not, in view of the intercourse between Greece and Babylon, press this word as proof of the recent date of Daniel. The intercourse between Babylon and Greece was sufficiently great to have rendered the conveyance of this name at least not impossible. It has been shown,

moreover, by Professor Whitehouse, that the word is probably derived from the East; indeed, he fixes on Phœnicia as its source. It must be observed that he maintains that, while originally Phœnician, the form it assumes in Daniel proves it to have come to the author of Daniel from Greek.¹

The word may have been modified from its more ancient to its more recent form, for the sake of readers. One of the suggestions of those who oppose the antiquity of the Book of Daniel is that *ḳinnor* (כִּנּוֹר) is the word that would have been used by a genuine Aramaic writer of Daniel's period, as *kinnor* and *qitharos* (or *qithros*) represent one and the same instrument; but, unfortunately for this, in the Peshitta we have both terms, the one after the other.

The other words, *סַנְתְרִין*, *συμφωνία*, and *פְּסַלְתִּין* (*p'santerin*), supposed to be equivalent to *ψαλτηριον*, are on a different footing.

In the first place, any one who has studied the apocalyptic writings, must see how peculiarly liable they are to interpolation. There is hardly one that is not largely and obviously interpolated. No one can deny that this has taken place with Daniel. The apocryphal additions are too well known for any one to maintain the opposite opinion. When, moreover, one begins to compare the Massoretic text with the more ancient versions, the Septuagint, the Peshitta, and that of Theodotion, we at once see that the changes which the text has undergone have not been confined to large interpolations, but all through there are words and phrases where the versions differ from the Massoretic text and from each other. The text especially from which the Septuagint translation has been made, must have presented many and important verbal differences from that adopted by the Massoretes. Even Theodotion, though his version agrees more closely with the Massoretic text than does the Septuagint, differs from it in ways and in a degree than can at times be explained only on the supposition that the text before him was not identical with that adopted by the Massoretes. The supposition that Theodotion has been altered from the Septuagint has been hazarded, and in a few cases it may have some semblance of probability, but in other cases it is destitute of every shadow of likelihood. The Peshitta is another source of various readings. Its variations are independent of either of the other two versions. In some chapters these variations

are more marked than in others, but in every case they are numerous enough to make any stress on individual words highly hazardous. While these variations are known and chronicled, there is no security that no variations occurred even before the types of the text separated from each other. In such a case as this, although it would be unscientific, on the ground of this uncertainty, to proceed to change the text to what seems to make better sense, it is equally unscientific to lay any evidential weight on single words.

But, further, no words are, in one respect, less evidential than musical terms. They are changed and modified with a freedom applied to few other things. Thus we have "cornet-a-piston" figuring also as "cornopean," two words like each other in sound, of the same meaning, but of widely different derivation. They pass from country to country with greater freedom than most other terms. To infer, then, that the writer of Daniel wrote under Greek domination, because certain Greek musical terms occur in the present Massoretic text, is rash in the extreme, and would, it seems to us, be universally regarded so, were there not an object to be gained by assuming that evidence drawn from them was liable to no doubt. New Testament critics have taught us to suspect what are called *tendenz* documents, i.e. documents that have an overweening bias towards one side of a controversy: there is such a thing as a *tendenz* judgment. The judgment of the critics in regard to the evidential value of these musical terms is a *tendenz* judgment, which we should say is even more to be suspected than the contents of a *tendenz* document.

The history of the argument from the alleged presence of Greek terms in Daniel is also instructive. The number of Greek terms that Hitzig and some earlier critics saw was large. Gradually they had to abandon all but those coming in the list of musical instruments here. Of these only four could be claimed as really Greek. However, one of these had soon to go, *שִׁבְרָה*; it was maintained to be derived from the *σαμβάκη*. It was found that this Greek word was really derived from an Eastern, probably an Assyrian, source. Next, it has been acknowledged by Canon Driver, as above stated, that much stress cannot be laid on *קָרְסִים* (*karṣim*), seeing it is an instrument of such ancient date in Greece, that it might easily have drifted eastward, name and thing, to Babylon. The matter is further complicated by the fact that the word, in all probability, is not Greek, to begin with, but Eastern, probably Phœnician.

¹ This cannot, however, be maintained absolutely, for *קָרְסִים* (Jer. xlv. 1), which is exactly parallel with *קָרְסִים*, is not a name of Greek but of Egyptian origin.

In regard to the remaining words—*sumphonya* and *p'santerin*—it is argued that they are of Greek origin, and that, while Babylonian intercourse with Greece is not denied, the origin of these words is maintained to be late, at all events, in the sense in which they appear in this passage. Thus, *p'santerin* is declared to be the Greek $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho\nu$, and it is further said that $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho\nu$ is not a term applied to musical instruments till late, Aristotle and Theophrastus being the earliest authors that use the word. That this word *p'santerin* is derived from $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho\nu$ is supposed to be proved by an argument which shows that the Greek letter ψ is resolved, in passing into Aramaic, into ψ and ϕ ; second, that ψ may be changed into ϕ , and that $-\iota\sigma$ becomes not infrequently ι . Even though all these points be admitted, it does not follow that *p'santerin* is derived from *psalterion*; as fair a case might be made out for deriving "mystery" from "mist." While ι sometimes represents $-\iota\sigma$, it much more frequently is simply the sign of the plural; and while ϕ may be at times the first half of ψ resolved, it also does represent at times the Coptic article $\Pi\epsilon$. While it is not impossible that *sante* may represent the remaining letters of the name of the Greek instrument, $\delta\alpha\lambda\tau\omega\pi\epsilon$ has a meaning in Coptic also; it may mean a chorus—"those singing to an instrument." This, then, would show that *p'santerin* might mean those singing in accompaniment to the previously named instruments. Confirmatory of this is the fact that in Lower Egypt, at the present day, there is a musical instrument called the *santeer*. When one remembers the great intercourse that existed between Assyria and Egypt when Esarhaddon and Asshur-bani-pal held possession of Egypt—the former of whom frequently held his court in Babylon—that Egyptian words should come into Babylon would not be extraordinary. We admit readily that possibility is not proof of actuality, yet it weakens the force of the other argument, which also is merely from possibility.

A prior question has to be settled before we deduce anything from the origin of this word *p'santerin*. Is it really part of the original text? There are in this third chapter of Daniel four distinct lists of what purport to be musical instruments. And these are arranged in such a way that the reader expects them to be identical. Each of these may thus be regarded as separate manuscripts. We have further three old versions, as already mentioned, as well as the Massoretic text: the Septuagint dated about B.C. 200 ;

Theodotion and the Peshitta, dated about A.D. 150; the Massoretic text, being fixed somewhere about A.D. 600, and represented by manuscripts, the earliest of which is of the tenth century—the Q'ri and K'thib represent two forms of reading. Of these authorities the latest is the Massoretic text.

To begin with the Massoretic text, the first thing that meets us is that, while in the fifth, tenth, and fifteenth verses, the word is $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho\nu$, in the seventh verse it is $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho$. This is not so insignificant as at first sight seems, for η and ϵ do not appear to have been pronounced in the same way originally, any more than the Greek θ and τ . But further, it is an acknowledged canon of criticism that when a passage has many variations of reading in different manuscripts, that itself raises a suspicion that it has come from the margin into the text. This variation of η and ϵ in a word is an instance similar to that of varying words in the case of a passage; a varying letter is, in the case of a word, a note conveying suspicion.

When we turn to the versions, we find that while the Greek—the Septuagint and Theodotion—have it, the word is quite omitted from the Syriac Peshitta. If it had dropped into the text from the margin, it would be most likely to do so in the Greek versions first, and then find its way into the Massoretic text afterwards. Hence the positive value of the evidence of the Greek versions is comparatively small, although their negative value is considerable. On the other hand, the word is not present at all in the Peshitta, which originated beyond the sphere of Greek domination. That being the state of the matter, we venture to maintain that the word *p'santerin* does not belong to the genuine text of Daniel.

The case against $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho\nu$ is yet stronger. In regard to this word there is a divergence between the Q'ri and the K'thib. Hence we may regard this as a case in which we have twenty manuscripts. If we now examine the evidence supplied by these, we shall find that the evidence for the presence of $\psi\alpha\lambda\tau\eta\rho\nu$ in the original text is very weak. In the K'thib, which represents in general the better text, we have *sumphonya* only in two cases, in one case we have *siphonya*, in the fourth case nothing at all. In the Q'ri we have three cases of *sumphonya*. When we turn to the Greek texts, we find that *symphonia* occurs in the Septuagint in two cases, in Theodotion only in one case. When we turn to the Peshitta, we have no case of *sumphonia*, but we have in all cases *tsiphonia*, a form akin to what we find in the tenth verse in the Massoretic text. If, then, we take these various cases together, and sum them up, we find eight cases of

symphonia, five cases of *siphonia*, and seven cases of nothing at all. As the word as we have it now is distinctly Greek, the evidence of the Greek versions, while strong negatively, is weak positively. We mean by this that a Greek word put on the margin might easily slip into the text of the Septuagint, and thence into the Palestinian recension—the Massoretic. Moreover, the case against *sumphonya* is strengthened when we compare the instances in which it occurs with those in which it does not occur. If we looked at the matter *a priori*, the cases where a word would most likely be dropped is in a conversational repetition of such a list of instruments. But the best supported case of the occurrence of this word is in the offer made by Nebuchadnezzar, that if even yet they would yield, they would be forgiven. The word in question occurs here in the two texts represented by the Massoretic in the Septuagint and Theodotion. It does not appear in the Peshitta—its place being represented by *tsiphonia*, as we said above. On the other hand, the place where we might most readily find a marginal note like *sumphonia* is precisely the last occurrence of a frequently recurring list. But, again, the place where we should most certainly expect to find every word of such a list given with scrupulous exactness, is what purports to be the record of a proclamation. But in Theodotion the word in question is not present in his record of the proclamation. In the seventh verse, where the proclamation is repeated to show the obedience it received, the word *sumphonya* is absent in the Massoretic text and the versions. Further, next to the record of a proclamation in likelihood for an accurate repetition of all the words of such a list, is, where a case is being founded on this proclamation. This, again, is a case in which *sumphonya* does not occur save in the Q'ri. When those who are about to accuse to Nebuchadnezzar the three Hebrews, repeat to him his proclamation, according to the Greek versions they leave out the word before us altogether, according to the K'thib and Peshitta they insert another word altogether. To us the argument seems conclusive that the word in question was not part of the original text of Daniel.

We cannot leave this question without adverting to some other aspects of it. The intercourse between the Hellenic peoples and Assyria seems to have been considerable. We know from Strabo, xiii. 2. 3, under the title of Lesbos, that Antimenidas, the brother of the poet Alcæus, was in the Babylonian army at the time when Nebuchadnezzar was king. Strabo quotes Alcæus, Ἀντιμενίδα δὲ φησὶν

Ἀλκαῖος Βαβυλωνίους συμμαχοῦντα—"fought along with the Babylonians as their ally." The Assyrians possessed Cyprus—another source of Hellenic influence. The later Sargonids, Esarhaddon and Asshur-bani-pal, those who had the closest relationship with Babylon, had also the supremacy in Egypt, and now we know from Flinders Petrie and others, in the accounts they have given us of their explorations at Daphne, that there was, before the time of the Babylonian power, a Greek colony of old standing. To meet this contention it is urged that the words in question are much later than the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Certainly we shall admit that the earliest instance of *ψαλτήριον* is in Aristotle, but the date of the word is not to be limited by its occurrence in Aristotle (Arist., 'Problem,' xix. 23. 2). It occurs in a definition of a *trigon* as a triangular psaltery—a mode of speech which implies that "psaltery" was already relatively a common designation. We could not define a "trichord" as a piano in which each note was produced by three wires of the same length stretched to the same degree of tension—unless pianos were comparatively common. That it does not occur earlier is probably due to the word beginning possibly as a localism, and then becoming common in literature. Thus many of the phrases denounced as recent Americanisms are proved by more careful investigation to be old provincialisms that have attained literary rank, or at all events semi-literary rank, in a new country. Hence, even though it were proved that *psanteria* is of Greek origin, and that it belongs to the original text of Daniel, which is more than doubtful, it would yet be no great strain to imagine the name and the instrument had passed over to Babylon before the traditional date of Daniel.

The case for *sumphonya* is even weaker. Even should it be granted to be in the text of Daniel, and further that it is a Greek word, it is not an instrument until at all events a much later date than any one pretends Daniel to have been written. Yet Canon Driver lays the main stress of his argument on the fact that in the passage before us it means an instrument, and in this view he is supported by Mr. Bevan. The whole stress of this statement really depends on a passage in Polybius (Polyb., xxvi. 10), in which it is alleged the word in question means a musical instrument of some sort. The view that the word before us in the passage means a musical instrument can only be maintained on reading the word preceding *συμφωνία* as *κεράτιον*, not *κεράμιον*, and on the further assumption that *κεράτιον* means a musical instrument, of which there is no proof. It is true that *κέρας* means not only the horn

of an animal, but also a musical horn; it is also true that *κεράτιον* is the diminutive from *κέρας*; but it is not to be assumed that all the senses of the original word are retained by the diminutive. A "lance" is the name given both to a medical instrument and to a weapon used by cavalry: it does not follow from this that since "a lancet" is a medical instrument, it is also a military weapon. There is certainly no instance to support the assertion that there ever was such a usage. As naturally it might be used of a drinking-horn. If the reading *κεράμιον* is adopted, the meaning assigned to *συμφωνία* loses even the limited plausibility it had. This view was presented years ago by Dr. Pusey, yet Canon Driver and Professor Bevan have repeated their exploded statements without the faintest attempt at answering the counter-arguments. Were any defender of Daniel to be guilty of anything similar, his ignorance would be sneered at, and his arguments hustled out of court.

But there is a further question—Is *siphonia* the same word as *συμφωνία*? That the *m* (*u*) might disappear and the *upsilon* of the Greek might be represented by *yod* in Aramaic, is not impossible, but the fact that, on the one side, there is the Greek word *σῖφων*, on the other there is the Eastern Aramaic word *tsiphonia*, throws grave doubt on this. With regard to *x*, Strack ('Lehrbuch,' p. 15) declares that *x* is interchanged with *b* before *t* sounds, and at the end of words; from this we deduce that *tsiphonia* cannot be derived etymologically from *sumphonia*. On the other hand, *siphonia* may readily be the product of *tsiphonia*, through the intervention of the Greek *σῖφων*, and perhaps the Hebrew סִפְיָן (*sūph*), "a reed." Changes otherwise impossible are rendered possible when they lead to a word with an intelligible sound. There is a verb סִפַּף, both Chaldean and Hebrew, which, however, does not seem to have any close connection with סִפְיָן, "a reed," or to have any musical meaning. It is used in Biblical Chaldean for the fulfilment of a prophecy (ch. iv. 30), in Targumic Chaldean "to have an end," "to cease" (Onkelos, Lev. xxvi. 20). The same verb with the same meaning occurs in Syriac (Luke ix. 54). This is an additional evidence that *tsiphonia* is the original form of the word. In transferring the word to Chaldean, they gave it a form intelligible to those who used that tongue. If Syriac were the language in which Daniel was written, then the meaning of the word in that language is important. Castelli—on what authority we know not—gives the meaning of *tsiphonia*, a word all but identical with that before us, as *tibia*, *tuba*.

Altogether, not only is the genuineness of

the word extremely doubtful, but even were it granted that there was a word there, it is not at all certain that it was a word connected with the Greek *συμφωνία*. As the assailants of the authenticity of Daniel have laid the great stress of their argument on these words, and, as we have seen, these words afford but dubious evidence, we may consider ourselves to have a right to demand from them to abandon their opposition, or show reason why they do not.

Vers. 16-18.—Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, answered and said to the king, O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful to answer thee in this matter. If it be so, our God whom we serve is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and he will deliver us out of thine hand, O king. But if not, be it known unto thee, O king, that we will not serve thy gods, nor worship the golden image which thou hast set up. The Septuagint Version differs in several slight points from the Massoretic, "And Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego answered and said to the King Nebuchadnezzar, O king, we have no need to answer thee in regard to this command, for our God in the heavens is one Lord, whom we fear, who is able to deliver us from the burning fiery furnace, and will deliver us out of thy hands, and then it shall be manifest to thee that we neither serve thy gods, nor the golden image which thou hast set up do we worship." In this version we see the sixteenth verse agrees with the Massoretic; in the next verses there are considerable differences. The Septuagint translator seems to have read some part of דָּרָל (*d'hal*) instead of בָּלָרָן (*pal'heen*). We cannot be certain that *Kúrios* represents הוה here, from the fact that the mannerism of the translator expresses itself in a preference for rendering אלהים by *Kúrios*. The Septuagint has τῶν χειρῶν instead of τῆς χειρός. Not improbably the original was dual, but the dual had practically disappeared from Hellenistic Greek. There seems a reference to the creed of the Jew (Deut. vi. 4) and to Ps. cxv. 3; speaking of God as "God of heaven" occurs in the previous chapter, ver. 18, and in ver. 28 Daniel speaks of his God as "in the heaven." However suitable, the first portion is yet to be put aside as an addition. The second portion of this differing clause occurs in Theodotion, and of it we shall shortly speak. There are several other less important differences over which we need not delay. Theodotion has, like the Septuagint, ἐν ὁρανοῖς, and like the Septuagint has the enclitic connection γὰρ, instead of the somewhat abrupt connection of the Massoretic, although the phrase, "in the

heavens," has thus the support of the two. The Peshitta Version has to some extent resulted from the abrupt beginning to the seventeenth verse as it appears in the Massoretic. The Peshitta renders the opening clause, "our Lord is merciful." As in the Septuagint, so in the Peshitta, the word *ḥithgam* (*pithgam*) is taken as meaning "decree;" but *miltha* precedes it, which must be rendered, "matter of the decree." Otherwise there is nothing worthy of notice in the Peshitta Version of these verses. Jerome begins the seventeenth verse with "ecce enim," which is not so much a difference of reading from the Massoretic as a difference of rendering from the Authorized. It is clear that the Massoretic punctuation implies something wanting. *ḥi* in Biblical Aramaic means "if," and *mi* "it is," that is, "if it be." One feels inclined to think that, suppressed, there was some statement equivalent to "if it be his good pleasure," thus manifesting a readiness to submit to God's will. According to the Massoretic, what follows asserts merely the ability of Jehovah, "our God whom we worship," to deliver his servants from the burning fiery furnace, and even from the hand of the great king himself; but there is no assertion that he will deliver them. The Septuagint Version presents a different aspect, as also Theodotion and the Peshitta. The mental attitude of the Massoretic is very different from the mood of later times. The versions, save Jerome, declare that God will deliver them out of the hand of Nebuchadnezzar. If they had received this assurance from God, there was in a sense less of witness-bearing to God than if they had not. The text of the Massoretic is here to be preferred. It is implied also in the meaning of the following verse. Even if God did not deliver them, still their determination is fixed—they will not worship the gods of the king, nor will they worship the golden image he has set up. It sometimes seems as if, even in our own day, we should be the better for the advent of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. There is still a demand that the people of God worship the golden image in the shape of wealth. The ministers of God are, we are told, not to denounce the wrongs of the world, lest the rich be offended. Wealth is not the only form of the golden image which men may be called upon to worship; the breath of popular applause may call them to denounce employers of labour unjustly on penalty of being dismissed or held up to reprobation. It is not the side that is important, but the motive; the cause of the poor may be pleaded as unjustly as that of the rich.

Ver. 19.—Then was Nebuchadnezzar full of

fury, and the form of his visage was changed against Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego: therefore he spake, and commanded that they should heat the furnace seven times more than it was wont to be heated. The text of the LXX. is practically the same as the Massoretic, with only this exception, that "one" is omitted as unsuited to the Greek idiom. Theodotion differs more from the Massoretic—"the furnace" was to be heated "sevenfold, till it was perfectly heated (*ἕως οὗ εἰς τέλει ἔκκαῃ*). The Peshitta, retaining the "one," translates, "one in seven times"—a rendering which seems to have little sense, as the Syriac idiom is the same as that before us. The change of countenance, from that of gratification at seeing a favourite, to that of rage, is a perfectly natural phenomenon, but one possibly even more marked among these races than dominant over the East than among ourselves. It was certainly not unnatural that, heathen as he was, filled with the belief in the mysterious power for good or ill that might be exercised over the empire were any of the gods offended, Nebuchadnezzar should be enraged. The result is that the calmness with which he had previously spoken with the three deserts him, and the form of his face changes, his visage becomes distorted with rage. It may be noted, in passing, that the word here used, *ih'tanni* (*יְהִי*), is the only case where the ethpaël occurs in Daniel; in all other cases the form is *hithpaël*, with the *ḥ* instead of the *n*. Since this is so, one is inclined to credit the peculiarity to scribal change. There is a difference here between the Q^ri and K^th^b, the latter reading *ishtannu*, which agrees by attraction with *anapolu*, "face," which, as in Hebrew, is plural. In order to express his wrath, he orders that the furnace be heated sevenfold hotter than ever before. The word here translated "wont to be" is really part of the verb *h'zah* (*הִזָּה*), "to see." Behrmann renders it, "Siebenmal so stark zu heizen als man ihn heizen gesehen hatte"—"commanded it to be heated seven times as hot as ever one had seen it heated." We cannot suppose the Babylonians had any means of measuring heat of that amount; it is simply a round number. Hitzig remarks on the recurrence of "seven," as if it helped to raise a presumption against the authenticity of the book. The fact that the Babylonians recognized seven planets, and seven gods of the planets, one for each, might as readily be taken as a proof of its authenticity. The probability is that vaguely many times more fuel was placed in the furnace than had ever been done before.

Ver. 20.—And he commanded the most mighty men that were in his army to bind

Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and to cast them into the burning fiery furnace. The first clause might more correctly be rendered, "He commanded warriors, warriors of might, in his army." The Greek versions assume that the repetition of *gub'reen* is equivalent to the superlative; hence the LXX. renders it ἄνδρες ἰσχυροτέρους; and Theodotion, ἄνδρες ἰσχυροῦς ἰσχύϊ. The Peshitta omits the first *gub'reen*. On the other hand, Theodotion omits the clause, "that were in his army." The action of Nebuchadnezzar in this reveals one of the contradictions so often manifested by polytheism. He might be ready to admit that no accumulation of human power could equal Divine power, yet it is obvious that these men of might were chosen for this purpose, in order that, despite Divine power, the royal sentence might be carried out. Such self-contradiction is not peculiar to Nebuchadnezzar nor to Babylon. Many men, professing to be Christians and acknowledging that God sees and knows all things, and that the wrath of God is an infinitely more serious matter than the contempt or "ill will" of men, yet commit sin secretly—to hide it from God. Hitzig indicates that he thinks these not to have been the ordinary body-guard of the king, but really the best troops in the province where the festival was taking place. It is evident that the troops referred to are not those *tabbāheen* of whom Arioch was the commander, otherwise we might have expected them to be mentioned. We know that there were different classes of soldiers in the Assyrian army, with differing kinds of arms and armour. In all probability something similar prevailed in the Babylonian army. It is not impossible that one corps might be specialized as the men of greatest physical strength. These men are employed to bind these three Jews to cast them into the burning fiery furnace.

Ver. 21.—**Then these men were bound in their coats, their hosen, and their hats, and their other garments, and were cast into the midst of the burning fiery furnace.** The LXX. omits the complexity of garments, and translates, "Thus these men were bound, having their sandals, and their hats upon their heads, with their other garments, and were cast into the burning fiery furnace." It would seem that *karb'lath'hōn* was either not in the text before the translator or was omitted by him. The latter hypothesis seems a hazardous one to adopt without good ground. We have no reason to accuse the Septuagint translator of this practice. Theodotion also presents signs of omission. קרבלת is not translated, but simply transliterated, σαραβάποις. Under this word Schleusner says, "Vestis Medica seu Baby-

lonica ad genus pertingens." Aquila, it may be noted, also transliterates, σαρδβαλλα. Theodotion's rendering is, "Then those men were bound in their coats (?), and hats, and hosen, and were cast into the midst of the burning fiery furnace." The Peshitta does as Theodotion, and transliterates with the change of a *shin* for a *samech* in regard to the first word, and instead of *l'boosheen*, "garments," has *qoobe'een*, which is rendered by Castelli *pileus*, or *galea*, a "military cap," or a "helmet." He wrongly says that *qoob'o* is used to translate *karb'lath'hōn*; the word used for that is *nitho*. We need not go into a discussion of the various garments named here. It is to be observed that, by the time of the Septuagint and the original of the version edited and revised by Theodotion, the meaning of the terms was lost—a thing hardly possible on the critical supposition that the date of Daniel is B.C. 168, if, as seems necessary to suppose from the Greek prologue to Ecclesiasticus, it was already translated into Greek by, at latest, B.C. 130. The point brought out by these garments being mentioned is in order to show the power of God manifested on them. They were all of an inflammable material, therefore emphasis was given to the miracle by this. But, further, it shows they were taken as they were, without opportunity of putting on any specially medicated robes, if such could be imagined (but see *Longman's*, August, 1894, reference to Basil Thomson's 'South Sea Yarns').

Vers. 22, 23.—**Therefore because the king's commandment was urgent, and the furnace exceeding hot, the flame of the fire slew those men that took up Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego. And these three men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, fell down bound into the midst of the burning fiery furnace.** The rendering of the Greek versions seems to have suffered from the interpolation of the Song of the Three Holy Children—the verses before us have been altered to prepare for the introduction of the song. The LXX. translates as follows: "Since the king's command was urgent, and the furnace heated sevenfold more than it had previously been, the men who had been appointed, when they had bound them and brought them forward to the furnace, cast them in. Then the flame which blazed in the furnace came forth and slew the men who had bound those about Azarias, but they themselves were preserved." Theodotion renders, "Since the word of the king was urgent, and the furnace was excessively heated, and these three men fell down bound into the burning fiery furnace, and they fell into the midst of the furnace, and walked about, singing praises to God,

blessing the Lord." There is nothing here, it may be noted, about those that bound the three friends being slain; there is also to be noted the addition, "walking about and singing praises to God and blessing the Lord." The Peshitta also suffers, though to a less degree. The rendering with it is, "Therefore the king's commandment was urgent, and the furnace blazed exceedingly, and slew the men who accused Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego. And these three men, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, fell bound into the midst of the furnace of great fire." Here a marvel is added, not those that threw the Hebrews into the fire were burnt, but their accusers. We must discuss separately the Song of the Three Holy Children. The furnace implied is one filled from above, but having a doorway at the side. The witnesses for the truth of monotheism and of the supreme Godhead of Jehovah were carried to the top of this furnace, and cast in amongst the fuel. We have nothing to do with how the miracle of their preservation was accomplished, we have only to do with the narrative as given. The fact that those who carried them and threw them in were killed gives proof positive of the fierceness of the heat. The fact stated in the twenty-third verse, that they fell into the midst of the furnace, excludes any supposition that they escaped by being sheltered from the fierceness of the heat. Separating the two portions of the apocryphal addition to this chapter, the song of Azarias from the united song of the three, we have a statement that "the angel of the Lord came down into the oven together with Azarias and his fellows, and smote the flame of the fire out of the oven, and made the midst as it had been a moist whistling wind; so that the fire touched them not at all, neither hurt nor troubled them."¹ This abundance of detail as to the method by which the miracle was wrought is evidence of a later time. We shall, however, leave the discussion of the date of this addition till later.

Ver. 24.—Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished, and rose up in haste, and spake, and said unto his counsellors, Did not we cast three men bound into the midst of the fire? They answered and said unto the king, True, O king. The Greek versions suffer in this verse also from the interpolation of the song. The LXX. renders thus: "And it was when the king heard them singing praises, and stood and saw them living, then was Nebuchadnezzar the king astonished and rose up hastily and said to his friends,

Did we not cast three men into the fire bound? and they said to the king, Truly, O king." Theodotion does not seriously differ from this, "And Nebuchadnezzar heard them singing praises, and marvelled, and rose up in haste, and said to his lords, Did we not cast three men into the midst of the fire, bound? and they answered, Truly, O king." The Peshitta rendering is, "Then Nebuchadnezzar the king was astonished, and rose up trembling, and answered and said to his princes, Were there not three men which we cast into the midst of the furnace of fierce fire and bound? and they answered the king, It is true, O king." As will be seen, the Peshitta varies less from the Massoretic than do the Greek versions. The Vulgate does not merit remark. The action of the king is introduced abruptly in the Massoretic text. This abruptness was probably the occasion of the interpolations made at this point. It may be observed that the interpolations—notwithstanding the efforts of redactors to soften the transition—all add to the difficulty. Theodotion has them immediately walking and praising God. The Septuagint translator, though he omits the walking, implies the praising. We are to understand the circumstances as of the nature of an *auto-da-fé*, which Nebuchadnezzar was gracing with his presence, much as Philip II. attended the burning of the heretics in Madrid. The refusal of worship to the god to whom he had erected the golden image was an act not only of heresy, but also of treason of the blackest kind. The word *haddab'reen*, translated "councillors," is derived by some from the Persian *hamdavar* (Behrmann and v. Bohlen). Gesenius would derive it from דָּבַר, "to do," hence "leaders;" he explains the first syllable of the Hebrew article. The first interpretation is impossible, as is well shown by Bevan (*in loco*). The supposition of Gesenius is difficult to maintain, as it involves a passage from one language to another. Moses Stuart regards the noun as derived from the aphe, אָפֵה appearing instead of א. This is not without parallel examples, e.g. אֶפְרַיִם. Fuller's parallel of *apalu* used along with *pal* for "son" in Assyrian, shows a habit of introducing initial syllables to help pronunciation. The Septuagint translator probably read *hab'reen*; hence the rendering φῖλαοι. In the uncertainty as to the meaning of the word, the reading of the LXX. may be regarded as at least a possible way out of the difficulty. Some further discoveries, either in Babylon or elsewhere, may enable us to decide. The presence along with the king, at this execution, of the high officials of the empire, was fitted to give it all the solemnity of an

¹ We here follow the received translation of the Apocrypha as found in our English Bible.

"act of faith," but at the same time, their presence gave a signal meaning to the miracle.

Ver. 25.—He answered and said, Lo, I see four men loose, walking in the midst of the fire, and they have no hurt; and the form of the fourth is like the Son of God. The Greek versions do not present much worthy of note, only both insert *malcha*, "king," instead of the pronoun, and omit "answered." From the fact that ver. 24 ends with *malcha*, it may have been dropped out of the Massoretic text. The insertion of *malcha* ("na), "answered," may be due to the frequent recurrence of this phrase. The Peshitta omits "four," otherwise agreeing with the Massoretic. The phrase, "the Son of God," is clearly wrong; the correct translation is, "The appearance of the fourth is like a son of the gods." Along with the three victims of his superstition was seen a fourth figure, like one of the figures portrayed on his palace walls as belonging to the demi-gods. This is the culmination of the king's astonishment. It was astonishing to see those men loose that had been cast into the furnace bound; still more so to see them walking, and none showing signs of having received any hurt; but most awe-inspiring of all is the vision of the fourth figure, like a son of the gods. We must not interpret this on Hebrew lines, as does Mr. Bevan, and comp. Gen. vi. 2. He knows the usage in the Targums is to retain the Hebrew plural in "when 'God' is meant, as in the Peshitta Version of the passage he refers to. As in most heathen mythologies, there were not only gods, but demi-gods, of several different classes. The god Nebuchadnezzar specially worshipped, Siliak-Moulou-ki (Marduk), was regarded as the son of Hea. There was a god of fire also, who was associated with these. The suggestion of Dr. Fuller, that here in *bar* we have not the word for "son," but rather a truncated form of this god of fire, *Iz-bar*, is worthy of consideration. It is impossible to say whether this vision of a divine being was vouchsafed to those standing about Nebuchadnezzar as well as to himself. While we ought to guard against ascribing to the Babylonian monarch the idea that this appearance was that of the Second Person of the Christian Trinity, we are ourselves at liberty to maintain this, or to hold that it was an angel who strengthened these servants of God in the furnace. The Septuagint renders *bar-elohem* by *εγγυλος*. Theodotion has *υἱὸς θεοῦ*.

Ver. 26.—Then Nebuchadnezzar came near to the mouth of the burning fiery furnace, and spake and said, Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, ye servants of the Most High God, come forth and come hither. Then Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, came forth of the

midst of the fire. The variations of the Septuagint Version here are inconsiderable. Instead of "spake and said," it renders, "called them by name," and omits the second repetition of the names, and the pleonastic "come hither;" instead of "Most High God," it has "God of gods Most High." Theodotion is in closer agreement with the Massoretic text; the only difference is that "spake" is omitted. The Peshitta and Vulgate are in exact accordance with the Massoretic. The distinction between *bar* and *malcha* is "go out" and "come." It is well rendered in our Authorized Version, only there was no need of "hither" being put in *italica*. As above mentioned, this shows the form of the furnace to be not unlike our own—open at the top, but having a door at the side. It was to this side door that the king approached. The fact that Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges Jehovah to be "Most High God" does not imply any recognition of his supreme Divinity, any more than a king of France acknowledged the supremacy of the head of the Holy Roman Empire, when in the credentials of his ambassador the emperor was called *Dominus urbis et orbis*. It was simply a matter of what we may call religious etiquette to address gods of the higher class as "god of gods," and "god most high." In ch. ii. 47 Nebuchadnezzar had already declared the God of Daniel to be "God of gods." It is not impossible that to the Babylonians *'illa'a* might have the appearance of a proper name.

Ver. 27.—And the princes, governors, and captains, and the king's counsellors, being gathered together, saw these men, upon whose bodies the fire had no power, nor was an hair of their head singed, neither were their coats changed, nor the smell of fire had passed on them. The versions present no variation of importance. We can, however, at this point compare the list of officials with that which we find in the beginning of this chapter, in vers. 2 and 3. We find that the word *haddab'reen* occupies the same place in the list as *g'dab'reen*, translated "treasurer," from which one might be inclined to think that *h* had taken the place of *g*, not an impossible change. The probability rather is that the word is to be regarded as collective, equivalent to "officials of the court," to save the repetition of the remaining classes. Whether or not these officials had seen the companion the three witnesses for the truth had with them in the furnace, they, at all events, were now able to bear testimony to the fact that the three friends had escaped, and "had quenched the violence of the fire" (Heb. xi. 34). This event was all the more important to the Babylonians as to them fire was a god high in the pantheon. The God of

Israel was thus manifested as so much greater than Iz-bar, that he could deliver his servants even when in the very element in which Iz-bar had his power. The fact that even their "coats"—whatever these garments were—were not burned, and not even a hair singed, while the cords that had been used to bind them were consumed, emphasizes their deliverance, and shows it to be the work of a higher power, who could discriminate and limit the deliverance. The cords were consumed, but the garments of his servants were preserved even from the smell of fire. The Babylonians had conquered the city of Jehovah, had burned his temple, and had done this through the power of Marduk, so they thought; but here Bel-Marduk had been openly defied by three worshippers of Jehovah. They had been hurled into the very element of Iz-bar, the servant and ally of Marduk, yet fire had been unable to harm them or vindicate the honour of Bel-Marduk. What emphasized this was that the fire that spared the servants of Jehovah slew the votaries of Bel-Marduk, who were eager to show their reverence for Marduk by carrying these Jehovah-worshippers to the furnace. Such a miracle, so wrought before all the high dignitaries of the Babylonian Empire, would go far to take the edge off any taunting reference to the weakness of Jehovah's Godhead as demonstrated by the ruins of Jerusalem. Jehovah had shown himself as the supreme Revealer of secrets when he enabled Daniel to tell Nebuchadnezzar his dream. He now manifested himself as Master of the most powerful of elements—fire. The Jews could thus maintain their faith unchallenged.

Ver. 28.—Then Nebuchadnezzar spake, and said, Blessed be the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, who hath sent his angel, and delivered his servants that trusted in him, and have changed the king's word, and yielded their bodies, that they might not serve nor worship any god, except their own God. The Septuagint and Peshitta, instead of "changed the king's word," have "despised the king's word," reading, *ἠῶ*, "to despise," instead of *ἠῶ*, "to change." Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic, as otherwise do the other two versions. We may regard this as the beginning of the royal decree revoking practically that previously promulgated, omitting only the statement of the titles of the monarch. The wording is somewhat peculiar, "Blessed be their God—of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego." It may indicate that some words in the immediate context have been omitted; in other words, that the editor, in quoting the decree, has endeavoured, as far as possible, to condense

without changing the words of the document. Bertholdt is mistaken in maintaining that this declaration is that the God of the three Hebrews is worthy of being blessed. All that Nebuchadnezzar acknowledges in this verse is that Jehovah really exists—that he is powerful, and the Hebrews did right to continue in the worship of their national God. We find that the *bar-eloheem* of ver. 25 is now regarded by Nebuchadnezzar as an angel, or, as we ought rather to translate it, "messenger." We have no need to import Hebrew ideas into the declaration of the Babylonian monarch. It was quite in accordance with his mythological notions that a great God like the God of the Hebrews might have a messenger, who was his instrument in the deliverance of his servants. The reading of the Massoretic, "changed," is to be preferred to "despised." To one like Nebuchadnezzar, stiff to obstinacy in his opinions, for anything to compel him to change not only his opinions, but more, to alter a decree, was a strange thing, and a thing that he would think worthy of chronicling. At the same time, he might feel it needed a justification. On the other hand, such a one as Nebuchadnezzar would not advertise the fact that any one had "despised" his "word." It is to be observed that Nebuchadnezzar recognizes not only the deliverance as an evidence of the truth of Jehovah's Divinity, but also the willingness with which his servants were ready to offer their bodies to be burnt. The evidence that compelled Nebuchadnezzar to acknowledge the might of Jehovah was the same in essence as that which converted the Roman Empire. Still, we must again repeat Nebuchadnezzar recognized in Jehovah only the God of the Jews, and in the faithfulness of the three Hebrews only a species of religious patriotism, which he could at once understand and respect without having the slightest belief in monotheism, or even comprehension of such a notion.

Ver. 29.—Therefore I make a decree, That every people, nation, and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill; because there is no other God that can deliver after this sort. The versions agree with the Massoretic text here, only that all put the crime, "speaking anything amiss," more strongly than we find it in the Massoretic recension. *הָו* is amended by the Massoretic to *הָו*, "erroneous," whereas the Septuagint renders, *ὅς ἐν βλασφημίᾳ*. Theodotion, *ἡ* (agreeing with *γλωσσᾶ*) *ἐν εἰρη βλασφημίαν*. The Peshitta renders *ܕܢ*, "to blaspheme." Hit

zig has suggested that the K'tib here is to be preferred to the Q'ri, maintaining that *לֵב* means "word," while *לֵב* really means "inadvertence." Certainly, if we were sure that the meaning he gives to *לֵב* is correct, and the versions all support it, we would give the preference to it. It has, however, to be borne in mind that, in the notions of heathenism, intentional disrespect was not taken into consideration in regard to the gods. The intention of the worshipper was of very little moment in such a matter; he might even desire to be specially respectful to the deity he worshipped; but if, by inadvertence, he omitted something, or did something which was not according to rule, all the good will and respect in his mind was nothing—the wrath of the insulted deity was poured out in full measure, unless some other deity regarded the action in question as specially honouring to him. It was the external action—the mere form of words—that was the important matter with the polytheist. Idolatry is by its very nature a mental and moral disease; it is as absurd to expect logically concatenated actions from an idol-worshipper in regard to his deities, as to expect the same from a madman in regard to his craze. We must guard against imagining that the decree was against blasphemy as a crime against Jehovah. Primarily it was against words that, by exciting the wrath of Jehovah, might bring down damage on the empire. Nebuchadnezzar was not jealous for the honour of Jehovah, but for the safety of the Babylonian supremacy. The punishment threatened, it may be observed, is the same as that decreed against the wise men because of their failure to tell the dream and its interpretation. In regard to this, in ch. ii. 5 the Septuagint renders the phrase, "Ye shall be made an example of, and your goods shall be escheat to the king's treasury." This change, as we maintained, was due to a difference of reading, not to any objection to the harshness of the phrase. The object of the punishment here was to remove utterly from the earth the wrong-doer and every remembrance of him, so that the offended deity might have no excuse for visiting the kingdom of Babylon with judgments. The reason, "because there is no other god that can deliver after this sort," is not to be stretched too far. All that is asserted is that no other god has been able to deliver his worshippers out of the very realm of the god of fire, and therefore it is to be argued that his power of offence is as great; hence all are to avoid enraging him; out there is no worship enjoined. The Lapid princes, when Jerusalem was in their hands, ordered sacrifices to be offered on their behalf daily. Nebuchadnezzar does

nothing of this sort; his decree is simply negative.

Ver. 30.—Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, in the province of Babylon. The Septuagint renders here, "Thus, then, the king gave authority to Shadrach, Meshach, and Abed-nego, and appointed them to be rulers over the whole province." There seems to have been a slight difference of reading, probably *hashlayt* instead of *hatzlah*, and *le'kol m'dee-ash* instead of *la'mdeanath Babel*. It seems difficult to decide which of these two readings is the preferable; perhaps, on the whole, the Massoretic is the simpler. The version of Theodotus is considerably interpolated, "Then the king promoted Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego in the province of Babylon, and made them great, and reckoned them worthy to have authority over all the Jews in his kingdom." The first portion agrees with the Massoretic text and with the LXX. in sense; but the last clause is a much later addition. The Peshitta agrees with the Massoretic. The exact meaning of *hatzlah* is "to make glad," "to give rewards to," and therefore is in no conflict with the Massoretic recension of the concluding verse of the preceding chapter, "And Daniel requested of the king, and he set Shadrach, Meshach, and Abednego, over the affairs of the province of Babylon." It is to be observed that in the deuterio-Isaiah (xliii. 2) there seems to be a reference to this event, "When thou walkest through the fire, thou shalt not be burned, neither shall the flame kindle upon thee." The deliverance from Egypt, and the passage of the Red Sea and the entrance into Canaan, and the passage of the Jordan, are referred to in the first part of this verse, "When thou passest through the waters, I will be with thee, and through the rivers, they shall not overflow thee." It certainly is but natural to suppose that the deliverance of the three Hebrews from the furnace of Nebuchadnezzar is the historical reference of the latter.

Excursus on the Song of the Three Holy Children.

When the student of the apocryphal addition to the Book of Daniel passes from the consideration of Susanna and the Elders, and Bel and the Dragon, with their manifold absurdities and manifest tokens of a Greek origin, to that of the Song of the Three Holy Children, he feels he has come into a different atmosphere. He has not done more than casually perused the whole of the composition called "The Song of the Three Holy Children,"

when he discovers it is in two distinct portions. The whole structure of the two songs indicates a Hebrew origin. The character of the two divisions is quite different. The first is intercessory, and it proceeds from one person; the second is liturgic, and purports to be the joint expression of the feelings of all three. In both there are manifold echoes of earlier psalms. In some cases the phrases are imitated, in other cases adopted with some slight modifications. At the same time, there are in neither portion any obvious tokens of Greek origin, such as may be found in the Story of Susanna, with its play on words which hold only in Greek, or in its Greek views of history as seen in the Story of Bel and the Dragon. When the examples of translation from Hebrew were so numerous as they were by the time that Ben Sira came down to Egypt, and when the translators had by common consent adopted a special style, it cannot be denied that not only could a cento of phrases from the Greek version of the Hebrew Psalter have been formed, but also the style might be imitated, even when the words and sentiments were original. Still, as the aim and ambition of the Jews in Egypt were rather to show the close resemblance there was between the works of the fathers of their race and the sages of Greece, the imitative activity of the Jewish literary *falsarii* was directed more to that than to suggest merely a Hebrew original for what they had composed. We have no indubitable instance of psalms being composed in Greek in imitation of the translation of the Psalms of the original Psalter. We have certainly the psalms which go to form the Psalter of Solomon; but these are generally admitted to have been composed in Hebrew, and translated from that into Greek. However, there would still be a dubiety. The only way is to examine this song, or rather these songs, to see whether they contain any traces of being translations from Hebrew originals.

As a basis of investigation, we have the two Greek and the Peshitta versions. In a subordinate position we have the Vulgate and the version of Paulus Tellenensis. The first thing that one observes, on a casual comparison of the two Greek versions, is that they are much more nearly related, and resemble each other much more closely in regard to these songs, than they do in regard to the rest of the book. The resemblance of the Peshitta to both is also close, but yet there are points of difference.

If we take the introductory sentence, we see considerable variation, greater than occurs elsewhere. The Septuagint begins thus: "Then Azarias stood and prayed

thus, and having opened his mouth, confessed to the Lord with his companions in the midst of the fire, made by the Chaldeans to burn exceedingly, and said." Theodotion is simpler—we give the ordinary rendering, "Then Azarias stood up and prayed on this manner, and opening his mouth in the midst of the fire, said." The Peshitta is, "And Azariah arose and opened his mouth to bless in the midst of the fire, and he opened his mouth and prayed, and said thus." All these versions have the appearance of being a union of two versions of the same thing. In the Syriac this is most obvious. In the Greek versions the evidence of reduplication is afforded by *ōtras* occurring in the middle of the sentence, instead of naturally at the end, to introduce the speech referred to. In the Syriac, which avoids this, it is evidenced even more by the repetition of the verb *pethah*, "to open." But this reduplication of versions implies an original of which there were already two readings.

A similar phenomenon is presented by the opening verse of the Song of Azariah. As rendered by the LXX. it is, "Blessed art thou, O Lord God of our fathers, and thy Name is worthy to be praised and glorified for evermore." Theodotion, in the reading preferred by Tischendorf, has *aiverōs* agreeing with *Θεός*. The Peshitta has changed the order, "to be exalted and praised is thy Name for ever." The "and" present in the two Greek versions is wanting. In the next verse the Septuagint renders, "Thou art righteous in all that thou hast done to us, and all thy works are true, and thy ways right, and all thy judgments are true." Theodotion omits "to us" in the first clause, and has in the last "truth" instead of "true." When we turn to the Peshitta, we find a reason for the resemblance of the second member of the second and fourth clauses. "Righteous art thou in all that thou hast done to us, and all thy works are in truth (*b'qooshtha*), and thy ways right, and all thy judgments are faithful (*m'heemin*)." In Hebrew, as in Syriac, this contrast could be maintained, but it was more difficult to the Hellenist, who had, perhaps, few words at his command. The following verse in the LXX. runs as follows: "Thou didst judgments of truth in regard to all that thou hast brought upon us, and upon thy holy city, the city of our fathers, because in truth and judgment didst thou all these things because of our sins." The only difference between Theodotion and this is the omission of *σου*, "thy." The Peshitta rendering does not evidence much difference from that of the Greek versions, "Because in judgment of truth was what thou didst to us, and in all that thou

hast brought upon us and upon the holy city of our fathers, upon Jerusalem, because in righteousness (*b'e'anotha*) didst thou bring upon us all these things." We shall only take the next verse, and shall conclude the verse-by-verse examination of the Song of Azariah. The rendering of the Seventy bears traces of being translated from a Shemitic dialect by one who had not a large vocabulary in Greek. "Because we sinned in all things and transgressed to turn aside from thee, and we sinned in all things, and the commandments of thy Law we obeyed not, neither observed, nor did we according as thou didst command us, in order that it should be well with us." Theodotion is exactly the same. The Peshitta is different, "Because we are debtors of sin (*hoobin d'hitin*), and wicked before thee, and have removed far from thee, and have done against thy words, and have sinned against thee in all things, and to thy precepts have not hearkened, and did not keep them, and have not done anything which thou commandedst, to be well to us." The sense here is evidently the same, but there has been a difference, if not of text, at least of apprehension of one and the same text. The Syriac could not have been made from the Greek, nor the Greek from the Syriac; they must have had a common source. It would be impossible to say with absolute certainty that this source must have been Hebrew; but the probability is in that direction. Aramaic does not so naturally lend itself to poetry as does Hebrew. Whatever poetry we have by Jewish authors in pre-Christian times which is not in Greek, has been in Hebrew.

That being settled, at all events conditionally, the next point is to examine the songs, and see whether they give any evidence in their contents of the background. In the first place, in regard to the Song of Azariah, if we take for granted that it was written in Hebrew, it follows almost necessarily from this that it was composed in Palestine. The next question that requires to be considered is the object of the composition. Was it intended to be placed here? was it written up to this situation? or was it written for some other purpose, and placed here simply because some one thought it suited? The first thing bearing on this question which we observe is the names which these three Hebrews bear. In the Aramaic part which belongs to the Massoretic Daniel, they are called by their Babylonian names; in this portion their old Hebrew names are revived from the first chapter. That of itself is an indication that this portion has not been written for the place into which it has been put. Further, if this first psalmic fragment

had been written for this place, it would have been put in the mouth of Hananiah. The arrangement of the names in Hebrew may have been merely according to the Hebrew alphabet, but instinctively one gives the first-named a certain precedence. Hence in the Peshitta this is called, "The prayer of *Hananiah* and his companions." For the choice of Azariah instead, there must have been a reason. The simplest reason would seem to be that already there was a sacred hymn extant written by a certain Azariah, and some later editor, seeing this, and knowing that there was an Azariah here, he gave him the credit of it, and as this event was the crisis of his history, declared it to have been composed in reference to this event. Azariah was rather a common name among the Jews; there are eighteen instances of it chronicled in Smith's 'Dictionary of the Bible.' It is certainly not so common after the Captivity, yet there was a captain in the Maccabean army called by this name, as above mentioned.

When we direct our attention to the song itself, we find what confirms us in our conclusions—that it was not written for this place, but was written as the natural expression of feelings produced by circumstances widely different from those narrated in the chapter before us. If we compare this with the prayer of Daniel, which we find in ch. ix., we see the difference emphasized between circumstances of captives in Babylon and those presupposed by the Song of Azariah. If we turn to the thirteenth and fourteenth verses of the song (vers. 37, 38), "For we, O Lord, are become less than any nation, and be kept under this day in all the world because of our sins. Neither is there at this time prince, or prophet, or leader, or burnt offering, or sacrifice, or oblation, or incense, or place to sacrifice before thee, and to find mercy," It will be noticed that the diminishing of the numbers of the nation, or the restriction of its territory, and the humiliating position it was placed in, is the point of Azariah's complaint. Daniel's sorrow is that they are driven to other countries: *קל-האזרח*, "in all the countries whither thou hast driven them." In the first case, we have a nation humiliated in their own land; in the second, a nation sent into certain definite countries, and there reproached with having no country or capital. Again, it is said in the hymn before us, "There is neither prince, nor prophet, nor leader." It is to be noted that the word here is "prince," not "king" (*nasi*, not *melek*). In the original Hebrew there was probably a play on the words

lo-nas' v'lo-nab', "neither prince nor prophet." As a matter of fact, in the period of Daniel, prophecy had not ceased, and all through the times of Jewish history it was known that there had been prophets during the time of the Exile. There was, at all events, Ezekiel by the river Chebar, and even if we take the date of the Septuagint for the inauguration of this golden image, and say that it was the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar, Jeremiah was still living and prophesying. As for "princes," they were still in Jerusalem, if we reckon the eighteenth year strictly, but if we regard it as counted according to the Babylonian reckoning, and therefore that Jerusalem had already fallen, there were still "princes," although captives. Moreover, Coniah was still living, the former king, as also was Zedekiah. If we turn to Daniel, he declares the reason of the fall of Jerusalem and of the captivity of the people—because kings and princes and people had refused to hearken to the word of the Lord as spoken by the prophets. Daniel implies the existence of prophets, princes, and kings, if not absolutely necessarily in the actual present, yet in the immediate past, which, historically genuine or not, fits the setting. In the Song of Azariah there is no reference to a king; there is reference to "a prince" (*nab'*, not *sar*, which is usually "one of many"). In confirmation of this, there is not only the play on the words, if it is *nab'*, but also the fact that the word used in both Greek versions is *ἄρχων*, which is the most common representation of *nab'* in the Septuagint.¹ This was the title of the head of the Sanhedrin, and borne usually by the high priest. It may also be noted that, while "sacrifices" and "offerings" are mentioned as having ceased, there is no mention of "priests." If this song was written at a time when the "prince" was the head of the priests, this omission would be explicable. Taking this as our guide, we should fix the date of the composition of the Song of Azariah at a time when the high priesthood was in abeyance, that is, during the Maccabean struggle, from the time when Epiphanes definitely desecrated the temple till its reconsecration by Judas Maccabeus. When we look at the state of the temple as implied in this Song of Azariah as compared with the prayer of

Daniel, Daniel speaks of the sanctuary being a desolation, and by connection it is implied Jerusalem was a desolation also; but in the song before us there is no place for sacrifice or offering. The Jews are excluded from the temple, there is no place allowed them there, but the place itself is not a desolation.

If, again, we turn to the eighth verse of the Song of Azariah, we find still further evidences of the external circumstances in which it was composed. "And thou didst deliver us into the hands of lawless enemies, most hateful forsakers of God, and to an unjust king, and the most wicked in all the world." The two Greek versions are here in absolute agreement; the Syriac here, as elsewhere, presents signs of its independent origin, "And thou hast delivered us into the hands of lords of enmity, evil men who are far from thee, and the habitation of a wicked kingdom, the most miserable in all the earth." The structure of the latter half of this indicates, as it seems to us, that something has been misunderstood in the original document. Some word meaning "unto the power of" has been interpreted as being "dwelling-place," that necessitated the change of "king" to "kingdom." If we then assume the Greek versions to be correct, we find a state of things exactly fitting the period we have suggested above. The mode of speaking of their oppressor—"an unjust king, the most wicked in all the earth"—is quite unlike anything in the Old Testament. When Hezekiah prays to God to be delivered from the power of Sennacherib, although he had reproached the living God, he does not declare that he is wicked. Sennacherib is denounced as proud and cruel, but not as wicked. That would imply a certain amount of godlessness, of which none of the Assyrian monarchs could be accused, and least of all could Nebuchadnezzar. Such a statement is in complete antagonism to the character given to Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel. It was by no means an unnatural description of Epiphanes. He seems to have had no belief in deities of any kind. His persecution of the Jews had in all likelihood a motive either of policy or of vengeance. Nebuchadnezzar had never attempted to persecute religion in the ordinary sense of the word. The officials of his court he might and did expect to follow him in worship.

Another thing to be observed is those that have turned away from God—*ἀποστατών*—*rheegeen* in the Peshitta. There were certainly many "apostates" at the time of the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, but they were not apostates to the deities of Babylon. The "other gods" the Israelites

¹ In the Peshitta the word is more general, *rosh*, "head," and there is no reference to prophet in the balancing clause; but *shaleet*, "ruler," occurs, and *nab'*, "prophet," follows, balanced by *m'daborno*, "leader"—an additional evidence of the independence of the Syriac version of this song.

were prone to worship were those of the nations around them. This apostasy was not connected with any treasonable submission to the Babylonian princes. So far as we can deduce the politics of the period from the prophecies of Jeremiah, the idolatrous party were patriotic so far as their resistance to Babylon was concerned, though they were always prone to coquet with Egypt. In the case before us, the enemies into whose hands the saints came were "apostates." If, however, we turn to the First Book of Maccabees i. 43, we find that "many also of the Israelites consented to his (Epiphanes') religion, and sacrificed unto idols, and profaned the sabbath." When we turn to 2 Maccabees, if we may trust it, we find that Jason, having purchased the high priesthood, encouraged Hellenic customs, and even sent money to Tyre for a sacrifice to Melkarth. These gave entrance to Epiphanes, and supported him in his cruelties. We can readily understand how a zealous Jew of the Maccabean time would regard these "apostates" as greater enemies than the heathen followers of Epiphanes.

So far as we know, right down from shortly after the return from the Exile on to the period of the domination of the Seleucids, the high priest was *nasi* and head of the people. After the Maccabean period until the Herodian period, the head of the people was the high priest. At the death of Herod the Great, the former relationship was resumed. Even during the reign of Herod there was a prince, in the shape of the king. The mention of a prince, without any mention of a king, excludes all after John Hyrcanus. The assertion that there was no longer a prince, shuts off all the period after Judas Maccabæus had assumed the high priesthood. We are thus led by another line to fix the date of this Song of Azariah as being the heart of the Maccabean period.

The following verse bears its own testimony to the date we have seen reason to fix on above. The Greek versions are at one here, and give the verse, "And now we cannot open our mouths, we are become a shame and a reproach to thy servants, and to them that worship thee." The Syriac has a slight difference in the first clause, "It is not for us to open our mouth before thee." This, however, does not affect the main reference of the verse. The meaning of the verse is that the widespread apostasy of the people made them a reproach and a shame to those who served the Lord and feared him elsewhere. The only time coincident with great persecution and consequent apostasy, when there were large communities fearing the Lord who might be scandalized by the apostasy of the Palestinian Jews, was

the Maccabean period, when there was the huge Jewish community of Babylonia, and the equally huge community of Egypt and Cyreno, not to speak of lesser and only lesser communities in Asia Minor. We venture, then, from all these grounds, to assume that this composition is to be dated as belonging to the Maccabean struggle.

The liturgical song put in the mouths of all three has nothing to fix its date by. Close examination seems to show that it may have been written for the occasion. A Jew of later times might easily occupy his mind in imagining what would be a likely form a song of praise would take in the mouths of men so situated. Looked at in this light, it on the whole deserves some commendation. If these martyrs did sing, of which there is not a single word in the genuine text of Daniel, it would naturally be a psalm. If they did not take the hundred and thirty-sixth, with its liturgic refrain, then something modelled on it would certainly be their song. Diffuse as this song is, there is a sense of ecstasy in it which suits the mood of martyrs raised by Divine indwelling above pain or fear of death. This seems to have been the original addition, because the twenty-second verse of this portion (ver. 46 in the continuous versification of the Vulgate and Septuagint) suits the state of matters mentioned in ver. 21 of the chapter. In fact, it seems an amplified and exaggerated version of the twenty-second verse. The Song of Azariah, therefore, is probably an insertion of later date than the interpolation of the joint song. Although its insertion is of later date, it not improbably had been composed for some time before its insertion.

Those connecting verses—the forty-sixth to the fiftieth, according to the Vulgate—have come to us in three different versions. The version of the LXX. is the longest, "The guards of the king who threw them into the fiery furnace, ceased not causing the furnace to burn (*καλοῦντες τὴν κέμινον*), and when they threw the three once for all into the furnace, and the furnace was very fiery on account of the sevenfold heat: and when they cast them in, those who cast them in were above them; but those from beneath them fed the furnace with naphtha, tow, pitch, and small wood. And the flames of the furnace went up forty-nine cubits, and it passed through and burnt up those of the Chaldeans whom it found about the furnace. And an angel of the Lord descended into the furnace along with Azariah and his companions, and smote the flame of fire out of the furnace, and caused in the midst of the furnace as it were a moist whistling wind; and the fire did not at all touch them, or grieve or trouble them." The

version of Theodotion is shorter by this—that it does not give the relative situation of those who threw the three Hebrews into the furnace, and those who fed it with fuel. The Syriac Version is on the whole in closer agreement with Theodotion, but has a different account of the fuel thrown in, and also mentions that the accusers were devoured. The forty-ninth verse, in the Peshitta, differs considerably from the other versions, “Then the angel of the dew descended with Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael into the midst of the furnace of fire.” The rest of the passage agrees, as we have said, with Theodotion, but the differences are sufficient to prove a difference of origin. It is to be observed that the three names are given in their Hebrew form, but in a different order from that in which they occur in the first chapter—a fact that gives greater plausibility to the view stated above, that when the Song of the Three Hebrews was originally interpolated, the Song of Azariah was not inserted.

When we go on to the song of the three, and look at it somewhat closely, there are what appear to be traces of a process. From the fifty-second verse to the fifty-sixth inclusive in all the versions, we find the Deity addressed. “Blessed art thou,” is the beginning of each verse; and the second portion of each verse concludes with, “to be praised and glorified art thou for ever;” or, as the Syriac renders it, “to be praised art thou and to be exalted art thou for ever.” The following portion of the song is an address to all living creatures to praise God—each verse beginning, “Bless the Lord,” and concludes, “Praise and exalt his Name for ever.” If this difference may be regarded as intimating a difference of origin, the second is the feebler and more diffuse, and therefore likely to be the secondary formation.

We do not need to go over this with any

degree of care. The differences mainly consist in transpositions of the successive liturgic summonings. On the whole, the Septuagint is the longer.

The phenomena before us have a certain bearing on the question of the date of Daniel. If we are correct in our assumption of the date of the Song of Azariah, then its exclusion from the canonical Daniel—written as it almost certainly was in Palestine, and composed in the Hebrew or Aramaic tongue—proves the canon to have been fixed at an earlier date, and, by implication, places Daniel at least as far back as that earlier date, and shows that it then was commonly known, and consequently disposes of the Maccabean origin of Daniel. Further, in the passage in 1 Macc. ii. 59, where the dying Mattathias exhorts his sons to valour, he refers to the deliverance of the three from the furnace, and calls them by their Hebrew names. This affords a strong presumption that at the time, at all events, when First Maccabees was written, the song of the three was not infrequently added to the canonical Book of Daniel. We can try among ourselves to see how many associate the incident of the fiery furnace with the names of Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah, compared with those who recall it, when we mention the Babylonian names Shadrach, Meshech, and Abed-nego. If we could affirm that this gives us the very words used by the dying priest, we could then place the date of this song back as far as B.C. 200; but not to press this, the First Book of Maccabees must have been written not later than B.C. 100. Then at that time the Book of Daniel had been so popular and had enjoyed such a vogue that there had already been added to it at least the germ of this song. This addition must have been made so long before that it too had become popular. It will be very difficult to imagine that all these processes could have taken place between B.C. 168 and B.C. 100.

HOMILETICS.

Ver. 6.—“*The burning fiery furnace.*” I. IT IS SINFUL TO COMPLY WITH RELIGIOUS ORDINANCES WHICH ARE INCONSISTENT WITH OUR CONVICTIONS. The sin in the present instance would have been apparent, viz.: 1. Jews, who believed in a spiritual God, were invited to *idolatry*. This is the substitution of a material for the spiritual as an object of worship. To a spiritual man all compliance with religious forms in which it appears to him that material rites take the place of spiritual service, involves the same sin of idolatry (John iv. 24). 2. Jews, who worshipped a holy God, were invited to bow before the image of an *unholy* god. The character of the Babylonian divinities was immoral. To worship one of them was to do honour to immorality. Where there are morally degrading features of any religion—such as the use of indulgences and the confessional in the Church of Rome—association with that religion must endanger our moral character. 3. Men who had *no faith* in a false god were required to worship him. This would involve deceit. The guilt of an ignorant,

believing idolater would be as nothing beside that of one who bowed before the idol knowing it was a false god. No lies are worse than lies in religion. The first religious duty is—"be sincere." 4. Jews, believing in the *jealousy* of their God, were required to honour a rival deity. A heathen could worship a strange god, because he could find room in his pantheon for any number of divinities. To the Jew, the Eternal is the only God. God demands the sole worship of our hearts. We cannot give him divided allegiance (Josh. xxiv. 15; 1 Kings xviii. 21; Matt. vi. 24).

II. THE ATTEMPT TO ENFORCE RELIGIOUS UNIFORMITY BY VIOLENCE IS BOTH FOOLISH AND CRUEL. 1. It is *foolish*. Persecution can neither convince the intellect nor secure the allegiance of the affections. At most it can only secure external obedience and hypocritical devotion. Moreover, the attempt to determine the religious worship of men by authority, even if it could succeed, would only be justified on the assumption of infallibility on the part of the ruler. But political authorities have no monopoly of truth; therefore, as the persecutor is as likely to be in error as the persecuted, and as persecution never tends to secure real conviction, the resort to it is a proof of twofold folly. 2. It is also *cruel*. Nebuchadnezzar's fury was excited by the opposition of the three Jews, and he issued a most ferocious order for their destruction. Their conduct was regarded as doubly offensive—a rebellion against the king and an insult to his god. Thus religious motives are used to justify the grossest cruelty.

III. FIDELITY TO GOD IS REQUIRED OF US IRRESPECTIVE OF CONSEQUENCES. The three Jews did not need to avail themselves of Nebuchadnezzar's offer of a time for reflection. It is dangerous to parley with temptation. No allowance for circumstances, no excuses of casuistry, should confuse our conviction of the duty of fidelity to God. This is simple and certain. Faith in Providence, however, will strengthen us in the performance of the duty. The three Jews believed that God could deliver them (ver. 17), and therefore they trusted themselves to his care. God may require the absolute sacrifice of all we have; yet, in yielding him unconditional devotion, we may be assured that he will not forget us, nor allow us to suffer more than is necessary for the accomplishment of his will of love.

IV. GOD SOMETIMES BRINGS DELIVERANCE AT THE LAST EXTREMITY. 1. When he does not save us from falling into trouble he can *prevent* the trouble from really *hurting* us. God did not intervene to hinder the execution of the royal decree, but he delivered the three Jews from all harmful consequences of it. God does not save us from toil and sorrow and death, but his grace can take the sting and curse out of them. While leaving us in the world, he can protect us from the evil of it, and though, unlike the three Jews, we may suffer pain in the furnace of affliction, this may do us no harm, but rather work our highest good. 2. By *delivering us in trouble* rather than saving us from trouble, *God is most honoured and we are most blessed*. The issue of this incident was the declaration of the glory of God (vers. 28, 29), and the promotion of his faithful servants (ver. 30). It is better to be first tried and then saved than never to be in danger or trouble.

Ver. 16.—*Brave carelessness*. The three Jews set an example of unhesitating decision and fearless promptness, which may afford a wholesome lesson to us who live in the midst of the quibbling casuistry and timid expediency of a less simple age.

I. TO A HEALTHY CONSCIENCE THE DUTY OF FIDELITY TO GOD IS CLEAR AND UNQUESTIONABLE. The three Jews had no question as to their duty, nor any wish to reconsider their decision. It was clear and final. 1. *Doubt and mystery* are more concerned with the problems of merely *intellectual interest*. As we come to the region of morality, we find clearer light and firmer ground. God has given us a revelation which is plain as regards our duty, though it may be obscure on speculative points (Ps. cxix. 105). 2. The most *important* duties are the most *clear*. Sophistry may find some excuse for its perplexity among the intricacies of minor morality; but the nearer we approach the fundamental duties, the less room is there for uncertainty. The duty of fidelity to God is the greatest of all duties, and it is the duty about which there can be least question. 3. When *doubt* invades the *vital centres* of morality, this may generally be taken as a sign that the conscience is not in a *healthy state*. Such doubt is like colour-blindness or inability to discriminate between the most elementary

musical sounds. It argues a defective organ, because it is contrary to the general testimony of healthy experience. Therefore, while intellectual doubt may be blameless, moral doubt on questions of fundamental duty is a sign of moral depravity.

II. WHEN DUTY IS CLEAR, ACTION SHOULD BE PROMPT. Knowing their duty, the three Jews had no wish to delay the execution of it. 1. There is nothing which tends to *obscure the simple conviction* of duty so much as *hesitation in putting it into practice*. Such hesitation affords an opportunity for a false casuistry; it allows time for questions to arise which should never be thought of; it reacts on the conscience, and through the feeling of uncertainty in action tempts the mind to uncertainty in thought. 2. Every moment of *delay* in executing the decision of conscience *weakens the force* of that decision. The impulse of conscience is never so strong as when it is first clearly recognized. A neglected duty seems to admit of indefinite postponement, and thus the vigour of conscience is demoralized and dissipated. 3. When once we know our duty, it is *wrong to delay* the execution of it, even if we are sure we shall ultimately perform it. Tardy obedience is a sign of indifference. Earnest fidelity implies prompt action.

III. THERE IS NO NEED TO FEAR THE CONSEQUENCES WHEN WE ARE ON THE PATH OF DUTY. The three Jews were uncertain of the issue of their momentous decision. But the danger and mystery of the future did not daunt them. They had good grounds of assurance. 1. God will *deliver* his faithful servants from the greatest danger if it is *consistent with right* and the highest ends of goodness to do so. 2. Though his faithful servants may suffer for a time, God will assuredly see that *in the end they suffer no real harm* (Ps. xxxiv. 19; Matt. xix. 29; Rom. viii. 28). 3. At the worst it is *better to do right and suffer* than to do wrong and be at ease. Righteousness is better than happiness.

IV. THERE ARE TIMES WHEN IT IS BEST TO DO OUR DUTY WITHOUT ATTEMPTING TO EXPLAIN OR DEFEND IT. The three Jews thought it useless or needless to enter upon any defence of their conduct. They confessed their duty without hesitation, but they felt no need to prepare an answer to their enemies' accusation. There are times when a defence of our conduct is useless: 1. Because it would *not be understood*; because our motives of conduct may be unintelligible to those in whose power we are. 2. Because an *adverse decision* is *clearly decided on*, and will not be affected by any contrary reasons. These two considerations, no doubt, prompted our Lord to silence at his trial (Matt. xxvii. 14). 3. It sometimes *injures* our cause to *defend it*. An apology often suggests questions that were not previously thought of. It is often wisest simply to live down calumny by quiet persistence in what we believe to be right. Our first duty is to please God, not men.

Ver. 25.—*The Divine presence*. I. GOD IS WITH HIS PEOPLE IN THEIR TRIALS. 1. He does not prevent them from falling into distress, but he *helps them when in*, which is better for the disciplinary ends of trouble. 2. God does not simply *send* help in trouble. He *comes* himself. Moses was not satisfied with the promise of the guidance of an angel (Exod. xxxiii. 2). He sought and obtained the assurance that God's presence would go with Israel (Exod. xxxiii. 14). Jesus Christ promises his abiding presence (Matt. xxviii. 20). This is more than the natural universal presence of God. It is a nearness of sympathy, an active intercourse, a special manifestation of his Spirit (John xiv. 23). 3. God's presence in trouble implies his *endurance with us by sympathy*. He is afflicted in our afflictions (Isa. lxiii. 9). Jesus bore our griefs (Isa. liii. 4; Matt. viii. 17). When we take Christ's yoke we are yoked to him, and he bears with us (Matt. xi. 29).

II. GOD'S PRESENCE IN TROUBLE IS AN ASSURANCE OF PRESENT SECURITY AND ULTIMATE DELIVERANCE. The secret of the safety of the three Jews in the furnace is seen in the fourth presence, like "a Son of God." 1. God's presence secures *present safety*. By his sympathy he helps us to bear trouble. By his spiritual strength in us he increases our strength. Apply this (1) to the endurance of suffering and (2) to the resistance to temptation (Isa. xlii. 2). 2. God's presence secures *ultimate deliverance*. God does not only help us to bear the trouble. He finds a way of escape so that, though we pass through it, we shall not remain in it.

III. GOD'S PRESENCE IN TROUBLE IS AN AMPLE COMPENSATION FOR THE ENDURANCE OF IT. Storms clear the air and reveal the distant prospect. Trouble brings the

eternal near and unveils the unseen. This nearness of God is the source of our holiest life and deepest gladness. It is worth entering a fiery furnace to meet Christ there. Heaven is the presence of God. The furnace of affliction becomes a paradise when he manifests his presence in it.

TWO PRACTICAL LESSONS. 1. *Be faithful.* The three Jews were faithful to God. Therefore God manifested himself to them. God is not present in every furnace of trial. He comes when we are true and trustful. If we are living without God in prosperity, we cannot expect him to visit us in adversity (Jer. xi. 14). 2. *Be fearless.* If we are following Christ, we need fear no trouble. The assurance of the Divine presence should nerve us to meet the hardest trial (Ps. xlii. 4). Christian courage is a duty which depends on faith in the presence and help of God (John xiv. 1, 18). This faith is the secret of the great difference between the fortitude of the Stoic, which often ended in despair and suicide, and the courage of the Christian, which issues in patient hopeful submission.

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1-13.—*The ceaseless creation of gods.* "Nebuchadnezzar the king made an image." "He set it up in the plain of Dura" (ver. 1). Questions respecting the image will be discussed in the Expository section. For homiletical purposes we distinguish here between three separate entities, all real enough in their own realm. 1. *The image*, built up and appearing in due time amid the phenomena of this material world. 2. *The idea* for which it stands, existing really enough in the mind of the king and those who thought with him. The image most likely stood for "Bel," the "world-power" that had (as the king imagined) given him all his greatness. The idea may have been, *was*, false, but it had nevertheless a real and influential subjective existence. 3. *The author* of first the idea, and then of the image, viz. the prince referred to in John xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11; Eph. ii. 2, and elsewhere. All this we shall find very suggestive; for to this hour *men have never ceased to set up images for the homage of their fellow-men.*

I. *THE IDOL EVER NEW.* Following the suggestion of the lines already laid down, note: 1. *The creator.* The prince of darkness. It is now the theological fashion to deny, at least to doubt, his existence. But such scepticism seems to us narrow. Surely all good and evil are not confined to earth; and as certainly these *may* have their influence in the world of men. The Bible implies right through that they have had and continue to have. 2. *The intellectual creation.* Erroneous thought. A false idea. An evil public opinion. Think of the enormous power exerted over life and speech and deed of man; e.g. What woman in China dares not to bandage and cripple her daughter's feet? At what terrible cost is caste broken in India? It required a William Lloyd Garrison in the early anti-slavery days to protest against the wicked public opinion of the South, with which there was complicity in the North, and then literally at the peril of his life. The sway of anti-theistic, anti-Christian, anti-philanthropic opinion is nothing short of despotic; e.g. recent treatment of Virchow by the evolutionists of Germany. 3. *The sensible form.* Forms of speech, of action, habit of life, modes of work, forced by false public opinion on men, against which only a faithful few are sometimes found to rebel. These idols are set up to rule everywhere; e.g. in the realm of domestic administration, of social life, in the various Churches, in the life of the nation, and even to domineer over the international relations of men.

II. *THE NIMBUS OF THE IDOL.* In the old mythologies a cloud of light was often seen, or supposed to be seen, around the persons of the deities. So was it with this image which Nebuchadnezzar set up. One cannot read these opening verses without being struck with the halo of splendour thrown around the idol. Majesty of size, brilliance of material, commanding conspicuousness, marked the image itself. With endless iteration—like the refrain of a song—we are told it was "the golden image that Nebuchadnezzar the king had set up." Royalty sanctioned it. The aristocracy was on its side. Education and literature bowed before it (ver. 8). The people endorsed the worship. All that the world could do, by calling together mighty concourses of people, by pomp of ceremonial, by elaborate musical performance, was

done, to give *éclat* to the idolatry. So is it with all the forms of nineteenth-century idolatry. Kings, princes, peoples, the literary and educated classes, as by one consent, in many ways, after many fashions, join to glorify the image that public opinion, alienated from God, uninspired by his Spirit, too often sets up. *Peoples* can make images as readily as *kings*.

III. THE IMMINENT PENALTY. Enumerate the burning fiery furnaces which modern devotees of the image kindle for them who will not bow down; e.g. losses in business, social exclusion, denial of political rights, persecutions petty and malignant in many forms.

IV. THE GENERAL PROSTRATION.

V. THE FAITHFUL FEW.

CONCLUSIONS. 1. *Be no party to the setting up.* 2. *Be you one not to bend the knee.*—R.

Vers. 14—18.—*Principle illuminated by fire.* "O Nebuchadnezzar, we are not careful," etc. (vers. 16—18). Sketch the leading features of this intensely interesting martyr-history; and then—

I. RELIGIOUS PRINCIPLE. And here, that we may not move in mist, let us open out, step by step, what needs to be said. 1. *Principle.* What is it? A principle is literally a first thing; a beginning; a cause. The spring on the mountain-side, whence the mighty river. The root of the tree. Newton's 'Principia.' The principle of the universe, the First, is God. 2. *Religious principle.* The essential idea in the word "religion" is that of binding. (See the etymology.) Religion distinguishes that which binds man to God: it names the link that binds earth to heaven. Principle in religion is that at the root of man's being; that beginning of things in the soul which determines the outer life—word, deed, demeanour, habit, conduct. 3. *The two kinds.* Strictly speaking, the beginnings of religion may be in two entirely different spheres. They may be objective or subjective. There are beginnings with God, and beginnings in man. (1) *The objective principles of religion* constitute the external revelation of God. That revelation is the expression of his love. Strictly regarded, this is the spring and root of all beside. From this point of view, the first principle of religion is indeed none other than God himself. (2) *The subjective principles of religion.* These are the effect of the objective. They are beginnings in man; from whence all that is distinctly moral and spiritual proceeds. (a) *Truth in the mind.* Fashion to decry the importance of truth; but it cannot be legitimately denied, it is vital. (b) *Feeling answering to the truth.* (c) *Direction from the conscience* according to truth and responding to emotion. (d) *Volition obedient to the royal authority of conscience.* 4. *The present form.* Religious principle with us will take on *evangelical* forms. Our position is different from that of the three. They in twilight; we in blaze of midday. Truth came from God—for them through Moses and the prophets; for us, by Jesus Christ. They started from Sinai, we from Calvary. We begin with trust in a personal Christ—that is our first subjective principle—then follow truth, emotion, the moral imperative, obedience. 5. *Moment of principle.* Impossible to exaggerate its importance. What a man is in principle, that the man is all through.

II. ADHESION TO IT. A sublime example. Illustration and illumination of religious principle. 1. *The temptation to abandon principle.* Note what they were required to do. To bend the knee to an image of the world-power, perhaps of Bel, possibly of the king himself. All Sinai protested against it. But see temptations. Read their force in the light of our own nature. (1) To bend the knee was a *little thing*. The moral meaning of little things; e.g. to sign another's name is forgery. To allow the Persians to pass Thermopylæ! (2) *All the world would do it.* (3) *Gratitude moved to compliance.* (Ch. ii. 48, 49.) (4) *Hope.* More favour in the future. (5) *Fear.* The furnace hot; the doom certain. (6) *Sight likely to be more dominant than faith.* Faith sees as through mist. 2. *The decision.* (1) *Slowly built up.* Perhaps the decision was instantly taken; but it was gradually built up in solidity and strength. The image not reared in a day. Gold to be collected. Plans. Estimates. Labourers got. The actual work. This would all take time. See mighty ruins of basements still at Dura. Some notice of the festival. Time to

consult with friends, above all, with the heavenly Friend. (See John Foster's admirable sermon in 'Lectures,' vol. ii. p. 42, Bohn's edit.) (2) *The moral victory was earlier than the event.* Long before first note of the music the decision had been reached, and the victory won. The pomp of the day had by meditation become familiar. All moral victory is secret and anticipative. (Illustration in common life: the Germans were virtually victorious before they crossed the Rhine in 1870-71.) So will it be with the Christian and death. (See Robertson's 'Sermons,' vol. iii. 190, 195, "Victory over Death.") (3) *The decision was irreversible, once taken.* 3. *The act.* The moral majesty of the three among millions. Alone. Yet not alone. Daniel. Sympathizers. Angels. God. All there with them! 4. *Their dependence.* These saints militant entrenched themselves behind two lines. (1) *God.* He was: (a) *Existent.* (b) *Their own God: "Our God."* (c) *The object of their service.* (d) *Able to deliver.* (e) *Certainly would.* But if all this were not so, then: (2) *Eternal righteousness.* Ineffable grandeur of this moral position. Let God not deliver, not be able, be only an imagined object of service, not be their God, because indeed he does not exist. Then there is something behind and deeper than his throne. Right is right for ever and ever. Our vision of God may be obscured; our sense of right scarcely ever. This is clear: (a) *If there be a God,* it cannot be right to bend down to a thing. (b) *If there be not, man is man, and still may not bow to a thing like this.* Amid all life's temptations, bear in mind there is a *God*; and even if (for the sake of argument) there be not, there is still a *soul*; and in the soul a concept of absolute, unconditioned, eternal righteousness. 5. *The result of the decision.* (1) *As to themselves.* (a) *Freedom from anxiety.* "We are not careful." (b) *Silence.* No noise. No apology. No elaborate defence. (c) *Salvation.* In the fire, yet out of the fire; for the Saviour there. (2) *As to others.* Who can estimate? (a) *On the Jews.* Obedient to Sinai, but in more obscure positions than that of the three. (b) *On the heathen.* (c) *On the universal Church, whenever and wherever the history of this heroism is told.—R.*

Vers. 19—27.—The Saviour in the fire. "The form of the fourth" (ver. 3). A sketch of the further developments of the history will well introduce the following topics.

I. THE SAVIOUR OF THE KING'S IMAGINATION. "Like unto a son of the gods." The king was certainly not acquainted with the Hebrew doctrine of the Messiah, and even if he were, the appellation, "Son of God," would not be familiar to him. The deliverer to him was perhaps an angel, but surely a visitant from the unseen.

II. THE REAL DELIVERER. "The Angel of Jehovah," the Angel-God of the Old Testament, the Lord Jesus, in those temporary and special epiphanies which preceded the great Epiphany of the Incarnation. This "coming down to deliver" does not stand alone. Therefore the other emergences out of eternity into time of the Lord should throw light on this; e.g. two appearances to Hagar (Gen. xvi.; xxi. 19—21). Two in the life of Abraham (Gen. xviii., xix., xxii.). Several instances in the history of Jacob (Gen. xxviii. 10—22; xxxi. 11—13; xxxii. 24—32; xlvi. 15, 16). At the burning bush (Exod. iii.; see also Exod. xxiii. 20—25; xiii. 20—22; xiv. 19, 20; xl. 33—35; 1 Kings viii. 10, 11; 2 Chron. vii. 1—3). The same august Personage was at Sinai (comp. Exod. xxiv. and xxxiii. 11—20 with Gal. iii. 19). Several manifestations, too, in the desert-life of Israel (Exod. xvi. 10; Numb. xii. 5; xiv. 1—21; xvi. 19, 42; xx. 6; Exod. xxxiii. 3). So in the life of Joshua (Josh. v. 13; vi. 5). See further epiphanies in Judg. ii. 1—5; vi. 11—24; xiii.; 1 Kings viii. 9—11, Isa. lxiii. 8, 9. (On the significance of these passages, see 'Mediatorial Sovereignty,' by George Steward, vol. i. pp. 111—137; Dr. Pye Smith, 'First Lines of Christian Theology,' pp. 248—251.) "The Angel of Jehovah" is none other than Jehovah himself manifested in the Person of the Lord Jesus. The doctrine of the Trinity the only adequate explanation. What Robert Hall said of the Divine Being is strikingly true of the doctrine of the Trinity: "Inexplicable itself, it explains all besides; it casts a clearness upon every question, accounts for every phenomenon, solves every problem, illumines every depth, and renders the whole mystery of evidence as perfectly simple as it is otherwise perfectly unintelligible, whilst itself remains an impenetrable obscurity." The following are reasons for believing that the Lord Jesus was present in this fire: 1. It

was antecedently probable that he would be. Taking into account antecedent appearances, observe the *time* of the Captivity was a critical epoch in the history of the kingdom of God; the *place*—Babylon—a grand theatre for the manifestation of the Divine. Evil clashed with conscience. The faithful there were helpless. It was for Christ to deliver. 2. It would fulfil a promise a thousand years old (Lev. xxvi. 14—44). 3. The moral effect of the epiphany would be great—on Jews, heathens; all to the end of time.

III. THE SAME SAVIOUR NOW. 1. The Lord Jesus *can be present with us* in the fire of our trouble. This depends on whether we give him welcome or not. He waits to come in unto us in our sorrows. Different is the intensity of the fire with different saints, with the same at various times. 2. His presence is *relief*. 3. Will be *ultimate deliverance and perfected salvation*.—R.

Vers. 28—30.—*Salvations demonstrate the Saviour*. "There is no other God that can deliver after this sort" (ver. 29). Explain the king's real state of mind. He did not own Jehovah as the only God, nor command him to be worshipped. He only declared him to be able to save his servants as none other could, and commanded that there should be no reviling of his Name. Curious commingling of tolerance and intolerance. So slowly do men learn the principles of religious and ecclesiastical freedom. (Matthew Henry is full and good on this section.) But the text may be used as the starting-point for a good missionary sermon. Illustrations will be abundant in proportion to our acquaintance with the best missionary literature—not merely that which appears in so fragmentary a form in magazines, but with full and exhaustive treatises, of which there are now many. The following outline is merely suggestive, and would have to be taken up selectively; for the whole would be far too much for one discourse.

I. EVILS FROM WHICH MAN CRIES FOR DELIVERANCE. 1. *Internal*. (1) *Darkness of intellect* in moral questions. (2) *Dwarfed, misplaced, perverted emotion*. (3) *Torpidity of conscience* (e.g. the extraordinary Pharisaism of the Chinese apart from the gospel, contrasted with his fear and pain when led by the convincing Spirit to a sense of sin). (4) *Terror of the awakened conscience*, which nothing but the gospel can assuage. (5) *Paralysis of the will*; i.e. sheer inability (i.e. moral) to do the thing we would. "I approve the good, but the evil I pursue" (Rom. vii.). 2. *External*. (1) *Individual*. Perhaps most of the sorrows and discouragements of life will fall under this classification. (a) *Limitation*. Nearly all forms of pain fall under this head; e.g. the feebleness of youth, weakness, sickness, deprivations, bereavements, discouragements, debility of age, etc. (b) *Strain*. Battle of life. Work of life. (c) *Impending death*. (d) *Imperfection of character*; i.e. of the external manifestation of the good within. (2) *Social*. There are evils that fall to us in our relations to our fellow-men. These arise from the extreme difficulty of carrying ourselves morally, rightly, in relation to our associates (see "Righteousness a Personal Relation," in Wace's 'Christianity and Morality,' p. 37, most suggestive). Hence many sorrows. Hence, too, many sins; wrongs in the family; unjust subjection of women; slavery; cruelty; neglect of ministrations to suffering; breaches of the fifth, sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth commandments; war, etc. Hence, too, all political tyrannies and religious persecution. No liberty, equality, humanity, unity, or true independence.

II. DELIVERERS PROVED INCOMPETENT. All religions which have declined from the purity of the primæval revelation, and in proportion to the extent of their departure. It may be necessary here to contrast the easy and flippant assumption that each religion is an evolution from the genius of each race, and congenial with it, and conducive to its moral elevation. E.g. the contrast between the comparatively pure idea, which the New Guinea people have, of a Great Spirit and the horrors of their cannibal life. Surely these may not be left to such religion as they have evolved. In showing incompetence to deliver from evil, the religions of the world must be classified, and then the incompetence of each demonstrated in relation to evils enumerated above. The following classification is suggested: 1. *Indifferentism*; i.e. any negative system that ignores the religious nature of man. 2. *Polytheism*. 3. *Pantheism*. 4. *Mere theism*; e.g. the Brahmo-Samaj movement in India. Its failure to meet the sin and sorrows of men is abundantly proved (see its own literary organs in India). 5. *Atheism*.

in all its modern forms; e.g. agnosticism, positivism. 6. *Impure forms of Christianity.* Note that even in Russia so deep is the void left by the Greek Church, that there are fifteen millions of Dissenters, whom Imperialism tries to crush. It would not be difficult to show that the Roman perversion of Christianity has proved incompetent, and just in proportion to its decline from primitive truth.

III. THE SAVIOUR ALMIGHTY. The whole history of Christ's kingdom, the facts of modern missions, our own experience, demonstrate the competence of Christ to fill the void of man's necessity, and to lift the burden from his surcharged heart; e.g. to enlighten the mind; to direct, purify, and elevate the emotions; to rouse and then soothe the conscience; to justify the will. And so with the other forms of evil marshalled above. Exhibit all this in detail, and demonstrate that "there is no other God that can deliver after this sort."—R.

Ver. 1.—*Man has a religious nature.* It is a valid argument for the existence of God, that every race of men demands some object of worship. Everywhere there is a felt dependence—a conscious need of protection and support. As soon as men are released from the pressing and exhausting care for daily food, their minds "feel after God, if haply they may find him." A sense of orphanage afflicts humanity till it finds God.

I. THE NATURAL MAN HAS AN INSTINCT FOR WORSHIP. It is true that while man remains in barbarous ignorance, he is prone to worship fancied evil agents, whose wrath he deprecates. But even this act is a confession that there is somewhere, outside him, a power superior to himself, who is able to work him real mischief. This confession is sufficient to establish the doctrine of Divine supremacy. And as men exercise their minds upon the variety of events that transpire about them, they discover that their fortunes and destinies are controlled by some Being mightier than themselves. Notwithstanding his power and his imperial rule, Nebuchadnezzar felt convinced that there was one Deity, or more, who had permitted to him this success in war—this magnificence of royal state. The natural instinct of his soul yearned for something to worship. Does any man living feel satisfied with his stature of moral excellence? Is it not a common confession that we are not as good as we might be? Do we not stretch forth our aspiration towards some ideal yet beyond this? And if there be ideal perfection somewhere, which our souls strain their energies to reach, can that perfection be impersonal, self-existent? Does it not rather reside in an unseen perfect Being, in whose image degenerate man once was made? This unknown Being men instinctively long to know and to worship.

II. THE NATURAL MAN CRAVES AFTER A VISIBLE MANIFESTATION OF GOD. Although Moses had heard God's voice, and had received from him the tables of stone engraven with his own hand, yet he ardently craves a vision of the Most High: "I beseech thee, show me thy glory." Moved by a similar desire to have nearer intercourse with God—a desire to be rid of all doubt and perplexity, Philip asked, "Show us the Father, and it sufficeth us." If left to himself, man invents aids to his devotion, which become positive hindrances. Hence among all nations there has appeared the demand for some visible object, which might serve as a representation of God; and, because of its injurious effect upon men, the prohibition was given to the Jews, "Thou shalt not make thee any graven image, nor the likeness of anything on earth." If the mind of man be so greatly superior to matter; if it possesses attributes which find no analogy in material forms; if nothing in visible nature can represent thought, feeling, aspiration, will; so nothing in the physical universe can represent the Creator of all things. We are driven to the other pole of existence when we read, "*God is a Spirit.*"

III. THE NATURAL MAN ASCRIBES TO HIS DEITY GREATNESS AND EXCELLENCE. Nebuchadnezzar had learnt (perhaps from the Jewish Scriptures) that the *human* form was the nearest approach to the *Divine*; yet he felt that God possessed a superhuman greatness and a superhuman goodness. The former idea he endeavoured to express by giving to his statue colossal magnitude; the latter idea he sought to embody in the gold which was lavished on the structure. Whether it was literally made of gold, or only overlaid with gold, the same feeling was intended to be projected, viz. that the most precious of the metals was required to express the superlative excellence of Deity. "Who is like unto the Lord our God, who dwelleth in the heavens?"

IV. THE NATURAL MAN WILL ALLOW TO DEITY THE MOST AMPLE SCOPE FOR ACTIVITY. Nebuchadnezzar erected no temple for this gigantic figure. He had erected temples in Babylon for other idol-deities; but now he gives larger play to his thoughts, and sets up this colossal image on the open plain. No building reared by human hands can contain the true God. The sapphire vault of heaven is the ceiling of his temple. The emerald greensward, enamelled with fragrant flowers, is the most fitting floor in his abode. The everlasting hills, with their snow-clad peaks, form the pillars in his house. "Heaven is his throne: the earth is a footstool for his feet." The myriad stars are the lamps of his majestic sanctuary. All things that live and breathe unite to celebrate his praise. "His kingdom ruleth over all."—D.

Vers. 2—7.—*Attempted coercion in religion a failure.* If, with his slender knowledge of God, Nebuchadnezzar supposed that the erection of this colossal statue would be pleasing to God, as a visible expression of the monarch's allegiance, or would serve to remind men of their religious obligation, so far the deed would be in itself praiseworthy. But when he proceeded further to compel a rigid conformity to his mode of offering worship, he trenched upon the rights of Deity—he invaded the sacred territory of conscience.

I. COERCION IN RELIGION PROCEEDS FROM LUST OF POWER. It may, in a few cases, arise from a mistaken idea of personal duty; but if the motive be searched to its source, it will be found to spring from this corrupt fount—the lust of power. Nebuchadnezzar, like an Oriental despot, had complete control over the persons, the property, and the lives of his subjects; but this lust for power grew by what it fed on. Like the horseleech, it was ever crying, "Give, give!" He craved to have control over the thoughts, beliefs, and religious acts of his people. He would carry his sceptre, if he might, into the inner realm of conscience, and sway the nations as he pleased. Hence he commanded the attendance and the religious homage of all who held any authority under him, to the end that *these* might, in their turn, exact a similar obedience from the people. The sovereignty of love is always a boon; the sovereignty of personal will is more or less a bane.

". . . man, proud man!
Drest in a little brief authority, . . .
Plays such fantastic tricks before high heaven,
As make the angels weep."

II. COERCION IN RELIGION IS A USURPATION OF DIVINE RIGHTS. "The powers that exist are ordained of God," yet only for limited and well-defined ends. Monarchs and judges stand in God's stead to preserve society from anarchy and injury; but over the interior life—over thought and affection and worship—they can have no dominion whatever. To bind and to loose men's beliefs by authority is an impossibility. There is another sceptre before which heart and conscience are constrained to bow. There is another tribunal before which kings and subjects must alike appear. No verdict of acquittal which a human monarch can give will serve as a passport to the favour of the Most High! Every one of the human race must give account "of *himself* unto God." "To our own Master we stand or fall."

III. COERCION IN RELIGION DEGRADES THE TRUE DIGNITY OF RELIGION. True religion is nothing less than the purest love of the human heart pouring itself out, in service or in speech, unto the living God; and if love *must* ever be spontaneous and free, in order to be love at all, so must be the piety of the human soul. Spontaneity is a necessity in religion. If compulsion be employed, its essence evaporates, its spirit disappears. It degenerates into formality. In the hands of an ambitious monarch, religion becomes a piece of state machinery; it is dragged in the mire of kingcraft. The pomp of state ceremonial—scenic splendour, displays of music—only degrade Religion, under pretence of doing her homage. The atmosphere in which she most flourishes is not the heated atmosphere of royal palaces, but the atmosphere of tranquil liberty. You may cast dead metals into moulds, and fashion them into what shape you please; but *life* refuses to be moulded after the caprice or art of man: it follows laws which are enshrined within itself. You may clip and cut a dead tree into any form you like, but a living tree will soon laugh at all your attempts to give

it shape. True religion is the outgrowth of the truest life of the soul. To make it conformable to human law is simply to destroy it.

IV. COERCION IN RELIGION MAKES MEN BIGOTS, HYPOCRITES, OR MARTYRS. You will find in every empire, men and women who are ready to yield compliance to royal mandates in the sphere of religion; but these are always persons of slender faith, or persons having no faith at all. Unworthy motives in crowds act upon the mind to induce servile obedience. All the motives which appeal to present advantage, and to self-interest in its lower forms, will be ranged upon that side. To retain official rank, to secure royal favour, to gain emolument, multitudes have always been ready to hide their real opinions or have forbidden convictions to mature in the conscience. They have stultified their manhood, starved their soul, and sold their immortal birthright for a mess of pottage. This has been the effect of coercion upon one class of the community. On another class the effect has been to produce unbelief in all religious truth—cold, blank atheism. If religion (say they) can only be propagated by the lash and the sword, it is not worth propagating at all. If the great God cannot maintain his own authority and rule without the aid of human violence, surely it is best to believe that there is no God! Such is the argument of many whom coercion has hardened and embittered. And on a third class of society the effect of coercion is martyrdom. Men and women who prize truth more than present convenience, who honour God more than they honour men,—these firmly decline the mandates of human authority in the sphere of religion. Come what may, they must be obedient to conviction and to conscience. They are bound by a prior obligation to follow the Spirit of truth whithersoever it leads. A voice speaks to them direct from heaven; and, let kings rave and storm as they please, they yield their first deference to the heavenly command. After all, a human king is but a fellow-worm, and it is an ignoble thing to steer our life-course according to the changing whims of pompous princes. And the result of honest resistance to religious tyranny has always been suffering—the rack, the flame, the prison, the gibbet.—D.

Vers. 8—12.—*The working of base and bitter envy.* The men of Chaldea, who plumed themselves with great titles, but possessed little souls, were not content with rendering servile homage to the king's golden image; they must needs turn informers against those who had the courage of religious conviction. While true religion ennobles a man every way, superstition dwarfs intellect and soul—emasculates a man. A gnat may sting to madness a mettled war-horse, and some men who are impotent to do good are busy with venting malicious spite on nobler natures than their own.

I. ENVY IS THE NATURAL CHILD OF SELFISHNESS—the base progeny of a base parentage. Under pretence of solicitude for the king, they were chiefly anxious to berid themselves of formidable rivals. These accused persons were foreigners, captives, and had been raised to eminent offices by virtue of their personal merits. But the little-minded native aristocrats could not endure this competition for royal honours, and were willing enough to degrade and injure good men, if only they could promote their own worldly interest. That is a despicable vice which has selfishness for its root. The envious man is ashamed to own his real object.

II. ENVY STOOPS TO USE THE MEANEST ARTS. These Chaldeans invented a new name, a name of opprobrium, by which to designate these hated rivals. As the foes of Christ invented the name of "Christian" as a byword and a reproach, so these Chaldean informers used the word "Jew" as a stigma of disgrace. Further, they sought to flatter the king with all the arts of sycophancy. They flattered his greatness, his love of power, his bigotry, his religious zeal, his autocratic will. The best friends of a monarch are those who speak in his ear at proper times most unpalatable truths, and seek wisely to abate the growth of imperious tyranny. But these men, with ingenious skill, sought only to inflame the baser passions of the king. They reminded him that his royal authority was outraged; that his gods were dishonoured; that his honour, as a truthful monarch, was at stake. No stone was left unturned by which to gain their nefarious end. There was a busy zeal, worthy of a nobler object.

III. ENVY MAGNIFIES THE SUPPOSED FAULTS OF OTHERS. From what appears in the narrative, there was no occasion for these Chaldean magnates to make any accusation against the Hebrews. It was no part of their office to become public prosecutors. The

idolatry of that age was extremely tolerant. Every nation and people were allowed to worship their own gods. If these Chaldean satraps had cherished a spark of generosity in their breasts, they would have argued *thus*: "These Hebrews have a religious faith of *their own*. Let them worship what and how they please." But it is very probable that these officious governors had themselves instigated the king to make this cruel decree, and had narrowly watched its effect upon the conduct of the Hebrew youths. *Now* they think they have caught them in a deadly snare. *Now* they will exaggerate their offence before the king. *Now* they will accuse them, not only of withholding homage from the new idol, but with dishonour to all Chaldaea's gods—with utter contempt of the king himself.

IV. ENVY IS BLIND IN FORECASTING RESULTS. These envious men proceeded upon the principle that they foresaw and foreordered the course of events. Clearly it seemed to them, the series of events was as certain as the links in a chain. The king would be incensed. These Hebrew youths would be destroyed. Themselves would be promoted to honour. But though the first step was successful, and their whole plan seemed about to bear its expected fruit, lo! miscarriage and disappointment! If they could succeed in circumventing and slaughtering these innocent men, they would have proceeded to accuse Daniel also. But the executors of the royal mandate were the only persons slain. The Hebrew youths enjoyed in the furnace the presence of a heavenly Companion and Guest. The God of the Hebrews received royal homage and public regard. The envious satraps were put to silence and to shame.

V. ENVY IS UNSCRUPULOUS AS TO OTHERS' SUFFERING. If only it can gain its paltry end, it cares not how much suffering of body and of mind it inflicts on others. They knew that the penalty decreed for non-compliance with the idolatrous practice was arbitrary and cruel; but what cared they? They might have foreseen that if these three Hebrew notables should suffer death, it would be the beginning of fiery persecution against the whole nation of Israel; but what cared they? Their pride and ambition were wounded by the elevation to office of these young Hebrews, and if they could only bring about their rivals' downfall, they were unscrupulous what amount of suffering would befall the Hebrews. Envy has ever been a deadly foe to brotherly love.—D.

Vers. 13—15.—*A critical alternative.* The alternative which these young men were called to face was idolatry or death. The claimants for their loyalty were Nebuchadnezzar on the one hand, God on the other. The former appealed to all the selfish principles of their nature; the latter, to the moral sense alone. Herein lies the crucial trial of human life. Shall God's voice be supreme? his authority be dominant over every part of my nature, over every act of my life? Or, on the other hand, shall some other master prevail? On our answer to this question hangs our heaven and hell.

I. AN ALTERNATIVE OF CONDUCT. Much might have been said by a wily advocate to induce compliance with the demand of the king. He had not demanded that his subjects should abjure their loyalty to another god; they might, therefore, make a compromise by rendering this outward act of idolatry, while they reserved the true love and homage of their hearts for God. Were they not the subjects—yea, the captives—of this earthly prince? and did he not rule by Divine right? Had he not been their benefactor in raising them to honour? and would it not seem base ingratitude to resist? Was it not desirable to maintain a general uniformity, and not seem to countenance rebellion and irreligion? Would it not preserve the public peace, advance their own interests, and protect the fortunes of their co-exiles, if they would comply? It was but a solitary act; God would readily condone it; it need not be repeated! Was it worth while to disturb the empire on so trivial a matter? Thus a thousand voices would whisper. But—

II. IT WAS AN ALTERNATIVE OF PRINCIPLE. Unless these Hebrews should act a falsehood, this deed of idolatry would be the visible expression of their belief. Outward acts are the proper fruits of inward conviction. A God-fearing man cannot bring forth the fruits of idolatry; neither can an idolatrous man bear the fruits of godliness. Seeming compliance here would be sheer hypocrisy; and are these young Hebrews going to stamp themselves hypocrites? This was a judgment-day: these young men

were on trial before God. Say what men will about mutual concessions, forbearance, peace,—this was a conspicuous occasion for the test of principle. If these young men played the coward now, they would be cowards for ever—the sport of every capricious wind of circumstance. If the ship's cable will not hold in a storm, of what use is it? True principle of character is of the nature of steel: you cannot permanently bend it. Leave it to its own action, and it flies back to its proper line.

III. IT WAS AN ALTERNATIVE OF DESTINY. Compliance brought present life; resistance was to issue in violent death. Hence it is evident that this act of idolatry was no trivial or even ordinary act. The king himself raised it into a public test. Yet this pompous king quite overshot the mark. Did he talk about the result and issue of this supposed contumacy? He was as a man who reckons without his host. The issues of events lie in another hand than his. Royal threats are often like the chaff which the wind driveth away. While this Babylonian king spake, a mightier King than he revoked the human mandate and inverted the predicted destiny. Nebuchadnezzar said in substance to these godly youths, "Die!" God uttered with the same breath his fiat, "Live!" "The Lord bringeth the counsel of the heathen to nought." Instead of disgrace, there came honour. Instead of death, immortality!—D.

Vers. 16—18.—*The Church's triumvirate.* Nothing was further from these youths' thoughts than public notoriety, much less world-wide renown. They did but perform what seemed plain duty; and they asked no more than to be allowed to serve their God in quiet obscurity. When temptation spake through royal lips, they calmly said "No;" because loyalty to the King of kings had a previous and paramount claim.

I. LOYALTY TO GOD RESISTS THE ENCROACHMENTS OF HUMAN AUTHORITY. "*In this matter,*" they affirmed, it did not concern them to answer the king. They had no answer that would be palatable to imperious arrogance. In all other matters they were prepared to render honest obedience and dutiful service. But "*in this matter,*" touching the love and worship due to God, no other course was open than to obey God rather than man. Plainly had Jehovah said, "Thou shalt not make any graven image, nor bow down to it;" and they had responded, "All that the Lord hath commanded us will we do." It was an abuse of human authority, an encroachment on the prerogatives of Deity, to set up forms of belief or objects of worship. This is tyranny, offensive both to God and to men. Only a spirit of mean subserviency will silently submit to such arrogance. Manly courage will follow the simple rule of Jesus Christ, "Render unto Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and unto God the things that are God's."

II. LOYALTY TO GOD IS CONFIDENT OF DIVINE SUCCESS. In true service of God we learn to know him, and increased knowledge leads to stronger faith. Obedience is the main portal to the temple of Divine truth. The closer we come to God, the clearer vision of his power and greatness we obtain, and the stronger grows our assurance that we have an interest in his friendship. We do not know who God is if we are not confident that he is well able to protect us in every emergency. But the faith of these men was stronger yet. They believed that God was sustaining them in this decisive resolve, and would, in some way, appear so as to vindicate their honest fidelity. *How* they should be delivered, they did not know; but they were well assured that ten thousand modes of relief were open to God, and they could leave the plan of campaign with their Commander-in-chief.

III. LOYALTY TO GOD IS ENTIRELY AN UNSELFISH PRINCIPLE. Assured, though these Hebrews were, that deliverance would come; yet, even if it had been otherwise, they would not have altered their line of conduct. Whether heaven be the outcome of pious loyalty to truth, or whether it be not, renewed men can act no other than they do. Let philosophers argue as plausibly as they please, they cannot persuade the conscience that moral obligation is a phase of self-interest. A good man does *not* pursue virtue for the sake of what he can get, however remote the expectation be. Nevertheless, the kindness of God has decreed that virtue, faith, holiness, shall bear sooner or later the fruits of abundant joy. And so these champions of Divine truth boldly avowed to the king that, come what might—fire or freedom, grief or gladness—they would have no complicity with idols. They would buy the truth at any price; they would sell it at none. They could die, but they dare not sin.—D.

Vers. 19—23.—*The brief reign of violence.* It is only consistent with the sketches of Nebuchadnezzar's character furnished us, to believe that he was not naturally a cruel man; nor was he so rigid an idolater as to oppose the worship of Jehovah. He was self-willed, excitable, easily inflamed; and was too easily led away by the base designs of others. For the moment he yielded to the excitement of passion. His autocratic pride had been wounded, and he would tolerate no resistance.

I. WE SEE VIOLENCE SUMMONING INTO THE FIELD ALL ITS FORCES. The king is "full of fury." His inward composure is disturbed. His very skin changes its hue. The blood rises and recedes with strange rapidity. Every muscle and nerve are stretched to highest tension. A very madness has seized the man. Reason is overborne as by a sudden tempest. Wisdom, sagacity, judgment, dignity, are drowned in a flood of uncontrollable feeling. Poor man! what an object of pity! He is verily possessed by a demon—"set on fire of hell."

II. WE SEE VIOLENCE OVERREACHING ITS OWN END. The king commanded that the furnace should be heated sevenfold, because of the independent boldness of the slandered Hebrews. This was a suggestion of wanton cruelty. But it would really benefit the innocent victims, inasmuch as it would shorten their sufferings. Yet reason had forsaken the king, and had fled into humbler bosoms. His unrestrained violence was weakness itself. Physical force is destined to fail.

III. WE SEE VIOLENCE INJURING ITS OWN FRIENDS. As the Midianites, when pursued by Gideon in the night, slew unwittingly their own comrades, so the weapons which Nebuchadnezzar's violence was sharpening were injuring those who handled them. The command to execute the Hebrew heroes was assigned to Chaldean's mightiest veterans. Very likely they had egged the king on in this shameless course, and were only too glad to do thoroughly the cruel deed. There is always weakness in haste. Justice is ever calm, for time is on her side. She waits her conquests with sweet composure. But now this cruel eagerness to destroy, lest forsooth the king should relent—this eagerness, is fatal to the proud captains. Endeavouring to slay others, their sword turns into their own breast. The material flame is alive with judicial discernment—has learnt from its Creator whom to slay and whom to save. "Verily there is a God that judgeth in the earth!"

IV. WE SEE VIOLENCE APPARENTLY TRIUMPHANT. God has not yet appeared on behalf of his injured advocates. Lo! they are bound, and no angelic hands present! Lo! they are cast into the fiery oven; they fall down into the very midst of the glowing coals! Has not justice abandoned our earth? Now may Violence wag her head and shake her tongue! Now she is loud-voiced and jubilant indeed! How eloquent are her taunts! "Where is now their boasted God? What profit now in all their prayers? These paragons of piety—where are they now? Did we not predict their discomfiture? Ah! so would we have it!"—D.

Vers. 24—27.—*The unexpected fruits of persecution.* As soon as the fierce tempest in Nebuchadnezzar's mind had expended its little force, there succeeded the calm of exhaustion. The tyrant is transformed into a servant, and appears like a docile child. Something has produced a strange impression on him—perhaps the sudden burning of his own officers, perhaps the unbending fortitude of the three Hebrews, perhaps the natural reaction from high-wrought excitement. Abandoning royal pomp, he visits himself the fiery furnace, that he may discern the wreck of human life wrought by foolish violence. An unexpected sight awaits him.

I. PERSECUTION IS HARMLESS TO THE SAINTS. Their experience is not always uniform. God seldom follows precisely the same course twice. The bodily life of the oppressed is not always preserved. Yet, in every case, it is true that no real harm is done to them. Often—

"Persecution has dragged them into fame,
And chased them up to heaven."

On this occasion the material flame, though heated sevenfold, was not nearly so vindictive and deadly as the fiery rage of the king. He had summoned into his service one of the most destructive elements of nature, but it would not obey him. The flame did them no harm: it did them good. It consumed their bonds; it did not singe

their clothes. It gave them liberty. It brought them new experience. It put a new sceptre into their hands, and made them kings of nature. They were mightier men than ever. It admitted them into new society, and brought an angel into their circle. God himself gave them new evidence of his presence, his tender concern for them, and his all-sufficient power. *Now* it is evident that fire has no consuming property *of its own*. It is a property given and maintained by God. All the forces of nature are like the manuals of an organ touched by a Divine hand. By faith in God these men "quenched the violence of fire."

II. PERSECUTION OF THE SAINTS GIVES OCCASION FOR THE MIRACULOUS INTERPOSITION OF GOD. All opposition raised against God only brings out the greater resources of his omnipotence. Satan's oppression of our race gave scope for the redemptive miracle. Creation is miracle, for the like was not before. Providence, which is but a continuous act of creation, is a miracle. Granting that there is a God, there is nothing unreasonable in miracle. Whenever God is pleased to work, if ordinary methods fail, extraordinary methods are forthwith introduced. No occasion is more fitting for the introduction of miracle than persecution. God has identified himself with his people, and injury done to *them* is resented as injury done to *him*. Nor are we to think only of the miracle wrought on the material flame or on the living bodies of these men. *That* is a narrow view of miracle. There was miraculous agency also displayed in the mind, the temper, and the conduct of these oppressed Hebrews. It was not *natural* that they should submit to human injustice without a word. It was not natural, but supernatural, that they showed no vindictive spirit nor indulged in any language of personal triumph. Their modesty and self-forgetfulness were as miraculous as their faith. With the ending of the persecution came the ending of the angel's visit.

III. PERSECUTION PATIENTLY ENDURED PRODUCES CONVICTION IN THE UNGODLY. The king himself was overcome by astonishment. He could not believe the evidence of his eyes. He could scarcely trust his memory. Hence he summoned his princes and counsellors to his assistance. He appeals to their recollections. He requires them to see, to investigate, and to understand these strange facts for themselves. In their presence the king himself (not a deputy) entreats these injured Hebrews to come out of the mystic flame. He prays to them whom just now he cruelly condemned. The king styles them, not fanatics, miscreants, traitors—he styles them "servants of the most high God." Yes, of *that* God whom he had awhile despised. The proof of Divine succour and of supernatural protection is complete, undeniable, overwhelming. And, with candour of mind, Nebuchadnezzar yields himself to the evidence.—D.

Vers. 28—30.—*Total reversal of Fortune's wheel.* During this momentous crisis, no change had passed over the convictions, resolves, or characters of these godly men—except such advancement in strength and courage as was always in progress. But upon their outward condition a great change was impending. A quiet revolution was proceeding outside them.

I. A CHANGE IN THE PLACE ACCORDED TO GOD. This was the central aim of the young Hebrews' resistance, that Jehovah might be recognized as supreme. This quiet endurance for God had completely annulled the effect of the gigantic idol, its imposing ritual, and its pompous music. Truth is advanced in more quiet ways. This royal endowment of idolatry had been public contumacy of Jehovah; but three modest youths, sustained by Divine grace, were more than a match for all the stately ceremonial appointed by the king. At the head of the nation, Nebuchadnezzar publicly recants his religious belief. *While* his language was, "Who is that God that shall deliver you out of my hands?" *Now* his language is, "Blessed be the God of the Hebrews, who hath . . . delivered his servants that trusted in him!"

II. A CHANGE IN THE MARTYRS' REPUTATION. Nebuchadnezzar had treated as weak and worthless the men who were accused of contumacy. He had regarded their convictions as contemptible scruples. Now his opinions have suddenly undergone a complete change. He appreciates their nobleness; he applauds their loyal constancy to God. He perceives a glorious beauty in their character, to which he was blind before. He confesses that their quiet firmness was more mighty, and more majestic, than his tyrannic rage. Their patient fortitude has captivated him. He places them upon the pedestal of royal regard, and does homage to their superior virtue. Well

saith the proverb, "Them that honour me, I will honour." The martyrs are canonized and worshipped as saints.

III. A CHANGE IN THE ROYAL EDICT. But just now the royal decree had been, "Let the worshippers of Jehovah be degraded—be cast out as dogs!" Now a new edict issues, "That every people, nation, and language, which speak anything amiss against the God of the Jews shall be cut in pieces, and their houses shall be made a dunghill." The tone and language of the king had undergone a complete change. This amounted almost to a miracle. To repeal the king's decree was deemed an impossibility. The kings of the East prided themselves on the observance of their word, let the cost be what it might. But there is a conspicuous abatement of pride in Nebuchadnezzar, and this new law will be a protection for all the Jews against the blasphemies of their foreign masters.

IV. A CHANGE IN THE OUTWARD CONDITION OF THE SUFFERERS. Their attainder is removed. They are not only restored to their former place, but are promoted to higher office yet. Just as a swelling wave, rolling on the sea-beach, recedes for a moment, but only to gather fresh force, and then rises higher on the shore than any point it has yet reached; so this transient degradation was but the mystic step to higher honour. From the fiery jaws of death they suddenly rose to the dignity of princely life. The pathway to immortal renown is through the vale of suffering. "It is through much tribulation we must enter the kingdom." The cross was the Saviour's road to his mediatorial throne; and if we suffer with him, "we shall also be glorified together." The fire of suffering does not destroy the Christian; it refines and purifies. He comes forth from the furnace as gold well burnished. Real merit, sooner or later, finds its true level.—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER IV.

Vers. 1—37.—THE MADNESS OF NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

We follow here the division of chapters which we find in our English Version, and as, indeed, in all modern versions. The Aramaic concludes the third chapter with the three verses which are placed in our version at the beginning of the fourth chapter. The arrangement of the Aramaic is followed by the Septuagint, by Theodotion, and by Jerome. The Peshitta and Paulus Tellensis follow the more logical division. Luther divides the chapters logically enough, but carries on the numbering of the verses from the preceding chapter. It is difficult to see anything that can even seem to be a reason for this division. It may indicate a suspicion of these verses at the time the chapters were divided.

Ver. 1 (Aramaic ch. iii. 31).—Nebuchadnezzar the king, unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multiplied unto you. The Septuagint has a different reading here, "The beginning of the letter of Nebuchadnezzar the king to all peoples and tongues dwelling in the

whole earth: Peace to you be multiplied." In this reading, the first clause is the heading of all that follows, and the document itself begins with, "Peace to you be multiplied." The absence of the opening words from the Syriac Version of the Septuagint by Paulus Tellensis is against its authenticity. It may have been a scribal note which has slipped into the text. Theodotion is an exact rendering of the Massoretic text. The Peshitta Version appears to have followed a recension between that on which the Septuagint Version is founded and the Massoretic text, "Nebuchadnezzar the king wrote to all nations, peoples, and tongues, Joy be increased to you." The most natural explanation of this uncertainty in the text is that this chapter is a condensation of a longer document. Were the document in question a proclamation of Nebuchadnezzar, his titles would necessarily have followed. These, however, are omitted, and only *malka*, "king," is retained. The baldness of this seems to have suggested the variations which we find in the Septuagint and the Peshitta. The recension before us gives the beginning of the letter according to the attesting note of the LXX. In the middle of the document condensation by the simple omission of clauses was seen to be awkward and perhaps impossible, so instead a summary is given in the third person. That we have not found the proclamation itself is not extraordinary from the very fragmentary con-

dition in which the annals of Nebuchadnezzar have come down to us.

Vers. 2, 3.—I thought it good to show the signs and wonders that the high God hath wrought toward me. How great are his signs! and how mighty are his wonders! his kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation. The Greek versions for these two verses are in absolute agreement, hence one is not surprised to find that in the Syriac of Paulus Tellensis, these verses, with that preceding, are marked with an asterisk, which proclaims them not to have been regarded by their translator as a genuine part of the Septuagint, but to have been added from Theodotion. They are in close agreement with the Massoretic text. In these two verses the Peshitta is also at one with the Massoretic text. It is possible that this may have been the actual beginning of the document; on the other hand, it may have been simply the suggestion of some later scribe of how such a proclamation might have begun. The latter is, perhaps, the more probable. At the same time, it vindicates its position by being a not unnatural expression of feelings such as Nebuchadnezzar might well be supposed to have had after such an experience as he had passed through. It may even be that the signs and wonders to which Nebuchadnezzar refers are not merely those of his dream and its fulfilment, but all the signs that had been manifested in his reign.

Vers. 4, 5.—I Nebuchadnezzar was at rest in mine house, and flourishing in my palace: I saw a dream which made me afraid, and the thoughts upon my bed and the visions of my head troubled me. In the Aramaic text there is what may be regarded either as a play on words of the nature of rhyme, or the traces of a doublet. The Septuagint begins the chapter with this verse, as does the Massoretic text, but further appends a date, "In the eighteenth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar said, I was at peace in my house, and established upon my throne: I saw a vision, and I was awestruck, and fear fell upon me." Theodotion differs from this and also from the Massoretic text, and renders, "I Nebuchadnezzar was flourishing (*εὐθηνῶν*) in my house, and was prospering (*εὐθαλῶν*)." The similarity in sound between *εὐθηνῶν* and *εὐθαλῶν* may have had to do with the rendering. It will be noted that this is further from the Massoretic recession than the Septuagint. The Peshitta repeats the idea of rest, "I Nebuchadnezzar was at peace (*shala*) in my house, and was resting (*reeh*) in my palace." The Massoretic is supported by the Septuagint, and, therefore, strong. The date in the Septuagint, however, may

be questioned. The eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar was that preceding the capture of Jerusalem, which, according to Jer. lii. 12, happened in the nineteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar. In the twenty-ninth verse of the same chapter we have an account of the carrying away of prisoners by Nebuchadnezzar in his eighteenth year, in a passage omitted from the LXX., in a way that makes it probable that, if this passage be genuine, the one is according to the Jewish, the other according to the Babylonian mode of reckoning. If that is so, the eighteenth year of Nebuchadnezzar would mean the year of the capture of Jerusalem. If this date had, however, been correct, something about the coincidence would have been mentioned. Had this book been written to encourage the Jews in their conflict against Epiphanes, it would have been mentioned that Nebuchadnezzar's madness occurred after he had captured Jerusalem. At the same time, a later scribe would have a tendency to insert such a date, even if no date had been there, or at all events to modify any other date into this. Thus we find in the Septuagint ver. 15 (Massoretic 19, Authorized Version 24) a reference to the capture of Jerusalem. Another cause would tend to make "eighteenth year" liable to occur at this point, it is that the previous chapter in the Septuagint begins with assigning the same date. The change must have been made before the exemplar from which the Septuagint translator made his translation had been transcribed, as it appears in Paulus Tellensis. Ewald has suggested "the twenty-eighth year"—in many respects a probable suggestion. As Ewald has pointed out, the proclamation would have a date. Even if, as Ewald maintained, it was the work of a later time than the days of Nebuchadnezzar, yet so skilful a writer could not fail to recognize the necessity. The Septuagint Version does not give the beginning of this narrative the form of a proclamation. The attitude of the king is that of rest after the toils of long wars—an attitude that could not be attributed to him when he had not reached the middle of his reign. The conquest of Egypt followed the capture of Jerusalem. The difference between "ten" and "twenty" in Aramaic, as in Hebrew, is comparatively little. *עשר* ("sar") is "ten," *יָעָרְשׁ* ("s'reen") is "twenty." As the "ten" is the final word in the numerical statement, it would be modified *asaratha*, whereas the word "twenty" is frequently in similar circumstances unmodified; we should then have "s'reen. It may have been even later, but if the real year had been "thirty-eighth," the modification of the words would

require to be greater. Ewald's further consideration, that as "thirty-eighth" would only leave five years till the forty-three years of Nebuchadnezzar were completed, and therefore would not leave space for the seven years of madness, is of less force, as we are not obliged to take "times" as "years" in vers. 16 and 32. The king had received tokens of Divine power in his past history, and had in a sort acknowledged God, but still he had not surrendered his pride. The idea that in this there is a reference to Epiphanes seems far-fetched. The only reason assigned by Hitzig and Bohrmann is that the Antiochian mob nicknamed him *Ἐπιμανής*. We have no reason to believe that this was a common nickname, even in Antioch, and there is not very much likelihood of the nickname spreading to Judæa. There is absolutely no evidence that Antiochus ever received the nickname "Epimanes." The passage appealed to is usually Polybius, xxvi. 10, but in that passage there is nothing of the kind said. This portion of Polybius has come down to us only in quotation in Athenæus' *Deipnosophistæ*—a collection of odds and ends, strung together by a dialogue. In this book, twice is this portion of Polybius quoted, and in introducing this quotation in both cases the author refers to the nickname "Epimanes." In the one case, v. 21 (193), he says generally "Antiochus, surnamed (*κληθείς*) Epiphanes, but called (*ὀνομασθεὶς*) Epimanes, for his deeds." So far as this goes, Antiochus may have been generally nicknamed Epimanes; but it is to be noted that this is not said, and Polybius is not given as the authority. In the other passage the aspect of things is changed. In x. 53 (439) Athenæus gives the reference to the book of Polybius, and says, speaking of Antiochus, "Polybius calls him Epimanes on account of his deeds." Here Athenæus says that Polybius himself called Antiochus Epimanes, not that anybody else did so. He does not say that Polybius says that Antiochus "was called Epimanes," but that "Polybius calls him (*Πολύβιος δ' αὐτὸν Ἐπιμανῆ καὶ οὐκ Ἐπιφανῆ*)."

He further gives no indication where Polybius says this. As there is no evidence for the nickname, there is no evidence that this incident was invented to suit this non-existent nickname. The picture of Nebuchadnezzar at rest in his palace is as unlike as possible the uneasy restless demeanour of Antiochus, staggering through the streets more or less drunk, joining with any brawlers he might come in contact with. If the writer of Daniel got the story of the madness from the nickname, he would not fail to get an account of the habits of the monarch, which

led to the nickname being given. If he intended his picture of Nebuchadnezzar resting in his palace after his victorious career, with all the dignity of an Oriental monarch, to be recognized as a portrait of Antiochus roaming the streets with a set of drunken companions, the author of Daniel must have had singular ideas of portraiture. It would require a madness greater than Nebuchadnezzar's to believe it.

Vers. 6, 7.—Therefore made I a decree to bring in all the wise men of Babylon before me, that they might make known unto me the interpretation of the dream. Then came in the magicians, the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers: and I told the dream before them; but they did not make known unto me the interpretation thereof. These verses do not occur in the LXX. Theodotion is a somewhat slavish translation of the Massoretic text, "From me there was set up (*ἐτέθη*) a decree to summon before me all the wise men of Babylon," etc. The Peshitta is somewhat freer, but as close to the Massoretic text. Still, the want of the verses in the Septuagint would throw a doubt on their authenticity, even if there were nothing in the verses themselves to make them liable to suspicion.

Ver. 8.—But at the last Daniel came in before me, whose name was Belteshazzar, according to the name of my god, and in whom is the spirit of the holy gods: and before him I told the dream, saying. This verse is also omitted in the Septuagint. Instead of this verse and those preceding, this verse occurs after the account of the dream, "And when I arose from my couch in the morning, I called Daniel, the ruler of the wise men, and the chief of the interpreters of dreams, and I related to him the dream, and he showed me all the interpretation of it." Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The Septuagint arranges differently; instead of deferring the account of the dream till Nebuchadnezzar tells it to Daniel, the account of the dream follows immediately upon the statement of the fact that it had occurred and had troubled the king. In it, as we have seen, there is nothing of the summoning of all the wise men of Babylon in all their various classes. This summoning of the whole college of wise men, astrologers, soothsayers, and Chaldeans, is in obvious contradiction, not only to ch. ii. 48, but also to the ninth verse of the chapter before us. There was no need of summoning the college of augurs until the king had consulted their head. The explanation of these verses and the occasion of their interpolation is not unlike the fact narrated in ch. ii. 2, where Nebuchadnezzar, on ac-

count of his first dream, calls together the wise men—that when he had a dream that troubled him it was natural that Nebuchadnezzar should do as the Septuagint declares he did, summon “Daniel, the ruler of the wise men, and the chief of the interpreters of dreams.” One result of which follows, if we discard these verses, i.e. that we get rid, in this passage, of the class of “Chaldeans,” and further, of the etymology of “Belteshazzar,” both of which have been made objections to the authenticity of Daniel.

Ver. 9.—O Belteshazzar, master of the magicians, because I know that the spirit of the holy gods is in thee, and no secret troubleth thee, tell me the visions of my dream that I have seen, and the interpretation thereof. This verse is also omitted in the Septuagint. Theodotion and the Peshitta both have this passage, but with slight variations from the Massoretic text. Instead of “No secret troubleth thee,” *compel*, Esth. i. 8] thee,” Theodotion renders, “No secret (*μυστήριον*) baffles (*ἀνυψαρεί*) thee.” The Peshitta renders, “And no secret is hid (*ethcasee*) from thee,” reading, instead of *אין*, probably *התקטן*. Behrmann, who translates the word by *verborgen*, thinks the choice of the word occasioned by Ezek. xxviii. 3, “No secret is hid from thee” (*קִטְּוֹן*), this last word, he thinks, occasioning the use of *אין*; but *קִטְּוֹן* is used in Aramaic (see Lev. xiii. 6, “dark” of the spot of leprosy). It seems more probable that there is some mistake in the reading. The Massoretic reading of the last clause seems modelled on the situation in the second chapter, where Nebuchadnezzar demands of the magicians that they not only give the interpretation of the dream, but tell the dream itself. The versions here do not agree with the Massoretic. Theodotion renders, “Hear the vision (*ὁρασις*) of the dream which I saw, and tell me its interpretation.” The Peshitta has, “In the vision of my dream I was seeing visions of my head, and tell me the interpretation.” The Massoretic reading contradicts the situation, and the variety of reading in the two versions confirms the suspicion of this verse induced by its absence from the Septuagint. “Master of the magicians” (*rab-hartum-majja*). There is nothing in ch. ii. 48 about the promotion of Daniel over the “magicians,” but only over the “governors (*signen*) of the wise men (*hakaymeen*) of Babylon.” This is not to be in itself regarded as a proof of antagonism between these verses and the earlier portion of the book, as Daniel might have been promoted in the interval. The Peshitta calls Daniel *rab-halmeen*, “chief of the wise men;”

Theodotion, *ἀρχων τῶν ἱεραδῶν*. It is also to be observed that the writer of these verses does not make Daniel *rab-mag*, which so generally was anciently understood to mean “master of the magicians.” Avoiding an alluring blunder is often as clear a proof of knowledge as a directly correct statement. “Spirit of the holy gods;” not “the Spirit,” but “a spirit.” The Authorized Version is here correct in translating “gods,” not “God,” as the adjective is plural; not as Theodotion, who renders, “a holy spirit of God,” reading, *רוח אלה קדוש*.

Ver. 10.—Thus were the visions of mine head in my bed; I saw, and behold a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great. The Septuagint is different here, “I was sleeping [on my couch], and behold a lofty tree springing out of the earth, and its appearance was great, and there was not another like to it.” The words, “on my couch,” are marked with an asterisk, denoting that they have been added, probably from Theodotion. There are indications here of a text slightly different from the Massoretic, even in the latter portion of the verse, where the LXX. and the Massoretic text come closest. Instead of *b'go'* (*בְּתוֹכָהּ*), “in the midst of,” the LXX. reading has been *saggee* (*σάγῃ*), “great.” The last clause is most widely different from the Massoretic text; instead of “and the height thereof was great,” we have, “and there was no other like it.” It is not easy to imagine how the one reading grew from the other. *Roomeh* (*רוֹמֵה*), “height,” might easily be mistaken for *קִקֵּה* (*d'mah*), if *roomeh* were written defectively; but the rest of the clause cannot easily be explained. The Massoretic text has a certain redundancy of meaning, which is suspicious. In this verse we are told the tree was “great;” the opening clause of the following says the tree grew; whereas the Septuagint, while asserting its loftiness, asserts also that it was “growing” (*φύμενον*). On the whole, we prefer the Septuagint, as it does not proceed to assert further that the tree “grew great.” Theodotion, while in the latter portion of the verse agreeing with the Massoretic text omits the introductory clause. The Peshitta is a briefer recension of the Massoretic text, “The vision in my couch was—a tree in the midst of the earth, the height great.” The reference here may be to the sacred tree of the Assyrians, the symbol of life, which is so perpetually introduced into the sculptures of Nineveh, and seen also in some Babylonian cylinders, especially in connection with royal acts of worship. In Lenormant (*‘La Magie,’* p. 27) we find that a sacred tree—a conifer of some sort

as seen by the sculptures—was supposed to have the quality of breaking the power of the seven *Mashim*. Whatever the origin of this belief, it seems to have passed into the faith of Assyria and Babylon, and to have so permeated them that Ezekiel (xxxi.) describes Assyria as a mighty cedar. To pass from the empire to its ruler was a specially easy step in regard to an Oriental monarchy, in which the state was the monarch. *In the midst of the earth.* This refers to the notion each nation had that their own was the middle point, or *omphalos*, of the world. Though *in (gav)* meant originally really “back,” not “middle,” yet it is used of the furnace of fire in the preceding chapter, and the primitive meaning is entirely lost in the Targums.

Ver. 11.—The tree grew, and was strong, and the height thereof reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth. This verse is transposed in the Septuagint with the following verse, and is rendered, “And its appearance (*ῥααῖς*) was great, and its top approached to the heavens, and its breadth (*κῶτος*, equivalent to “branches”) filled (*πληροῦν*) to the clouds all things beneath the heaven and the sun and the moon were, and dwelt in it, and enlightened all the earth.” The addition in the last clause is a singular and picturesque one to one standing beneath a spreading tree; sun and moon might pierce with their rays through some thin points in the foliage, but they would seem never to get beyond the widespread branches of the tree, and therefore it would be but a poetical mode of statement to say, “the sun and moon dwelt amid the branches.” At the same time, it is not impossible that there was some astronomical legend of the sun and moon and the tree of life. If this proclamation was originally written in cuneiform, there might easily be some difficulty at times in deciphering and fixing in which of a dozen possible senses a given word must be taken. The variation is beyond the region of mere ordinary blundering in Aramaic. On the other hand, it seems too picturesque for the work of a commonplace interpolator. Theodotion in the main agrees with the Massoretic, but instead of “sight thereof,” he has “breadth (*κῶτος*) thereof,” reading some such word as *pathoother* instead of *hazothet*. The Peshitta is in close agreement with the received text. To those who, like the Babylonian, believed the earth to be a vast plain, it was not inconceivable that a tree should be so high as to be seen over the whole earth. It is a very suitable symbol of a great world-empire. At the same time, we must remember that the great variation in this

verse in the Septuagint makes its authenticity somewhat doubtful.

Ver. 12.—The leaves thereof were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all: the beasts of the field had shadow under it, and the fowls of the heaven dwelt in the boughs thereof, and all flesh was fed of it. The Septuagint Version here is widely different: “Its branches were thirty furlongs in extent, and underneath its shadow all beasts of the earth took shelter, and in it the birds of heaven made their nests, and its fruit was much and good, and it supplied all living creatures.” As already mentioned, this verse occurs before the one we have just been considering. It differs, like it, more than can be explained by a mistake in reading the Massoretic Aramaic; if it were translated from a cuneiform document, it is easily imaginable in what form the statement might be made. The reading, however, is not an unlikely one in the description of a dream. If we could have imagined the Indian banyan tree to have been known to the authors of this version, we might have understood the tree of the dream to have been like it. Theodotion is at one with the Massoretic text, as also the Peshitta. Whether we take the symbol of a tree used for the Babylonian empire, as drawn from the Babylonian tree of life, or merely devised by the poetic fancy of the monarch, inspired for the time, it must be recognized as very apt. From the Persian Gulf to the Mediterranean, it stretched from the cataracts of the Nile in all probability into Asia Minor. Over all this empire the monarch maintained the attitude of an earthly providence. It was because government was strong that peaceable men could live. It is useless to carry the similitude into the minutiae of Jepheth-ibn-Ali, who maintains that the wild beasts are the nomads of the deserts, and the birds the strangers that came to Nebuchadnezzar from far. In the Aramaic here there are traces of the antiquity in the language: the use of *inbaya*, “fruit,” instead of *ibbaya*, is one instance. *Saggee* (with *sin*) is a proof that the distinction between *ṣ* and *s* was still understood, and probably heard. It is remarked by Keil that this word does not really mean “much,” but rather “great,” “strong.” Although it is undeniable that he is correct as to the primitive meaning of the word, it can scarcely mean anything else than “much” in the present connection. *Mazon*, “food,” is rare as a Biblical word, but occurs in Genesis as well as Chronicles. Professor Bevan quotes Nöldeke in favour of a Mandæan origin for it.

Ver. 13.—I saw in the visions of my head upon my bed, and, behold, a watcher

and an holy one came down from heaven. The Septuagint Version is shorter here, and therefore, other things being equal, is to be preferred, "And I saw in my dream, and an angel was sent in power from heaven." Theodotion is as usual in closer accord with the text of the Massoretic than is the Septuagint; yet he omits "of my head." The Peshitta, yet closer to the Massoretic text, only omits "behold." There is now a change in the vision. The monarch sees "a watcher and a holy one descend." This is rendered rightly by the Septuagint, "an angel." Jepheth-ibn-Ali maintains that there are two, and that the watcher is the higher. The word *רִמְּ* ('eer), "watcher," occurs only in this chapter in the Bible. In the Book of Enoch the name occurs almost a score of times, and is used to designate the arch-angels. In the present case the word *רִמְּ* (*gaddeesh*), "a holy one," is in all likelihood an explanatory addition, the word being unknown before—probably an adaptation of some Assyrian name. On the other hand, in the Book of Enoch every one is supposed to be as well acquainted with the *רִמְּ* of Daniel as with the cherubim and ophanim of Ezekiel and the seraphim of Isaiah. Does not this imply that, at the time the Book of Enoch was written, the Book of Daniel was equally well known with those of the two other prophets? The latest conceivable date for Enoch is B.C. 130, and so late a date never would have been thought of had there not been a necessity to place its date after that at which critics in their wisdom had placed Daniel. The date above mentioned implies that Judas Maccabæus is unmentioned in a struggle of which he was the crowning hero. Even grant that later date, it is inconceivable that a single generation could have given Daniel such a place of honour as to be regarded as the equal with Isaiah and Ezekiel. In this connection it is to be noticed that, though the *ophanim*, "wheels," of Ezekiel are made use of, the *soosim*, "horses," of Zechariah do not appear in the later books. Yet they are declared to be spirits. If Daniel were a contemporary of Ezekiel, and his writings had thus had time to sink into the mind of the Jewish people, this phenomenon can be understood.

Ver. 14.—He cried aloud, and said thus, Hew down the tree, out off his branches, shake off his leaves, and scatter his fruit: let the beasts get away from under it, and the fowls from his branches. The Septuagint Version is, "And one called and said to him, Cut it down, and destroy it; for it is decreed by the Highest to root it out and destroy it." It is possible that *αὐτῷ* in the Greek was due to *קַיְנ* (*kayn*) being read as

קַיְנ (*ḳayn*). The phrase as it stands in the Greek is not unlike Rev. xiv. 18, "And another cried with a loud voice to him that had the sharp sickle." It is, therefore, equally possible that *קַיְנ* (*ḳayn*) has been changed into *קַיְנ* (*kayn*). The latter part of the verse is more condensed, and therefore, by that, more probable; only the rooting out commanded seems to contradict the fact that it is also commanded to leave "one root of it." Theodotion is in much closer agreement with the Massoretic, save that the beasts, instead of being warned to depart from beneath the shadow of the tree, are to be shaken (*σαλευθήσασιν*) from beneath it, as are all the birds from its branches. The Peshitta is an accurate translation of the text of the Massoretic. A peculiarity to be observed in the Aramaic is that the verbs are in the plural, which is retained in Theodotion and the Peshitta. It seems difficult to understand this. Stuart's explanation—which is practically that of Hävernick and Hitzig—that the command is addressed by the *רִמְּ* ('eer) to his retinue, seems highly forced, as there has been no word of a retinue. Keil's and Kliefoth's view, that the plural is the impersonal, does not suit the circumstances. We have a suspicion that the plural is due to a mistake—thinking the watcher and the holy one were separate persons. The Septuagint, however, has the plural, which is all the more extraordinary that *αὐτῷ* is singular. The function assigned here to the angels must be observed. Here, as in the parables of our Lord, the angels are the instruments by whom the decrees of providence are executed. In our days angels are not believed in. It is possible that materialism has much of its advantage over us, in that we do not recognize the existence and activity of angelic forces among the agencies of nature and providence.

Ver. 15.—Nevertheless leave the stump of his roots in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts in the grass of the earth. Again the Septuagint differs considerably from the received text, "And thus he said, Leave one root of it in the earth, in order that it may with the beasts of the earth browse in the mountains on grass like an ox." As the reading is the briefer, it is on the whole to be preferred, the more so that the belt of iron and brass is got rid of. The Septuagint assumes that the work of demolishing the tree had gone on to some extent, and then the watcher intervenes to bring forward this limitation to the completeness of the destruction at first enjoined. Theodotion is in

agreement with the Massoretic text, as also the Peshitta. Moses Stuart thinks the belt of iron and brass is represented as being put round the stump of the tree in order to prevent it cracking, and so rotting, in this following von Langerke. Keil, with more justice, thinks that this is a transition from the symbol to the person symbolized; in this view he agrees with Hengstenberg, Kliefoth, Zöckler, Behrmann, Hitzig, Ewald, Kranichfeld, and others. There is a further division of opinion as to whether it symbolizes the mental darkness Nebuchadnezzar will be under, or the limitation of his kingdom, or the fact that, as a maniac, he will be bound with fetters. The fact that, while commentators have devoted so much time to this, there is no reference to it in the interpretation, confirms us in our suspicion of the whole clause. The transition to the person, if barely doubtful in regard to the belt of iron and brass, is obvious in the remaining clauses in this verse. Every tree is wet with the dew of heaven—that would indicate neither degradation nor hardship; and the browsing with the beasts is impossible to a tree. The transition from thing to person is in perfect accordance with what every one has experienced in dreams.

Ver. 16.—Let his heart be changed from man's, and let a beast's heart be given unto him; and let seven times pass over him. The Septuagint rendering seems to be taken from the previous verse, "And let his body be changed by the dew of heaven, and let him be pastured with them seven years." It seems difficult to imagine, either, on the one hand, *lib'bayh* (changed into *ῥῆμα* (*rhēma*), the word by which Paulus Tellenius translates *σῶμα*, though it suggests "carcase," or into *ῥῆμα* (*rhēma*), the word used in ch. vii. 15; or, on the other, that either of these should be read *l'bab*. At the same time, *ῥ* and *ב* are not unlike in old inscriptions, nor *א* unlike *ג*; any indistinctness in the third letter might easily lead to a mistake. It is not impossible that some of the words in the latter part of the previous verse have been modified from some word meaning "body." It is equally difficult to guess what word has been read by the Septuagint translator instead of *ῥῆμα* (*rhēma*), "let them pass over." The greater brevity of the Septuagint is in its favour. Theodotion is, as usual, in closer agreement with the Massoretic; he renders *min-anaosha* or *anosh'a* by ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, "from men"—a possible translation, and one favoured by some recent commentators. The Peshitta agrees quite with the received text. According to the received text, the main change was mental—the human heart is removed, and the heart of a beast given. On the

other hand, in the twenty-third verse, in which we have the fulfilment of the dream, the change is mainly physical, and it is to be observed that the change is produced by "the dew of heaven." *Secent times*. The word "iddanun," "times," is a matter of some difficulty; it means really "seasons" or "points" of time, as in Eccles. iii. 2, Targum, and Gen. xxxviii. 1, Targum Onkelos, "It came to pass at this time." It is purely arbitrary to fix the meaning here as "years," as is done by the Septuagint and by many commentators. Theodotion keeps the indefiniteness of the original by rendering the word here *καποί*. The Peshitta transfers the word. It may be "months" as suggested by Lenormant; it may be "seasons," in our usual sense of the word. Rendel Harris's 'Biblical Monuments,' p. 73, says, "Summer and winter are the only seasons counted in Babylonia;" if so, seven 'iddanun would be nearly four years. From the fact that exposure to weather is the point of importance, Mr. Harris's view is not impossible; but pathological reasons suggest "months" (see Excursus at the end of chapter). *Seven*, with the Babylonians, as with most other Semites, is a round number of sacred import, and therefore may not be pressed.

Ver. 17.—This matter is by the decree of the watchers, and the demand by the word of the holy ones: to the intent that the living may know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will, and setteth up over it the basest of men. In this verse the difference between the Septuagint text—we mean the text behind that version—and that of the Massoretic is great. It is as follows: "Until he know the Lord of heaven to have power over all things which are in heaven and on the earth, and such things as he willeth to do, he doeth." This, as may be observed, is very much briefer than the Massoretic, and hence, to a certain extent, to be preferred. It is, however, difficult to imagine the genesis of the one from the other, as they have only two words in common in a similar connection, *שֹׁלֵט* (*shaleet*) and *יְיָ* (*yhwh*). If we start with the supposition that the Massoretic text is the primary, we have a difficulty in seeing what reason induced this peculiar form of condensation. Had it been to get rid of the decree of the watchers, and the demand of the holy ones, that clause might have been simply omitted, and the sense would have given no sign of anything having been omitted. If, again, we start with the Septuagint text as our basis, it is difficult to understand what led to the insertion of "the decree of the watchers" and "the demand of the holy ones." Of

course, the period of the Persian domination and that of the early Greek supremacy was one in which the angelic hierarchy was enormously increased and made vastly more complex than it had been before. Further, it is to be noted that "the watchers," *עֲרֵכִין* (*'ereen*), are here distinguished absolutely from "the holy ones," *קָדְשֵׁיין* (*qad-deesheen*), whereas in ver. 10 (13) "the watchers" and "the holy ones" are identified. This distinction is made in later Jewish commentators, and therefore its presence here, in contradistinction to ver. 13, is proof of a relatively late origin for this clause. Zöckler would avoid this by asserting a parallelism of members in this sentence; but, in the first place, this is not verse, but prose, and therefore parallelism need not be expected. Further, *גְּזָרַת* (*g'zayrath*) is "a decree" given by a person in authority, and *שְׁאֵלָת* (*sh'alayth*) is "a petition" presented to one in authority. So far from the two being identified in the verse before us, the watchers and the holy ones are as absolutely contrasted as they can be. Bevan simply appeals to ver. 10 (13) to prove their identity—sense has no influence with him. When we turn to Theodotion, we find that, in his practical identity with the Massoretic text, he has preserved the contrast between "decree" and "petition," the former word being represented by *σύνκριμα*, and the second by *ἐπερώτημα*. These two words represent fairly well the distinction between *גְּזָרַת* (*g'zayrah*), and *שְׁאֵלָת* (*sh'aylah*). It is probable that *σύνκριμα* is used instead of *κρίμα* in order to show that *εἶς* is to be regarded as genitive plural. The Peshitta follows the Massoretic, but less closely. It has *ܩܕܝܫܐ*, "watcher," in the singular. This clause in the Syriac should be rendered, "according to the decrees of the watcher is this order, and according to the word of the holy one is the request;" it retains the distinction in question much as it is in the received text, but with a distinct difference of meaning in regard to the other words of the clause. So, too, Jerome in the Vulgate translates, "In sententiâ vigillum decretum est et sermo sanctorum et petitio," thus maintaining, in all the confusion there is in this rendering, the distinction we have referred to. In the final clause, the Vulgate is further astray from the Massoretic, translating, *super eum*. The theology of this passage is singular, so singular that, were it not for the omission of the passage from the Septuagint, and its contradiction of ver. 13, we might be inclined to think it must be genuine. (For a similar statement, see Gal. iii. 19, "The Law . . . was ordained by angels;" Heb. ii. 2, "If the word

spoken by angels was steadfast.") The view seems to be that the Almighty had a council of angels, and before them was every question discussed ere it was decreed. In short, that there was a heavenly sanhedrin, corresponding to that on earth—an idea which was developed by the Talmudists. It appears in Enoch, not yet fully developed. In Enoch xii. certain of the watchers are denounced as having defiled themselves with women; in ch. xx. we have the name of the holy angels who watch, and in this chapter we have the different provinces assigned to each of them. Six are enumerated. They have thus no collective function. In the portion of Enoch preserved in Syncellus, men are represented as calling to the heavens, and addressing them; and the four angels, Michael, Uriel, Raphael, and Gabriel, give answer by looking down upon the earth, and they see the blood that is being shed by violence. Then follows the statement, "And the four archangels came before the Lord, and said." They may be here said to act in a collective capacity, but they have no deliberative function, still less have they any power to decree. The interpolated verse before us thus represents an angelology more developed than that of the date of the Book of Enoch. And *setteth up over it the basest of men*. This phrase suggests the "vile person," *נִבְזֵחַ* (*nib'zeh*), of ch. xi. 21, who is probably Epiphanes—the reference in this interpolated verse is not unlikely the same. The Syriac form of *ܩܕܝܫܐ* in the K'thib has to be observed. One peculiarity which points to interpolation is the Hebrew plural here used, *עֲרֵכִין* (*'an'sheem*). Were it not that our suspicions of this verse are deepened by examination of it, we should be inclined to see a reference to that usurpation of Nebuchadnezzar's throne, which Lenormant thinks is implied in the title Neriglissar gives to his father. There seems to be a reference to something like this in ver. 24 of this chapter, according to the version of the LXX.

Ver. 18.—This dream I King Nebuchadnezzar have seen. Now thou, O Belteshazzar, declare the interpretation thereof, forasmuch as all the wise men of my kingdom are not able to make known unto me the interpretation; but thou art able; for the spirit of the holy gods is in thee. This verse is wholly omitted in the Septuagint. On the other hand, the verse in the Septuagint which occupies this place is totally different from anything in the Massoretic text: "Before me was it cut down in one day, and its destruction was in one hour of the day, and its branches were given to every wind, and it was driven out and dragged forth, and it ate the grass of the earth, and

it was delivered to a guard, and in brazen fetters and shackles was it bound with them. I marvelled exceedingly at these things, and the sleep departed from mine eyes." The first thing that strikes one with this is the fact that it is a translation from Aramaic. The clause, "in brazen fetters and shackles was it bound with them," seems nearly demonstrative of this. *Ἐν πένδαις καὶ ἐν χειροπένδαις χαλκαῖς ἐδέθη ἡν' αὐτῶν* is not a sentence which any one would naturally write in Greek, but the sentence is natural if the translator followed his Aramaic original slavishly. If, then, this is correct, the hypothesis of a *falsarius* is reduced to that of an Aramaic *falsarius*, who intruded this verse into the Aramaic original which was conveyed down to Egypt. On the other hand, the verse in the Septuagint completes the narrative which the Massoretic text leaves unfinished. This may be used as an argument against the authenticity of this version, as the need of completion may have suggested the mode in which the need was to be supplied. But it is also to be noted that there is present the same mixture of sign and thing signified, which, natural in a dream, is so unnatural in ordinary narration, that the *falsarius* who had observed the incompleteness of the Massoretic text, and had the necessary skill to supply the want, would not have increased the confusion, already manifest enough. When we turn to Theodotion, we see symptoms of trouble, "This is the vision which I Nebuchadnezzar the king had, and thou, Belshazzar, tell the interpretation, because none of the wise men of my kingdom were able to show me its interpretation; but thou, Daniel, art able, because a holy spirit of God is in thee." The introduction of the Jewish name Daniel in the midst of a speech in which he is always elsewhere addressed by his Babylonian name, is suspicious. The repetition, in this as in the Massoretic, of the original incongruity that Daniel, the head of the court magicians, is only summoned after the other magicians have proved unable to solve the mystery of this dream, is to be noted. The Peshitta here partly follows the same text as that followed by Theodotion, and partly that of the Massoretic. Like Theodotion, "Daniel" is inserted, but, following the basis of the Massoretic text in opposition to Theodotion, it has "a spirit of the holy gods." There seems no possibility of imagining the LXX. reading to have developed from the Massoretic, or *vice versa*. If there were any proof of Dr. O. H. H. Wright's hypothesis, that our present Daniel was a condensation of a larger work, it might be supposed that the Massoretic represented one condensation, and the LXX. another.

The Septuagint at this point inserts, "And having risen early in the morning, I summoned Daniel, the ruler of the wise men and chief of the interpreters, and related to him the dream, and he showed all the interpretation of it." In Gen. xli. we have two accounts of Pharaoh's dream, first in connection with his actual dreaming, and next in his narrating to Joseph his experience. If the original tract—from the union of several of which we imagine our book has been compiled—from which this chapter is condensed contained, like Gen. xli., two accounts of Nebuchadnezzar's vision, and the Egyptian recension followed one condensation of this tract, and the Palestinian another, the phenomena are explicable without the idea of a vague gratuitous variation, such as that of which, on the traditional view, the writer of the Septuagint has been guilty. On the ground that the Massoretic text may represent also a true text of Daniel, another fragment of the original document, we may examine it a little more closely. The king declares the dream to Daniel in a way that indicates a certain attestation of the accuracy of the report of what he had seen. "This is the dream which I Nebuchadnezzar the king saw." Then follows the command to declare the interpretation, "You are master of magicians. I have duly brought before you an accredited dream which I have had, fulfil now your office, interpret to me my dream." This much is natural. What follows is an obvious interpolation. It contradicts what has preceded, which, by implication, asserts Daniel's duty to interpret, and therefore the probability that not last, but first, would Daniel have been appealed to. It contradicts also what follows, which is a commendation of Daniel's powers, which, as known to the king, ought to have led him at once to summon him, as the Septuagint says Nebuchadnezzar did. The commendation of Daniel appears an addition to get over the difficulty, but, like many other attempts of the same kind, it fails, and really adds to the confusion.

Ver. 19.—Then Daniel, whose name was Belshazzar, was astounded for one hour, and his thoughts troubled him. Thus far the two main recensions are agreed. The Septuagint renders practically to the same effect as our version, only that *ὁρῶντας κατέσπευδεν αὐτόν* means rather "suspicions disturbed him," which is the rendering of Paulus Tellenius. There are traces in it of doublet; the rendering of the LXX. is, "And Daniel greatly marvelled, and suspicions disturbed him, and he was terrified, trembling having taken hold of him, and his visage was changed, having moved (*κινήσας*) his head, having been amazed one

hour, he answered me in a meek voice." Theodotion and the Peshitta are at one with the Massoretic text here. It is to be noted here that the word *sh'n'a*, translated "hour," has no such definite meaning; Gesenius gives, "a moment of time," in which he is followed by Bevan, Keil, and Stuart. Ewald translates, *eine Stunde*, and with him agree Hitzig, Kranichfeld, Zöckler. Both the Greek versions have *ὥρα*, but we must bear in mind that *ὥρα* had not the definite meaning which we attach to "hour." Jerome renders *hora*. The Septuagint adds, as we have seen, somewhat grotesquely, "having moved (*κινήσας*) his head, he was astonished for one hour." This seems a case of "doublet," that phenomenon so frequent in the Septuagint. The Septuagint rendering, "And (*ὁ*) Daniel was greatly astonished, and suspicious troubled him, and, trembling having seized him, he was afraid," suggests that it is not impossible that *ὁ*, "greatly," had been read instead of *ὥρα*, "an hour;" but the rest is not so easily explicable. There is one case of Syriasm here in the vocalization of *ἡ* instead of *ὁ*. The king spake, and said, Belteshazzar, let not the dream, or the interpretation thereof, trouble thee. This clause is absent from both the Greek versions, though present in the Peshitta and Vulgate. As it stands, on the one hand, it is a departure from the epistolary style, or perhaps rather the proclamative style of the earlier portion of the chapter. On the other hand, if we think this clause an interpolation, we cannot fail to note that the kindly courtesy and consideration ascribed by the interpolator to Nebuchadnezzar is utterly unlike the character of Epiphanes as manifested to the Jews. Nebuchadnezzar saw that Daniel was filled with sorrow and apprehension at the meaning he saw in the vision, and endeavours to reassure and encourage him. If the conduct of Nebuchadnezzar is unlike that which a Jew of B.C. 170 would have ascribed to him were it his intention to present in him Epiphanes under a disguise, still more unlike is the conduct of Daniel to that which certainly would have been ascribed to him had the author intended to represent him as a model of the pious Jew in a heathen court—in the court of Epiphanes. Would Mattathias have remained astonished and speechless in the presence of Epiphanes, had it been revealed to him that Epiphanes was to be driven out to the wilds a madman? If, then, it is an interpolation, it is an early one—earlier than the Maccabean struggle. But if the interpolation be early, the book interpolated must be yet earlier. Belteshazzar answered and said, My lord, the dream be to them

that hate thee, and the interpretation thereof to thine enemies. The Septuagint maintains the epistolary character of this narrative here, "And Baltasar answered me with a meek voice, This dream be to those that hate thee, and let the interpretation thereof come upon thine enemies." Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate are at one with the ordinary text. The feelings of Daniel towards Nebuchadnezzar seem to have been those of the highest personal loyalty, and thus in the widest contrast from the feelings that any Jew of the time of the Maccabees would have towards Epiphanes. He, Daniel, in his love for the grand impulsive despot, would have the enemies and haters of his monarch swept forth to wander as maniacs, rather than that he should so suffer.

Vers. 20—22.—The tree that thou sawest, which grew, and was strong, whose height reached unto the heaven, and the sight thereof to all the earth; whose leaves were fair, and the fruit thereof much, and in it was meat for all; under which the beasts of the field dwelt, and upon whose branches the fowls of the heaven had their habitation: it is thou, O king, that art grown and become strong: for thy greatness is grown, and reacheth unto heaven, and thy dominion to the end of the earth. The Septuagint Version here differs very considerably in wording from the above, but not in sense, "Thou, O king, art this tree planted in the earth, the appearance of which was great, and all the birds of the heaven made their nests in it: the strength of the earth and of the nations, and of all tongues to the ends of the earth, and all the provinces (*χῆραι*) serve thee. And that tree was exalted and neared the heaven, and its breadth (*κῦρος*) touched the clouds. Thou, O king, wast exalted above all men that are upon the face of the whole earth, and thine heart has been [literally, 'was'] lifted up with pride and strength over those things which pertain to the Holy One and his angels, and thy works are manifest, because thou hast laid waste the house of the living God on account of the sins of the consecrated people." The latter portion of this contains plain evidence of interpolation. Had there been anything of that sort in the original Daniel, it would not have disappeared from the Massoretic text. This addition reveals the mental attitude of the Jews of the Maccabean period to foreign oppressors. The fact that the whole atmosphere of the primitive Daniel differs so much from this is an indirect evidence of its genuineness. If one looks at the Septuagint rendering of these three verses, there seem evidences of an early origin. The first verse is clearly an instance in which

the text behind the Septuagint is superior to that of the Massoretic; the latter is obviously filled out from ver. 11. The statement of Nebuchadnezzar's greatness in ver. 22 (14 Septuagint, 18 Massoretic) may be somewhat the result of paraphrase. The fifteenth verse, according to the LXX., which is paralleled by Tischendorf with ver. 19 of the Massoretic, is really another version of the preceding verses, probably slightly modified to give the resulting text the appearance of being continuous. Theodotion bears a very close resemblance to the Massoretic text, only he has *κῶτος*, "breadth," instead of *ῥαυσις*. The Peshitta differs but little, though still a little, from the Massoretic text. Instead of rendering, "ment for all," it has, "for all flesh." According to both recensions of the text, Daniel repeats, either in substance or with verbal exactness, the description Nebuchadnezzar had himself given of the tree of his vision, but applies it to the monarch. To us the terms of the description of Nebuchadnezzar's power are exaggerated; but we must bear in mind that the manners of an Oriental court are different from those of Western nations. It is not unlike the boastful language of Nebuchadnezzar in the Standard Inscription. The monarch's dominion was vast, but it had been given him, and that he did not recognize, and hence the judgment that came upon him.

Ver. 23.—And whereas the king saw a watcher and an holy one coming down from heaven, and saying, Hew the tree down, and destroy it; yet leave the stump of the roots thereof in the earth, even with a band of iron and brass, in the tender grass of the field; and let it be wet with the dew of heaven, and let his portion be with the beasts of the field, till seven times pass over him. This in the beginning agrees with the text behind the Septuagint Version of ver. 14 (7 LXX., 11 Massoretic). In that verse, instead of the elaborate process of cutting off branches and shaking off leaves, the Septuagint had simply, *καταφθεῖρε αὐτό*. This confirms us in our preference of the Septuagint there. In the present instance, the Septuagint is briefer than the Massoretic text; it varies in some points, which may indicate the hand of a redactor, "And the vision which thou sawest, that an angel was sent in strength, and commanded to root the tree up and to cut it down, the judgment of God shall come upon thee." Here, again, there is nothing of "the watcher and the holy one," nothing of the belt of "iron and brass," nor of the "tree having its portion with the beasts of the field," nor that it was to be "wet with the dew of heaven." Some of these features are mentioned in the account

of the vision, but are not repeated now. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta carries the repetition yet further, and inserts, "And his heart shall be changed from the heart of a man, and the heart of a beast shall be given him." In this the process already begun in the text of the Massoretic is carried a little further. The Vulgate agrees with the received text. Daniel rapidly notifies the principal features in the king's dream, before he proceeds to explain it.

Ver. 24.—This is the interpretation, O king, and this is the decree of the Most High, which is come upon my lord the king. The passage in the Seventy which is parallel with this is partly in the last clause of the previous verse and partly in the verse that occupies a similar place to this in the Septuagint text, "The judgments of the great God shall come upon thee, and the Most High and his angels assail thee (*κατατρέχουσιν ἐπὶ σέ*)."

The change of tense here indicates that the second clause is an alternative rendering, brought into the text from the margin. In this marginal note *m'ta* has been taken as "assail," and *malka'*, "O king," has been, by transposition of the two final letters, read *m'la'k*, "angel." Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The respectful tone in which Daniel addresses Nebuchadnezzar in the received text is to be observed; it is utterly alien to the boastful tone Judaism was afterwards accustomed to impute to its old saints. That there is no reference to the watchers or to their decree in this is imputed to Daniel's recognition of its true source; but in the Septuagint there is nothing equivalent to the statement in ver. 17. The fact that it is omitted here confirms the suspicion against it which we expressed in regard to the earlier verse.

Ver. 25.—That they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field, and they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and they shall wet thee with the dew of heaven, and seven times shall pass over thee, till thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whosoever he will. The Septuagint Version is here much briefer, and in that better, "And they shall put thee in guard, and send thee into a desert place." The Massoretic text, although it agrees with that from which Theodotion's Version, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate have been translated, is pleonastic. The Vulgate drops the causative element, and simply says, "Thou shalt eat grass like the ox, and thou shalt be wet with the dew of heaven." The Peshitta, while translating *אֵפֶן* by the aphel of "cal—that is to say, making the meaning causative—renders

par by the passive, *tūtāba*; similarly Theodotion renders it. If we are to take the words of Daniel strictly, even in the Massoretic, much more if we take the Septuagint, text, he seems to have understood the dream to point, not to lycanthropy, but to an overthrow at the hands of his enemies, when they would compel him to eat grass in his distress, and, by depriving him of every shelter, force him to be wet with the dew of heaven. There is nothing to indicate that the compulsion should work within, and that by these inner scourges the messengers of the Most High would drive Nebuchadnezzar forth to the fields.

Ver. 26.—And whereas they commanded to leave the stump of the tree roots; thy kingdom shall be sure unto thee, after that thou shalt have known that the heavens do rule. The Septuagint Version here is different, and not so good as the received text, "And (as for) the root of the tree which was left and not rooted out, the place of thy throne shall be preserved to thee to a season and an hour; behold, for thee they are prepared, and they shall bring judgment upon thee. The Lord liveth in heaven, and his power is in all the earth." The last clause here is plainly a paraphrase of "the heavens do rule." "A season and an hour" is a doublet, and since it is to be observed that the phrase, "after that thou shalt have known," is omitted, we may deduce that *thindā*, "thou shalt know," is, by transposition of letters, read *l'iddan*. Theodotion, who is usually slavish in his following of the Aramaic construction, renders here, "And because they said, Suffer the stump (*qūp*) of the roots of the tree." This suggests that in the text before Theodotion *mem* is omitted from *למשב* (*l'mishbag*), and it was read *לשב* (*l'shbagoo*), meaning, according to the Mandaitic form of the verb, "they shall leave"—a form in accordance with the previous construction, then further altered to the second person plural. The end of the verse is also slightly different, "Until thou shalt know the heavenly power," reading here *shooltan dee sh'mya* instead of *shaltan sh'mya*. The Pesbitta renders, "till thou shalt know that power is from the heaven (*min sh'mya*)."
Mr. Bevan remarks on this usage of "heavens" for "God," which he compares with the Mishna and with the New Testament. He does not observe that the difficulty all the translators have with the phrase is a proof that, when the versions were made, it was even then not a common usage; hence that its introduction here was not due to the influence of the Mishnaic Hebrew stretching back, but was owing rather to the peculiar circumstances of

Daniel. Professor Bevan's reference to the New Testament is mistaken. In no case in the New Testament is *οπαροι* used for "God." Even in the Greek Apocrypha is no usage precisely equivalent. Daniel, by using the phrase he did, put himself on the same level as the heathen king—pride against the gods (*ββρις*), and of this, by implication, is Nebuchadnezzar here accused. Certainly the words of his inscriptions do not indicate anything of this sort. In fact, many of the phrases in the prayer to Marduk in the India House Inscription indicate reverent humility almost Christian. Still, these phrases might be due, to some extent, to political custom. The relation of a polytheist to his gods is a psychological enigma to a civilized monotheist. On the one hand, he recognizes his dependence on the god; on the other, he considers the god honoured by his worship, and therefore owing him certain duties in return.

Ver. 27.—Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable unto thee, and break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor; if it may be a lengthening of thy tranquillity. The Septuagint Version differs in this case somewhat considerably. It connects itself with the preceding verse, "Entreat him on account of thy sins, and to purify all thine unrighteousness in almsgiving, in order that he may give thee humility, and many days on the throne of thy kingdom, and that thou be not destroyed." This version is paraphrastic and inferior as a whole to the text of the Massoretes, but at the same time, there must have been a different text to make such a rendering possible. Theodotion is more in accordance with the Massoretic text, but also has resemblances to the Septuagint here, "Therefore, O king, let my counsel be acceptable to thee, and atone for thy sins by almsgiving, and for thine unrighteousness by mercies to the poor (*πενιτωρ*), perchance (*ιως*) God will be long-suffering to thy transgression." The last clause may be due to reading '*elaha*' (*אלהא*) for '*archa*' (*ארכא*), in which case the last clause would read, "God may be for thy tranquillity." In this case Theodotion's rendering is a natural paraphrase. The Pesbitta is in agreement with the received text, save that *malka*, "king," is left out, possibly from its resemblance to *milki*, "my counsel." The Vulgate rendering is, "Wherefore, O king, let my counsel be pleasing unto thee, redeem thy sins by almsgiving, and thine iniquities by mercies to the poor; perchance he will forgive (*ignoscet*) thy sins." This follows Theodotion so far in the last clause, but not wholly.

It is to be noticed that all the versions translate *נָתַן* (*nat'qah*) "almsgiving"—a late meaning, and one not present in the Massoretic here. It can only be forced upon this passage by giving *נָתַן* (*nat'qah*) a meaning it never has, as Professor Boyan and Koil show it to mean "to break," and as breaking a yoke meant "setting free," it thus meant redeeming a person; but in the sense of paying a ransom for sins, it never is used, even in the Targums. There is, therefore, a wide difference between the moral standpoint of the writer of Daniel and that of his translators—so wide that the writer of Daniel does not see the possibility of his words being twisted to this meaning. In Ecclesiasticus almsgiving is made equivalent to righteousness. The writer of Daniel is on a different moral plane from Ben Sira. But more, Daniel must have been translated into Greek before Ecclesiasticus, as the whole canon was translated when the grandson of Ben Sira had come down to Egypt, and this at the latest was B.C. 135; on the critical hypothesis, not a score of years separate the text of Daniel from the translation. The courteous beginning of Daniel's speech is to be observed; he is anxious to win the king to repentance. Compare the stern, unrelenting demeanour of Elijah to Ahab, and of Elisha to Jehoram. If we compare this with the way the Jews of Talmudic times regard the memory of Titus, the Roman captor of Jerusalem, we see we are in a totally different atmosphere from that in which the Jewish *falsarius* of any period of Jewish history could have lived. A grand impulsive character like Nebuchadnezzar could not but at once allure and awe the young Jew, but a zealous Jew would have regarded it as derogatory to imagine this of a prophet of the Lord, and so we see the Septuagint translator drops the courteous words with which Daniel introduces his advice. Daniel looked upon the fact that the warning had been given as an evidence that there might be a place for repentance.

Vers. 28, 29.—All this came upon the King Nebuchadnezzar. At the end of twelve months he walked in the palace of the kingdom of Babylon. The Septuagint here has the look of a paraphrase. In continuation of the preceding verse, "Attend (*ἀγάνυσον*) to these words, for my word is certain, and thy time is full. And at the end of this word, Nebuchadnezzar, when he heard the interpretation of the vision, kept these words in his heart" (compare with this the phrase in Luke ii. 19). "And after twelve months the king walked upon the walls of the city, and went about its towers, and answered and said." The variations appear to be due to a desire to expand and explain.

It seemed to the translator more natural that, after a survey of the walls and towers of Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar should speak his boastful words, hence he makes the suitable changes in the verse before us; so, too, with the effect of Daniel's words on the king. The rendering of Theodotion coincides nearly with the text of the Massoretic, save that *haychal* is translated "temple" rather than "palace"—a translation which usage quite permits. The Peshitta retains the double meaning. One of the great buildings erected by an Assyrian or Babylonian monarch was his palace, which had also the character of a temple. In the case of the Ninevite monarchs, the walls of the palace were adorned with sculptures, portraying the principal events of the monarch's reign. This not impossible might be the case with the palace of Nebuchadnezzar. Babylon as a city seems to have been practically rebuilt by him—his bricks are the most numerous of any found in Babylonia.

Ver. 30.—The king spake, and said, Is not this great Babylon, that I have built for the house of the kingdom by the might of my power, and for the honour of my majesty? The meaning of the Septuagint rendering is the same as the above, "This is Babylon the great, which I built, and the house of my kingdom is it called, in the might of my power, to the honour of my glory." Theodotion and the Peshitta in the main agree with the received text. It is one of the characteristics of the earlier Chaldean monarchs who reigned over the small Chaldean cantons in Mesopotamia, that they named their capital city from themselves, as Bit-Dakuri and Bit-Adini; the capital of Merodach-Baladan was called after his father, Bit-Jakin. We need scarcely explain that *bit* represents *beth*, "house." In all ages an imperial power has expressed its greatness in the splendour of its capital, but in the case of the Babylonian Empire, Nebuchadnezzar was the empire, therefore the splendour of the city was a testimony to his glory.

Vers. 31, 32.—While the word was in the king's mouth, there fell a voice from heaven, saying, O King Nebuchadnezzar, to thee it is spoken; The kingdom is departed from thee. And they shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field: they shall make thee to eat grass as oxen, and seven times shall pass over thee, until thou know that the Most High ruleth in the kingdom of men, and giveth it to whomsoever he will. The Septuagint rendering has many points of interest, "While the word was yet in the mouth of the king—at the end of his speech—he heard a voice out of heaven, To thee

it is said, O King Nebuchadnezzar, the kingdom of Babylon has been taken from thee, and is being given to another—a man set at naught in thy house: behold, I set him in thy kingdom, and thy power and thy glory and thy delicacy he takes possession of; that thou mayest know that the God of heaven hath dominion over the kingdoms of men, and to whomsoever he willeth he shall give it. To the rising of the sun another king shall rejoice in thy house and shall possess thy glory and thy might and thy dominion." The differences between the Massoretic and Theodotion are inconsiderable. The Peshitta adds the clause, "wet with the dew of heaven," to the description of the humiliation of Nebuchadnezzar; and to the account of the supremacy of the God of heaven adds, "and raises to it the humble man." This latter clause seems like a faint echo of the more precise statement of the LXX. The Vulgate differs here only as in the former case, omitting the causative. The reference in the LXX. to a special person in the house of Nebuchadnezzar, exalted upon his throne, appears to support an idea thrown out by Lenormant. Neriglissar, the son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar and the successor of Evil-Merodach, claims to be the son of Bel-zikir-iskun, King of Babylon (Lenormant, 'La Divination,' 204), but in the list of Ptolemy there is no such name; hence Lenormant imagines that this Bel-zikir-iskun usurped the throne for a short while, too short to be in the canon of Ptolemy. There is no trace of such a usurpation in the contract tables. Rawlinson's hypothesis is difficult to believe. It is that this Bel-zikir-iskun was king in Babylon before the fall of the Assyrian Empire, before Nabopolassar. But from the accession of Nabopolassar to the death of Evil-Merodach is sixty-five or sixty-six years. A man of the age implied was little likely to take part in a revolution or leave behind him an infant son. It is difficult to decide, but it must be admitted that Lenormant's position is at all events a possible solution of the question.

Ver. 33.—The same hour was the thing fulfilled upon Nebuchadnezzar: and he was driven from men, and did eat grass as oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven, till his hairs were grown like eagles' feathers, and his nails like birds' claws. The verse that is placed as parallel with this in the Septuagint differs very considerably. In the LXX. this verse is still part of the proclamation of the angel, "Early shall all these things be completed upon thee, Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, and nothing shall be wanting of all these things." This verse is properly without a correspondent in the Massoretic text.

The next verse resumes the proclamation, "I Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon was bound seven years, and they fed me with grass as an ox. I ate from herbs of the earth." Then after a verse which Tischendorf marks as an interpolation, but which really is a misplaced doublet, we have a continuation of ver. 30 (33 Authorized Version), "And my hairs became like feathers of an eagle, and my nails like those of the lion, and my flesh and my heart were changed, and I walked naked with the beasts of the earth." The fact that this is longer than the Massoretic text is decidedly against it. It seems to be a paraphrastic rendering of a text somewhat similar to the Massoretic. On the other hand, the fact that it retains the first person makes it at least possible that the condensation of the middle portion of this chapter, according to the received text, is not resorted to in this recension. It is to be noted that only a very few words in the Septuagint necessitate any idea of condensation; only in the beginning of ver. 27 Septuagint (28 Aramaic, 31 Authorized Version) is there a change of persons. This verse is rendered by Theodotion in a way much like the Massoretic text. The first portion of the verse is an exact translation of the Aramaic, but at the end the rendering is, "till his hairs grew like those of lions, and his nails as those of birds." The Peshitta agrees exactly with the Massoretic. One cannot help being suspicious of this assertion of the hair being like eagles' feathers, partly because the eagle is a bird, and "birds" are spoken of in the next clause of the verse, and further there appears to be a pun on the last portion of the king's name in the word used for "eagle" (*nasher*). The Jewish scribes were prone to have such plays on names. Early in history it occurs, as when Abigail makes use of it to David in regard to her husband (1 Sam. xxv. 25), "Nabal is his name, and folly is with him." This possibly is the reason for the Hebrew variation in the name given to the Babylonian Nabu-kudur-utzur. Theodotion's version shows the result of reasoning—it is a scribe's emendation. That matted hair should have an appearance which suggested the feathers of birds, is natural enough, and the utter inattention to matters of personal cleanliness is an exceedingly common symptom in cases of insanity. This personal neglect would naturally result also in the growth of the nails, and their incurving would give them vaguely the appearance of lions' claws. We can picture the Babylonian monarch that had, like his Ninevite predecessors, been finical about his curled locks and trimmed and jewelled fingers, walking in wild nakedness so far as his

shackles permitted him, with hair in matted locks, and his nails misshapen and long.

Ver. 34.—And at the end of the days I Nebuchadnezzar lifted up mine eyes unto heaven, and mine understanding returned unto me, and I blessed the Most High, and I praised and honoured him that liveth for ever, whose dominion is an everlasting dominion, and his kingdom is from generation to generation. If the translator of the Septuagint had the Massoretic text before him, he has gone utterly away from it, and gives us a mere paraphrase, "And after seven years I gave my soul to prayer, and besought concerning my sins at the presence of the Lord, the God of heaven, and prayed concerning mine ignorances to the great God of gods." There is another version of this verse, for this which we have given has been misplaced. The verse which appears in the proper place, though also very different from the Massoretic, is as different from that we have just given, "And at the end of seven years the time of my redemption came, and my sins and mine ignorances were fulfilled before the God of heaven, and I besought concerning my ignorances the God of gods, and behold an angel out of heaven called to me, saying, Nebuchadnezzar, serve the holy God of heaven, and give glory to the Highest; the kingdom of thy nation has been restored to thee." The latter clause has the look of leading into the following verse. One cannot but feel that there is in both the work of the paraphrast, but at the same time, he seems, in both cases, to have been working with a different text from that of the Massoretes. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree accurately with the Massoretic. The sudden gleam of intelligence that broke the spell of madness is a perfectly natural termination to an attack like that under which Nebuchadnezzar suffered. The tranquillizing effect of prayer is well known. The ascription of praise in the liturgic formula here given is not unlike what we find in the Ninevite remains. Bevan suggests as a parallel, Euripides' 'Bacchæ', where there is a recovery from madness accompanied with looking up.

Ver. 35.—And all the inhabitants of the earth are reputed as nothing: and he doeth according to his will in the army of heaven, and among the inhabitants of the earth: and none can stay his hand, or say unto him, What doest thou? The rendering of the Septuagint here is very difficult to follow, from the state of confusion in which the text is. The verse that comes next in order is very short, "At that time my kingdom was set up, and my glory was restored to me." This is a condensed statement of what is recorded in the following verse (ver. 36; 33 Massoretic), and we shall con-

sider it in that connection. The verse which succeeds suits more the conclusion of such a letter or proclamation as is here represented, so far as form goes, though the matter shows traces of exaggeration and amplification natural to the Jew. At the same time, it bears a resemblance to the last verse of this chapter, according to the Massoretes, only greatly amplified. It may thus be best to regard this verse as not present in the Septuagint text. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The statement here is true, but Jewish, not Babylonian, in colour. This, along with its absence from the Septuagint, leads us to believe it to be the insertion of a Jewish scribe. On the other hand, it looks like a statement in brief of what we find expanded in Isa. xl. and elsewhere. If brevity is to be regarded as an evidence of antiquity, this passage might be taken as the more ancient. It is, however, too bald and prosaic to be the original of such an impassioned passage as that in Isa. xl.

Ver. 36.—At the same time my reason returned unto me; and for the glory of my kingdom, mine honour and brightness returned unto me; and my counselors and my lords sought unto me; and I was established in my kingdom, and excellent majesty was added unto me. As we have already mentioned, the verse in the Septuagint text which agrees to this is very brief, "At that time my kingdom was set up and my glory restored to me." It may be a condensation of some independent scribe, carried to a greater degree in the one case than the other. Only from the genesis of our Daniel, as we have imagined it, it would seem more probable that the briefer forms are the more primitive, and the longer the result of the expansion to be credited to imaginative copyists. In proof of this it is to be observed that neither Theodotion nor the Peshitta exactly represents the Massoretic text. Theodotion renders, "At that time my intellect (*αἱ φρένες μου*) was restored to me, and came to the glory of my kingdom, and my beauty ("*ἡ μορφή μου*") returned to me, and my rulers and nobles sought me, and I was confirmed upon my kingdom, and more abundant greatness was added unto me." The Peshitta differs somewhat from this, "And when my intellect returned to me, my nobles and my great army sought me, and to my kingdom was I restored, and its great inheritance was increased to me." The differences between these two and the Massoretic text are slight compared with those that separate any one of those from the Septuagint; yet startling with the Septuagint text, the others are easily reached by slightly varying additions. The Peshitta certainly more clearly

portrays what seems likely to have taken place—first, a revolution during the king's madness, and a counter-revolution to restore him when his reason returned. If, however, Nebuchadnezzar was simply confined in a portion of the palace, then his nobles, on the news of his restoration, might seek unto him. None of the texts presents quite a self-consistent representation. If we could perfectly unravel the confusion of the texts which form our present Septuagint text, we should probably find one of them nearly self-consistent.

Ver. 87.—Now I Nebuchadnezzar praise and extol and honour the King of heaven, all whose works are truth, and his ways judgment: and those that walk in pride he is able to abase. The Septuagint Version has all the appearance of an original composition by a scribe, not impossible in imitation of the Song of the Three Holy Children, taking as its theme the subject of the verse before us, "I confess and praise the Highest, who created the heaven and the earth and the sea. He is God of gods, and Lord of lords, and King of kings, because he doeth signs and wonders, and changeth seasons and times, taking away the kingdoms of kings and setting up others instead of them. Now from this time I shall worship him, and from fear of him trembling hath taken hold of me, and all the holy ones I praise, for the gods of the nations have not power in themselves to turn away the kingdom of a king to another king, and to kill and to make alive, and to do signs and marvels great and fearful: and to change very great matters according as the God of heaven did to me, and charged to me great things. I will offer sacrifices to the Highest every day of my reign for my life, for a savour of sweet smell before the Lord, and what is pleasing before him I shall do, and the people and my nation and the countries which are in my dominion. And as many as shall speak against the God of heaven, and as many as shall be taken saying anything, these shall I condemn to death." Several of the phrases in this short hymn—for that it rather is than a version of an Aramaic original—are derived from other portions of Scripture; e.g. "for a savour of a sweet smell before the Lord." There are traces also of the familiar phenomenon of "doublets." Theodoret and the Peshitta agree with the Masoretic text. So far as the Masoretic text represents the original Daniel, there is no evidence that Nebuchadnezzar had ceased to be a worshipper of Bel-Marduk and Nebo and Nergal. Certainly he recognizes that Jehovah is to be worshipped also. Further, it is to be admitted that Nebuchadnezzar carries his adoration very near the point of true and exclusive worship. In what he

came short it may be that he yielded to the political necessities of his situation—as Naaman bowing in the temple of Rimmon. Even an autocrat like Nebuchadnezzar would be conditioned by those who served him, and after his madness he would be specially under the power of those officials who had restored him to his place.

Excursus on Nebuchadnezzar's Madness.

The events of the fourth chapter of Daniel are full of elements that have caused question from the days of Porphyry downwards. Many of these have been discussed as they occurred in the narrative. The question of the madness of Nebuchadnezzar has several features which cause it to be of interest. Some of these have been passingly treated in reference to the passages in which they are mentioned. But to a thorough understanding of the matter it is well to collect these features together and discuss it as a whole. To do so effectively, we shall have to consider (1) the nature of the disease under which Nebuchadnezzar suffered; (2) the length of time during which he was under it; (3) what evidence there is in the narrative, or on the monuments, of political changes during the time he was incapacitated.

1. The disease under which Nebuchadnezzar suffered. Dr. Pusey says (p. 428), "It is now conceded that the madness of Nebuchadnezzar agrees with the description of a rare sort of disease called lycanthropy, of which our earliest notice is a Greek medical writer of the fourth century after our Lord, in which the sufferer retains his consciousness in other respects, but imagines himself to be changed into some animal, and acts up to a certain point in conformity with that persuasion. Those who imagined themselves changed into wolves, howled like wolves, and (there is reason to believe, falsely) accused themselves of bloodshed." Archdeacon Rose, in the 'Speaker's Commentary,' says, "There is now no question that the disease under which Nebuchadnezzar is said to have suffered, is one of a well-known class of diseases known by such names as lycanthropy, kyanthropy, etc., according to the animal whose habits are simulated by the subject of this disease." There is no question that there was a disease that was so called: Dr. Pusey has collected proof of that. It is to be noted that all the instances he quotes are from ancient writers. It occurred also in Mediæval times. The point that is not quite so certain is that Nebuchadnezzar had this disease.

In the first place, *lycanthropy* has a distinct and definite meaning in mental patho-

logy. Those suffering from it "abandon their homes and make for the forests, that they may consort with those they imagine to be their kind; they allow their hair and nails to grow; they carry their imitation so far as to become ferocious, and mutilate and even to kill and devour children." Here we must observe that the neglect of the person, with the result of hair and nails growing, is not peculiar to that form of madness, but is really common to many varieties of mental disease. The two other characteristics are more special—the endeavour to consort with animals of the species to which the patient imagines himself to belong, and the destructive ferocity that in the form of wolf-madness, *lycanthropy*, properly so called, led to cannibalism. Of neither of these symptoms have we any indubitable evidence in the narrative. In regard to the first, of Nebuchadnezzar it is certainly said (vers. 15, 23) that "his portion" should "be with the beasts of the field;" ver. 25, "Thy dwelling shall be with the beasts of the field;" but here there is nothing to indicate that Nebuchadnezzar did this out of a mad overmastering longing. Rather, the very opposite is implied by the statement (vers. 25, 32), "They shall drive thee from men, and thy dwelling," etc. So in ver. 33 it is said, "And he was driven from men." The question may be said to turn on the force of the word "they." It certainly may mean that the angels of God, as avenging spirits, might drive Nebuchadnezzar from men, and that his longing to consort with animals may have been the scourge that drove him, but that is not said or implied. It may have been the members of his own household that so drove him forth directly, or it may have been the indirect result of the cruel treatment intended to be curative. It may be urged that the statement, "Let a beast's heart be given him," implies this longing to consort with animals. In the first place, "heart," לֵב (l'bab), among the Shemites does not, as among Occidentals, mean the longing appetitive part of our nature, but really the spirit. In the next place, the reading in the Septuagint is quite different; it is not the "heart," לֵב (l'bab), but the "body," σώμα, reading בָּשָׂר (b'sar) instead of לֵב (l'bab).

Indeed, when we turn to the Septuagint, we find a total want of all this appearance of abandoning house and home. In the statement of the dream (ver. 11, LXX.), "And it [the tree] was dragged and torn out, and in brazen fetters and shackles was it bound with them." Again, in the interpretation (ver. 18, LXX.), "And they shall put thee in guard, and send thee to a desert place." When we turn to the fulfilment of

the dream (ver. 25, LXX.), we find, "And the angels of heaven shall drive thee (ἀποτορῶσαι σε) seven years, and thou shalt not be seen nor speak with any man; and thou shalt eat grass as an ox, and thy pasture shall be from the herb of the field." Again (vers. 27, 28, LXX.), "I was bound for seven years, and they fed me with grass as an ox, and my hairs became like eagles' feathers, and my nails like lions' claws, and my flesh and my heart were changed, and I walked naked among the beasts of the earth."

The more I studied this, the less I was satisfied with the all-but universal decision that Nebuchadnezzar suffered under *lycanthropy*. Having a friend a specialist in mental disease, I submitted the case to him, giving him, in addition to what he found in his English Bible, the version of the Septuagint. He is eminently qualified to judge all questions of mental disease. David Yellowlees, Esq., M.D., is head of one of the largest lunatic asylums in Scotland, Gartnavel, near Glasgow. He has been President of the Medico-Psychological Association of Great Britain; is Lecturer on Insanity in the University of Glasgow; and has had over thirty years' experience in the treatment of mental disease. He kindly wrote me the following, which he has permitted me to publish:—

"Nebuchadnezzar's illness was *not* *lycanthropy*; it was an attack of acute mania, which recovered, as such attacks usually do if uncomplicated, in seven months.

"Acute mania, in its extreme forms, exhibits all kinds of degraded habits, such as stripping off and tearing of clothes, eating filth and garbage of all sorts, wild and violent gesticulations, dangerous assaults, howling noises, and utter disregard of personal decency. The patient often is liker a wild animal than a human being. These symptoms merely show the completeness of the aberration, and do not at all indicate a hopeless condition. On the contrary, they are seen most frequently in the cases which recover.

"The king was apparently treated as kindly as the enlightenment of the times permitted—bound when injuring himself or others, taken to a desert place away from other men, and allowed a mad freedom, in which his attacks found relief and eventual recovery."

In another communication, Dr. Yellowlees says, "The 'seven times' certainly did not mean seven years for recovery from that form of insanity, that is, acute mania would be most unlikely after so long a time. Seven months is a far more likely period."

2. This leads us to consider the second question—the length of time during which Nebuchadnezzar was under this malady.

The phrase which states the duration occurs four times—vers. 16 (13), 23 (20), 25 (22), 32 (29)—and is always the same, “till seven times pass over him (thee).” שבעה עשר ימים יעברו עליו (*sheeb’ah ‘iddaneen yahi’phoon ‘alohee*). The question turns on the sense to be given to *‘iddan*. This word is found thirteen times in this book—nine times besides the four times in this chapter. We find it three times in the second chapter, where it means the time during which certain planetary and stellar influences were at work. This naturally suggests the signs of the Zodiac and the phases of the moon, and therefore a month, though the probability is that the period in the king’s mind was much shorter. The ruling phases of the moon would make a fourfold or threefold division not improbable, while the positions of the planets in the various astrological houses make it more likely that a day rather than even a month is meant. We find the word next in the following chapter (vers. 5 and 15), “At what time (*‘iddan*) ye hear,” etc. Here it means a point of time, and in the other verse (7), where the phrase occurs we have זמן (*zim’na*), which usually means a set, fixed point of time. We find it again in the seventh chapter (vers. 12 and 25). In the twelfth verse, after the destruction of the fourth beast, the other beasts continue for “a season and time,” זמן וזמן (*zman v’iddan*); it here means a space of time totally indefinite. In the twenty-fifth verse the word in question occurs three times in the phrase, “a time, times, and a dividing of time.” Here it has been assumed to mean “a year,” and this is certainly not improbable for this particular case; but nothing can be drawn from this as to the sense of the word elsewhere. So far as the usage of this book is concerned, we can say the word *‘iddan* means a space of time, the length of which is determined by the context. When we pass into the Targuma, we find the same, or, if possible, even greater freedom of use. It is used for the time of old age in Ps. lxxi. 9; in Eccles. iii. for “the times.” There is a phrase, *‘iddan b’iddan* (“time in times”), which is commonly understood to mean a year. This would render it probable that the word was originally some period much shorter than a year, probably a month; thus Gen. xxiv. 55, where we render, according to the Masoretic, “a few days, at least ten.” Onkelos renders, *‘iddan b’iddan* ‘o *‘asrah yarheen* (“time in time, or ten months”), where the word certainly means “months.” The usage of the Peshitta is much the same. Gaon Saadia would assign to *‘iddan* here the sense of “month;” in this he is followed by Lenormant. Notwithstanding the

objections of critics and lexicographers, we venture to follow these two authorities the more readily that the critics have assigned no reason why we should not do so.

3. Is there any trace in the inscriptions surviving to us to throw light on this mysterious event? At one time it was supposed that in the Standard Inscription of Nebuchadnezzar we had a distinct reference to this period of madness. As at first translated, Nebuchadnezzar declared that for four years he did not occupy himself in building. A series of further negative sentences followed. More careful study and more accurate rendering have removed that misconception. From the nature of the Standard Inscription, it was *a priori* unlikely that anything of the kind supposed should have been found in it. It is a record of the various buildings, etc., he had constructed for the honour of the gods and the beauty of his capital. The dates of the erection of these edifices or the construction of these canals is not given; so the fact of years in which nothing was done is not necessarily noticeable. Lenormant (*‘La Divination*, 204) makes another suggestion. When he ascends the throne, after the murder of his brother-in-law, Evil-Merodach, we find Neriglissar (Nergalsharezer) claiming that his father, Bil-zikir-iskun,¹ had been King of Babylon. Lenormant’s theory is that Bil-zikir-iskun reigned while Nebuchadnezzar was thus incapacitated by madness. Certainly, between the accession of Nabopolassar in B.C. 625, to the death of Evil-Merodach in B.C. 559, there is no sovereign but the three members of the one dynasty. Rawlinson (*‘Five Great Monarchies*) places him immediately before Nabopolassar, and reads his name Nebu-sum-iskun. But as deposition meant death, this would imply that his son—Neriglissar—even if only an infant, at the death of his father, would be at least sixty-five years of age at the death of Evil-Merodach. This is not an age when men engage in conspiracies. But more, he leaves behind him an infant son. While not impossible, this is an unlikely solution. If, then, he did not reign before Nabopolassar, there must have been some interval in which he held the throne while the legitimate occupant was incapacitated by disease or distance from the capital. It was not during the interval between the death of Nabopolassar and the accession of Nebuchadnezzar, because Berosus tells us of the rapid march Nebuchadnezzar made through the desert from Syria to reach Babylon before any usurpation took place. It did not take place between the death of Nebuchad-

¹ Read by Rodwell (*‘Records of the Past*, v. 139) “Bel-sum-iskun.”

nezzar and the accession of Evil-Merodach, for, from the contract tables, there seems to have been no interval of uncertainty. Bel-zikir-iskun may have, so M. Lenormant thinks, usurped the throne during the illness of Nebuchadnezzar. If the interval were less than a year, Ptolemy might not insert the name in his chronicle. Against this theory is the fact that throughout the whole of Nebuchadnezzar's reign there never is seven months without a contract preserved to us, dated by the years of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar. This is not absolutely conclusive, because some of the contract tables, after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus, are still dated by the reign of Nabunahid. We are compelled to abandon the position that we have any trace of this madness. We have an analogous case

in the history of Nabunahid; for a long period, not less than five years, he was unable to take part in the business of the empire. Meantime, there is no indication in the contract tables that anything is wrong. The annals of Nabunahid reveal to us the fact that the king's son was acting monarch; but had these not come down to us, we should never have known of any incapacity befalling this monarch. Bel-zikir-iskun may have acted as monarch during Nebuchadnezzar's illness, and this may have been the fact that enabled Neriglissar to assert his father to have been King of Babylon.

It is not impossible that Nebuchadnezzar's decree may yet turn up from the rubbish of ages.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—3.—*The testimony of experience.* It is interesting to observe that the account of Nebuchadnezzar's great humiliation comes from the lips of the king himself, without a word of comment by his servant Daniel. While the conduct of the prophet teaches us to regard the chastisement of other people with a similar courtesy of reserve, that of the king should remind us of the duty and utility of frankly confessing the lessons of our own experience.

I. THE DESIRE TO GLORIFY GOD AT THE EXPENSE OF OUR OWN HUMILIATION IS ONE OF THE FAIREST FRUITS OF GENUINE REPENTANCE. 1. Nebuchadnezzar had been a *haughty despot*. The confession of deep humiliation by such a man is evidence of a great change of spirit. The moral value of humility must be measured (1) by the strength of the natural disposition to pride, as this varies greatly in different temperaments; and (2) by the temptations of a man's station in society. To some self-abasement is familiar and natural. To others it brings keen agony. In the latter case it is a wonderful result of repentance. 2. Nebuchadnezzar had *defied the God of the Jews*. (Ch. iii. 15.) To recognize him as the true God, who held the king's destiny in his hand, was another proof of a great change. It would have been much if Nebuchadnezzar had privately trusted in the true God. But his repentance is confirmed by this public confession. 3. Nebuchadnezzar had been a *selfish tyrant*. He now sinks his self-interest in concern for the glory of God. We never truly and perfectly repent until we renounce self, and give ourselves up to a pure desire to glorify God.

II. THE TESTIMONY OF EXPERIENCE IS AN EVIDENCE OF SPIRITUAL TRUTHS WHICH WE SHOULD CAREFULLY OBSERVE FOR OURSELVES AND GRATEFULLY OFFER TO OTHERS. The recognition of Divine truths in the passage before us is specially valuable, because it is not based on abstract grounds, but is derived from personal experience. It does not come from an inspired Hebrew prophet, but from a heathen king, and it derives a special force from this circumstance, because the spiritual teaching of Scripture thus finds an echo in a most unlikely quarter. 1. *Ignorance* of Divine truths on speculative ground gave force to the testimony. There can be no self-deceit in such cases. 2. *Prejudice* against these truths, after it was overcome, increased the force of the testimony. The king was not accustomed to bow before any providential power. His recognition of this is the more significant. It disposes of any suspicion of hypocrisy. 3. The *depth of the experience* gave intensity to the testimony. Much religious language sounds hollow because it is not verified by experience. As we realize truth in our lives, we see and feel it with a new power, and then we have at once the clear light of personal knowledge and the strong earnestness of personal feeling to enable us to declare it to others (1 John i. 1).

III. A SOUND INTERPRETATION OF EXPERIENCE WILL TEACH US TO SEE THE POWER, WISDOM, TRUTH, AND RIGHTEOUSNESS OF GOD IN ALL HIS WAYS WITH US. (See vers. 3 and 37.) 1. The *power* of God is seen in his successful performance of his will when the greatest force is set against it, and the greatest difficulties lie in its way, as in the overthrow of the might of Nebuchadnezzar, and the more wonderful restoration of him from his insanity (vers. 29—36). 2. The *wisdom* of God is seen when mysteries of providence are interpreted by later experience, as when the king saw the purpose and meaning of God's strange dealings with him (ver. 36). 3. The *truth* of God is seen in his keeping his word. The dream-prophecy was fulfilled (ver. 28). 4. The *righteousness* of God is seen in the ultimate justice of his chastisements and their good results, as in the deserved punishment of Nebuchadnezzar, and the final good this wrought in him (ver. 25).

IV. A RIGHT UNDERSTANDING OF THE MUTABILITY OF EARTHLY THINGS WILL HELP US TO RISE TO FAITH IN THE ETERNITY OF THINGS DIVINE. Nebuchadnezzar now sees that "God's kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and his dominion is from generation to generation." Before this the king had been warned not to trust in the perpetuity of earthly monarchies, but to see that these must give way before an everlasting kingdom (ch. ii. 44). God sends us changes and disappointments that we may not rest in the temporal and transitory (Heb. xii. 27); and he sometimes reveals, through these changes, principles and purposes which run up into the eternal.

Vers. 28—33.—*The king's madness.* I. INSANITY IS SOMETIMES THE DIRECT RESULT AND NATURAL PENALTY OF WRONG CONDUCT. Although the physician may rightly detect here the symptoms of brain-disease, the religious teacher may go further, and see in this brain-disease the fruits of moral faults. Insanity often shows itself as much in moral as in intellectual aberration—especially in its earlier stages. In many cases it can be traced back to the indulgence of animal instincts, passions, and self-will, to the neglect of higher restraining influences. 1. *Irregular self-will* tends to insanity. Nebuchadnezzar was a tyrant whose merest caprice became a law for his vast empire. If such a man has no moral principles to guide him, the inordinate indulgence of his wild will must be so contrary to the natural course of life that his mind will be in danger of losing its balance. Lunacy is often only the full development of the vice that throws off all restraints. He who would keep his mind in perfect sanity should learn to yield his will to a higher will. 2. *Inordinate self-conceit* tends to insanity. The king's madness came upon him when he was elated with vanity (ver. 30). Insane people are commonly inclined to dwell on their grievances or their imagined greatness, and this absurd habit may often be traced back to an over-sensitiveness or an undue elation with regard to their own worthiness. It is never healthy to think much about ourselves. Mental soundness is best secured by self-forgetting activity and concern for the interests of the large world around us. The habit of introspection and the indulgence in a too subjective religious experience are causes of religious insanity. They who incline in this direction should remember our Lord's caution (Matt. x. 39).

II. WHEN BRUTAL PASSIONS HAVE BEEN THE RULING POWERS IN LIFE, THE HUMILIATION OF THE BRUTE MAY BE A REASONABLE RETRIBUTION. Nebuchadnezzar had shown himself to be governed by passions which can only be described as brutal, and yet he had been honoured with little less than Divine worship. Here was the greatest inconsistency between desert and experience. Frequently this inconsistency is preserved all through a man's life, because judgment is deferred. But whenever judgment is given, it must be expected that, while the man of spiritual character will be exalted to a state of fitting honour, the man of brutal passion will be put down to one of brutal degradation; for it is just that there should be harmony between the outer and the inner life. Perhaps this is implied in St. Paul's teaching about "the spiritual body" (1 Cor. xv. 44), which may be just the most exact expression and closest-fitting vesture of the soul. The principle of justice which underlies the fantastic Oriental doctrine of the transmigration of souls may thus be exemplified in the various ranks and orders of bodily life in the future world. He who would claim to rank as superior to the brute creation must justify his claim by a corresponding elevation of conduct.

III. THERE IS A SPIRITUAL INSANITY IN WHICH MEN RENOUNCE THE PRIVILEGES AND DUTIES OF THEIR HIGHER NATURE, AND LIVE AS IF THEY HAD NOTHING ABOVE THE ANIMAL IN THEM. The degradation of Nebuchadnezzar finds its spiritual counterpart in the voluntary behaviour of multitudes. They have human souls, yet they live as though they should perish like mere animals. They are made in the image of God, yet they act after the manner of brutes. They have spiritual faculties which they blind and deaden with animal passions. If we were not so familiar with such people, and did not all of us, more or less, share their faults, it would be difficult not to regard them as the worst of madmen. While we shudder at the calamity of Nebuchadnezzar, should we not be far more appalled at the awful depravity of so large a part of the human world which calmly accepts a fate in all moral respects its equivalent?

Ver. 37 (last clause).—*Pride humiliated*. I. THE GREATEST PROSPERITY CONTAINS IN ITSELF NO SECURITY AGAINST THE GREATEST ADVERSITY. 1. As *all earthly things are changeable*, it is foolish to place our trust in the permanence of any. Yet there is a tendency to infer that because all is well, all will remain well, as though the mere existence of prosperity were a guarantee of its permanence. This may result from a misapplication of the true principle that the future is determined by the present, and with a certain law of similarity—like producing like (Gal. vi. 7, 8). But if so, it is forgotten that outward prosperity is a very superficial thing, and that the real life and its outgoings lie deeper and may be preparing its very opposite beneath the shallow pleasure of the hour. Therefore to assure one's self for the future, it is necessary to have some deeper and larger ground to rest upon than the mere outside aspect of affairs. 2. *Happiness depends far more upon the condition of the inner life* than upon any external circumstances. Nebuchadnezzar thought himself a beast of the field. With this idea in his mind, all his resources counted as nothing in respect to his comfort. To a blind man the world is dark. A gloomy mood throws a shadow over the brightest scene. The rich and discontented man is miserable, while the poor man will be happy so long as he is contented, because happiness depends not upon possession, but upon satisfaction. Therefore it is useless to be assured that our outward affairs are safely prosperous, unless we have also the assurance of peace of mind and inward gladness.

II. THE FITTING PUNISHMENT OF PRIDE IS HUMILIATION. There is a just and natural association of certain sins with corresponding forms of punishment; e.g. the luxurious Dives tormented with a burning tongue; the man with one idle talent deprived of his talent (cf. Hos. viii. 7). This conception is worked out in Dante's 'Inferno.' So he who will not humble himself shall be humiliated against his will. Pride prepares its own fall (1) by making its possessor careless and self-confident; (2) by disturbing the sobriety of his judgment with the giddiness of self-elation; (3) and by rousing the jealousy and envy of rivals and subordinates.

III. THIS PUNISHMENT OF PRIDE, THOUGH SEVERE, IS NOT HOPELESS. The tree is to be hewn down, but the stump and roots are to be left (ver. 15). So Nebuchadnezzar was to suffer only for a limited period—seven "times" (ver. 25). When prophets threatened the overthrow of the Jews, they promised that this should not be total—a remnant should be spared (Isa. i. 9; Jer. xv. 11); nor final—the people should be restored (Isa. lii. 1—10). Even the severest calamities are tempered with mercy and relieved of despair (Amos iii. 12; Hab. iii. 2).

IV. THE OBJECT OF THE HUMILIATION OF PRIDE IS NOT VENGEANCE, BUT SALVATION. The spite which seeks pleasure in the shame of humiliated pride is itself a fruit of sinful pride, and can find no place in the heart of God. Nor is the feeling of complacency which arises in us from the contemplation of the "poetic justice" this exemplifies, a true image of God's feeling in the humbling of proud men. All God's purposes are, at the root, love. He humbles the proud man because he loves him, and for his good. 1. This humiliation is beneficial in making a man feel the *folly and sin of pride*. 2. It is helpful in making him feel his *own insufficiency* and the need of higher grounds of confidence than are to be found in his own merits and resources. Nebuchadnezzar was led to recognize the true God, and humble himself before him with faith and worship, and thus his salvation was accomplished through his humiliation.

So the salvation of mankind is effected by the humiliation of its representative Christ, and through the self-humiliation of each individual when he takes up his cross and follows Christ in the narrow path of self-denial.

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—3.—*The comeliness of confession.* "To me it seemed *comely* to declare the signs and the wonders that God Most High for me hath wrought" (ver. 2, amended translation). The history of the king's insanity is told, not by the Prophet Daniel, but in a state paper, under the hand of the king, and quoted by the prophet. The edict is true to human nature and to the king's character. The following motives may have influenced him: 1. Gratitude. 2. Conscience. It was right to admit sin and to recount its judgments. 3. A certain complacency in being the object of Divine dealing. 4. A self-respectful independence of the opinion of the crowd. From the text occasion may be taken to discourse on the propriety of recounting the Lord's dealings with ourselves.

I. THE RECOUNTING should be marked by the following characteristics. 1. *The subject-matter* should be of *public concern*. The facts should either be already public, or such as may with propriety be made public property. There are deep things of the human spirit, which, to recount, would be good neither for ourselves nor for others. In Nebuchadnezzar's case, the facts were notorious, though it rested with him to exhibit them in a Divine light. 2. *The audience* may then be *one whole circle*. The largeness of our circle depends in part on our social elevation. The higher our standing, the larger the number who know us. Not entirely our social elevation; for much will depend on our moral elevation. Thomas Wright, the prison philanthropist; Levi Coffin, who was "the underground railway" by which slaves passed from misery to Canada,—were names known all over the world. All who had any knowledge of the king were to hear what the Lord had done for his soul (see ver. 1). 3. *The tone* should be *kindest*. "The royal style which Nebuchadnezzar makes use of has nothing in it of pomp or fancy; but is plain, short, and unaffected, 'Nebuchadnezzar the king.'" 4. *Integrity* should pervade the recital. It should constitute one whole. God's rebukes, as well as his favours, should come into our account, even though humiliating to ourselves, if the good of others and the glory of God demand it. Some striking instances of such recital of sins and the Father's chastisement, will be found in the narrative of his early life by George Müller, in 'The Lord's Dealings.' 5. *The motive* should be *God*. Certainly not our own glory—not self, nor others, save subordinately.

II. THE PROPRIETY OF IT. Such a recounting of Divine dealing with us is: 1. *Good for ourselves*. In the case of the king, he was led (1) to admire the Divine acts; (2) to infer the Divine rule. 2. *Salutary for others*. 3. *Conducive to the Divine glory and the extension of the Divine kingdom*.—R.

Vers. 4—18, 20—27.—*Human greatness, its rise, fall, and restoration.* "Behold a tree in the midst of the earth, and the height thereof was great" (ver. 10). The subject naturally suggested by the text is that of human greatness, its rise, its decay, its restoration. It should be remembered, even in the first entertainment of the theme, that this greatness may inhere in man *individual* as in man *collective*. To guide our thoughts, especially in its practical applications, it will be well, then, to keep distinctly before us the concept *man*, and also that other—the *nation*. The applications will then be rich and manifold. A striking illustration of the greatness of a nation is to be found in the slow growth and present position of Great Britain. That tree has indeed "reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof to the end of all the earth." The pre-eminence of the Anglo-Saxon race, including now the people of the United States, is a still grander illustration. Another hint—that we may not lose ourselves in the grandiloquent and miss the practical, observe that greatness is, after all, only relative, that all humanity is as nothing compared with the majesty of the Eternal. A workman may be relatively great in the workshop; a child in the school; therefore there is no limit to the *applications* of the subject. Apply it to the low levels of common life, as well as to the highest.

I. HUMAN GREATNESS—IN ITS RISE. Observe: 1. *Its dependence.* The tree and the man are alike in this—in being living things. Now, life at first is from God; and is ever sustained by effluence from him. The tone of the king (ver. 30) was that of moral madness (see also ver. 17). 2. *Its growth.* The tree from its tiny seed. The law of man's life is that he *must* grow. The tendency of man (both individual and collective) is to growth. He ought to be so indefinitely. The man that ceases to grow at forty or fifty, mentally, morally, is dead. The young, a-pring spirit is to be retained to life's last hour. Looked at on the reverse side, no greatness is instantly attained. Neither man nor nation vaults into the throne of moral eminence. Wait, but *actively* wait, not passively, as the child of mere circumstance. 3. *Its majesty.* The tree majestic. Man majestic. So a nation. Let not false humility preach otherwise. The grander our conceptions of man, the higher our adoration of his Maker. Even sin cannot hide the original grandeur. A temple, albeit in ruins. 4. *Its loneliness.* Eminence ever lonely. The spires above the city. The snow-domes above the lower mountain ranges. As man rises, he retains, or he should retain, sympathy with all below; but he himself rises into a region where the lower sympathies do not follow him (see Robertson on 'The Loneliness of Christ;' and Dr. Caird on Isa. lxiii. 3, in volume of 'Sermons'). 5. *Its conspicuousness.* The tree was seen from every part of the far horizon. The more eminent man or nation, the more the observed of all observers. The attendant responsibility, therefore—virtue more influential, vice more pestilential. 6. *Its use.* (Ver. 12.) Literal pressing of the figure here impossible. Keep to the commanding central thought, that human greatness *must not have self for its object*. The eminence of man is for beneficence. We live for others, and in so doing find our richest life. One might be tempted to say that in this we contrast with God; but not so. All things, indeed, flow in upon God as their object, but only that he may again give himself, in the grandeur of his love, to the universe.

II. IN ITS DECLINE. Note: 1. *The failure.* In the dream-parable of the tree, nothing is said of the failure; but look at the man, Nebuchadnezzar. To appreciate his usual delinquency we must take account of the extraordinary character of his public works; the aim, pitilessly pursued, of his own aggrandizement; the consequent sacrifice of the wealth, labour, comfort, happiness, and lives of his people. (See 'Daniel, Statesman and Prophet,' R.T.S., pp. 119—121, 126, 127.) The eminence of the great king was not for use and benediction. 2. *The judgment.* (1) *Its time.* In the very height of the king's prosperity. "I was at rest in my house, and green in my palace" (ver. 4). We do not know the exact date, but we know the time in relation to the rest of the king's life. At rest in domestic relations; no serious solicitude about public affairs; conquests achieved; great buildings finished. (2) *Its cause.* Insist on the truth that the doom of men and nations is *morally* conditioned. Illustrations are more than abundant in modern life. (3) *Its source.* Observe: the "watchers" here are not necessarily angels; for they are not objectively real, but subjective in the dream. Still, they point to a *reality* in heaven. (a) *Intelligence* there. The watcher intellectually was characterized by a large, piercing, sleepless eye. (b) *Holiness.* This the moral characteristic. "A holy one." (c) *Arbitrament* there. (d) *Power* there. "Cried aloud." The execution certain (ver. 17). 3. *The decay.* (Ver. 15.) Compare parables of the talent and of the pound.

III. IN ITS RESTORATION. Observe: 1. *The subject remains.* The man indestructible (ver. 15). The moral possibilities abide. 2. *The conditions of restoration.* (1) *The reawakening of the consciousness of God.* (Ver. 34.) (2) *Penitence.* (3) *Bearing practical fruit.* (Ver. 27.) (4) *The conditions accepted on the ground of Christ's atonement.* The atonement, so far as its efficacy goes, is a perpetual fact. The Lamb has been "slain from the foundation of the world." Knowledge of the atonement not absolutely necessary to those blessed by it. It stands as an objective ground, justifying Divine benedictions on the unworthy. The providence of God is the atonement in action. The moral government of God is, since the Fall, mediatorial, always and everywhere.—R.

Vers. 19, 26, 27.—*Reproof by the saintly.* "Then Daniel, whose name was Belteshazzar, was astonished for one hour, and his thoughts troubled him" (ver. 19).

"Astonied for one hour." This is not quite accurate. The meaning is that Daniel was so troubled, so overcome, that he remained for *some time* without uttering a word. Perhaps he stood gazing at the king in mute amazement and sorrow. At length the king himself broke the distressing silence, encouraging the prophet to cast away all fear of consequences, and to tell the meaning, whatever it might be. With much trembling, doubtless, in a tone of deep respect, with fidelity softened by tenderness, Daniel proceeded to point out the meaning—the king's sin and the king's doom. This passage in the history suggests much as to the giving and receiving of reproof. We are our brothers' keepers, but it is to be feared that this duty of spiritual guardianship is one very much neglected. Let us first look at things from the point of view of—

I. THE REPROVED. There are many difficulties in approaching a man with even the most necessary reproof, most of which were present in this case of the king. A sinner is like a fort surrounded by many lines of entrenchment. The reprover is quite conscious of the strength of the moral fortification, and is oft deterred from his duty. The reproved is ready to repel reproof by virtue of: 1. *Self-love*. "Most quick, delicate, and constant of all feelings." 2. *Pride*. The reprover seems to assume the office of both lawgiver and judge. But what right this superiority? 3. *Difference in social rank*. It matters not whether, as in this case, the reproved be of superior rank or of inferior. If the former, the reproved resents the audacity; if the latter, what he is pleased to call the patronage. 4. *Absence of moral aspiration*. The reproved does not really desire to be better than he is. 5. *Contrariety of judgment*. The reproved doubts the principle upon which you are proceeding; e.g. you expostulate with a man on the sin of gambling; but he disputes your premiss, viz. that there is wrong in gambling. There is a sin or vice which some men will not be found to defend. Nebuchadnezzar may have considered all his oppressions of the poor, etc., as quite within his kingly right. 6. *Suspicion of the reprover's motive*.

II. THE REPROVER—his tone and spirit. He should be characterized by: 1. *Sincere and simple sympathy for the man*. In this respect Daniel was perfect. 2. *Grief over the moral position*. 3. *Sorrow for the consequences*. 4. *Fidelity*. 5. *Courtesy*. Note the tone of vers. 19, 27. Daniel was mindful of his relation to his king. 6. *Hopefulness*. Daniel gave counsel simple, comprehensive, direct. And then expresses a large hope, "If it may be," etc. (vers. 26, 27). Some elements in—

III. THE REPROOF WILL BE SUGGESTIVE. 1. *It was solicited*. An immense advantage. 2. *Based on adequate knowledge*. Nothing can be more paralyzing to a would-be reprover than to find that he is proceeding either on false or unproved assumptions. 3. *Strong by authority of truth*. "In presenting admonitory or accusatory truth, it should be the instructor's aim that the authority may be conveyed in the truth itself, and not seem to be assumed by him as the speaker of it." "One man, a discreet and modest one (and not the less strong for that), shall keep himself as much as he can out of the pleading, and press the essential virtue and argument of the subject. Another makes himself prominent in it, so that yielding to the argument shall seem to be yielding to him. His style, expressly or in effect, is this: 'I think my opinion should have some weight in this case;' 'These arguments are what have satisfied me;' 'If you have any respect for my judgment,' etc. So that the great point with him is not so much that you should be convinced, as that he should have the credit of convincing you." 4. *Well-timed*. "The teller of unpleasing truths should watch to select favourable times and occasions (*mollia tempora fandi*) when an inquisitive or docile disposition is most apparent; when some circumstance or topic naturally leads without formality or abruptness; when there appears to be in the way the least to put him (the person reproved) in the attitude of pride and hostile self-defence." For aught we know, Daniel may have had it on his mind for a long time to speak to the king; at length the day of opportunity dawned.

IV. THE RESULT. 1. *The reproof was not at once successful*. For a year more (ver. 29) the king seems to have gone on, in the same spirit, to do the same deeds. 2. *But was so finally*. (Ver. 34.) When reproof had been emphasized by judgment. The memory, then, of Daniel's counsel.—B.

Vers. 28—37.—*Revelation in the world of soul*. "Is not this great Babylon, that I have built?" (ver. 30). In approaching the kernel of this remarkable history, many

matters would have, by way of introduction, to be set in a true light. They would all fall under these three heads: 1. Confirmations of Bible history from the science of *medicine*. 2. From the *probabilities* of the case. 3. From secular *history*. (See Exposition above; and 'Daniel, Statesman and Prophet,' R.T.S., where they are given in full.)

I. THE IDOL. The very essence of sin is self-centredness, which ignores our relations with others and the attendant duties, and which blots out God. The atheism of selfishness may be only *practical*, but also *speculative*. When the latter, it is sure to be also the former. 'The idolater of self: 1. *Confines his vision to the material*. So with the king on the roof of his palace; his eye swept palace, city, land, but saw only the material magnificence. His heart was of the world, worldly. 2. *Misjudges greatness*. Not bulk, not material wealth, not splendid show, constitute a nation's greatness. The elements of greatness are ever moral. As with a nation, so with an individual. A nation may be small, and yet clothed upon with moral majesty. On the other side, a nation may be small (e.g. Monaco) and vile. The two things are not commensurate in any way—material size and grandeur of spirit. Some nations, *i.e.* constituents of nations, need to lay the lesson very much to heart. 3. *Makes self the centre of the universe*. Babylon was as the palace of the kingdom. The kingdom revolved around the capital, and all around the proud personality of the king. 4. *Ignores God*. All below and around the man lies in light, but seen through the coloured and distorted medium of selfishness. All above is hidden by dense mist and cloud; as often, in mountain regions, the snow-clad pinnacles and the serenity of heaven are absolutely invisible. God is unseen, unrecognized. Note the sin of this in the king. We are too likely to think that where God's clearest revelation through Christ is not, *no* light is. We underrate the light of natural religion. God moves without witness. To the king testified nature, experience, reason, the inner light. Christ in all these (John i. 9).

II. ITS DETHRONEMENT. Self usurped the throne in the moral realm, in the heart and life of man, and so from that throne self was hurled as by a thunderbolt. Observe, the ruin of the doomed was: 1. *Stayed*. Did not come at once on the sin. But warning and counsel at the lips of Daniel. Then a year's delay. Opportunity for penitence. Misused. The patience of God. 2. *Sudden*. "While the word," etc.; "The same hour," etc. (vers. 31—33). Whilst the king was adoring his own shadow, the phantom melted into vacancy. Striking picture of what oft occurs under the moral government of God—long respite—at length sudden and overwhelming calamity. 3. *Utter*. "The world recedes, it disappears," but no heaven opens on his eyes, no ears "with sounds seraphic ring." The world went; and down fell the self-idolater into a temporal hell. (Note all the particulars, in light of the text, illustrated by all we know of *this form of insanity*.) 4. *Strictly related to the sin*. As always. The deification of self and so the prostration of self. Occasion might well be taken to read off such lessons as these: (1) *The obligation of gratitude for reason*—its gift and continuance. (2) *The duty of sympathy for the imbecile and insane*. To be expressed *practically*, by prayer and contribution. (3) That the *causes of insanity* can be demonstrated to be, in the *vast majority of cases, moral*; e.g. vanity, care in excess, alcohol, violent passion of any kind, specially the many and various breaches of the seventh commandment.

III. THE ENTHRONEMENT OF GOD. We may discourse on this by putting it in this way: we may mark the gradual steps of the return of God subjective to the throne in man. God objective—*i.e.* in his reality and power—is never off the throne. But he may be subjectively cast down in the thoughts and sentiments of men. 1. *God remains in the mind*, animating recognition. "Not even an extreme form of mania interferes with the consciousness of personal identity, of the soul's relation to God, and therefore does not abate the power to pray. Rather, perhaps, is it to be believed that in many cases the deepest and truest nature of man, his religious nature, is brought into high and brilliant relief" (see 'Daniel, Statesman and Prophet,' pp. 136, 137). 2. *God recognized*. "Lifted up mine eyes unto heaven." This is the recognition of God. The enthronement of God. The returning conscious recognition of God marks the advent of moral sanity. 3. *Reason returns to the throne with God*. 4. *And with reason, an admirable twin*. All that makes life worth living—con-

viction of the existence of God; of the everlastingness of his blessed rule; of the comparative insignificance of any man; of the universality of his empire; of the resistlessness of his might—that “everything which God does is well done” (ver. 37); that “those that walk in pride he is able to abase;”—add to these convictions that there came back, with reason, brightness of outer life and the joy of fellowship with men. **Note:** Afflictions last till they have done their work—and then no longer.—R.

Vers. 1—3.—*Royal witness for God.* Even kings learn the humiliating lesson at last that they are but men. As a counterpoise to their advantages, there is, on their side, *this* great disadvantage, viz. that their minds are singularly impervious to appeals from God. A drawback *this* which more than counterweights all their privilege.

I. GOD'S BEST GIFTS ARE OFTEN CONVEYED TO MEN THROUGH PAINFUL CHANNELS. God “causeth his sun to shine on the evil and the good. He sendeth rain on just and unjust alike.” So with earthly riches, honour, rank, fame. These gifts betoken no special favour of the Highest. They are of so little worth that God gives them in abundance to his foes. But his best gifts are obtained only through penitence, self-denial, suffering—both vicarious and personal. Job's wealth came, at the first, almost as an accident, and it exposed him to the envy and malice of Satan. If he had lived and died in his luxurious ease, the world would never have heard of him. But suffering wrought in him patience, submission, and faith. This was wealth which entered into his character, and abides with him still. The poor kingdoms of earth may be gained by the accident of birth, or by the mere chances of diabolic war; but the everlasting kingdom can only be reached through soul-tribulation. “Though he were a Son, yet learned he obedience by the things which he suffered.”

II. GOD'S BEST GIFTS ARE INTENDED TO REVEAL HIMSELF TO THE SOUL. These gifts, when rightly estimated, are prodigies of skill and mirrors of Divine love. If God may be seen in his material works, he can be yet more clearly seen in his gracious gifts to men. Every one of these is a love-token, bearing on it the impression of his heart. Nebuchadnezzar had been wont to think that his royal good fortune was the highest good he possessed; but now he is led into the dark school of suffering, and made to learn his folly. Now he learns that God's gifts of mind, reason, memory, speech, are far nobler than royal dignities, and that for the creation and preservation of these he is indebted to the God of heaven. Further, he is made to learn that there is a higher King than himself, and that to know and love God is the loftiest good of man. Jesus Christ is God's best Gift to man, because he reveals to us the Father. Let us value most those blessings which bring us nearest to God!

III. GOD'S BEST GIFTS ARE INTENDED TO BEAUTIFY CHARACTER. Nebuchadnezzar's wealth, power, conquests, had brought no real good to the man; nay, they had done him harm. They had corrupted the better principles of his soul. They had made him self-sufficient, proud, tyrannical. But now, in a season of mental suffering, God's grace had touched his heart. In that humiliated state, the king learns his dependence on God, his need of Divine help, and the homage due to the supreme Jehovah. His pride is abated. His love of the world is diminished. He is constrained to give unto God his due. He is made another man. His inmost character has been benefited. He is more indebted to temporary insanity than to all his successful wars.

IV. THE BEST GIFTS OF GOD DEMAND PUBLIC ACKNOWLEDGMENT. There was the greatest propriety that the Chaldean king should proclaim to the world his obligations to God. He had been placed under weighty indebtedness, and could show his gratitude in no other way than by declaring to the world his obligation. Often had he made proclamations and edicts to propagate his own will and pleasure; it was fitting that he should now act as a dependent, as a herald of the great King. What better form—what other form—can gratitude assume, than publishing our obligations to the world? We can do no good to God in return for his kindness; we may do good to our fellow-men. If gratitude be genuine it will be publicly acknowledged. Honest recipients of blessing will say, “Come, ye that fear God, and I will declare what he hath done for my soul.”—D.

Vers. 4—9.—*True and false prophets.* It is amazing how some men are addicted to folly. It seems ingrained into the very nature of some men. Nebuchadnezzar had

proved aforetime the vain pretensions of his magicians and soothsayers, and had proved, too, the incomparable superiority of Daniel; nevertheless, he neglects Daniel again on this occasion, and sends for the pretentious astrologers. Such men must be pounded in a mortar before the folly can be expurgated.

I. THE PROPHET HAS ALWAYS A PLACE IN THE WORLD. There has always been, and always will be, a need for him. Scientific discovery, however rapid its advancements, will never push the prophet from his niche. A vision was granted to Nebuchadnezzar by God, yet even the vision does not suffice. It only perplexes, saddens, alarms. The carnal mind cannot understand it. It is a terrific enigma—confusion worse confounded. There is need of a prophet to unfold the signification. As long as man requires authoritative interpretations of Divine truth, so long he requires the prophet.

II. THE PROPHET CANNOT BE MADE BY THE ART OR SKILL OF MAN. The Babylonian king may make decrees from morning till night, but no number of royal decrees can manufacture a prophet. He may call a certain number of recluses "wise men;" but he can never make them so. Both kings and meaner men allow themselves to be easily deceived by the mere *show* and *pretence* of authority. Let kings learn that there are some things which *even they* cannot do. In their extremity king-made prophets fail.

III. THE TRUE PROPHET IS CREATED BY THE SPIRIT OF GOD. God reveals his mind and will to whomsoever he pleases. As every power of mind is his creation, so this gift of prophetic insight is a direct donation from God. The capacity is *God's*, though man can improve and develop it by wise use. Prophecy is not so much a faculty of mind as the production of a peculiar temper of soul. It is strongest in the man who walks most closely with God; in other words, who is most conformed to God's character and image. "The secret of the Lord is with them that fear him." To the same end, Jesus rejoiced in spirit, and said, "I thank thee, Father, . . . because thou hast hid these things from the wise and prudent, and hast revealed them unto babes."

IV. THE TRUE PROPHET MAY BE KNOWN BY HIS HUMILITY AND LOVE. Daniel did not push his way into the presence of the king, with the rest of the wise men. He calmly waited in obscurity until his presence was sought. Real merit is neither forward nor froward. Nor, when Daniel perceived the purport of the dream, was he in haste to make known the coming disaster. Astonishment and sorrow sealed his lips for the space of an hour. Then, required by the king to unburden his soul, the prophet expresses profoundest sympathy with the king's doom: "My lord, the dream be to them that hate thee." The true prophet will not only bring God's message, but will bring it in God's spirit. He "speaks the truth in love."—D.

Vers. 10—18.—*A vision of self-ruin.* It must always be regarded as a mark of God's kindness, when he forewarns men of his impending judgments. If vindictive retribution only was intended, there would be no premonition. The old adage current among the heathen, "The gods have feet of wool," has no place in God's kingdom. "The axe is laid at the root of the tree"—a proof that kindness is not extinct in God's bosom.

I. WE HAVE A PICTURE OF BRILLIANT PROSPERITY. It was a common method in olden time to represent a prosperous man under the image of a flourishing tree. "The righteous shall prosper as a palm tree: he shall grow as a cedar in Lebanon." The greatness and splendour of Nebuchadnezzar resembled such a tree. He reigned in Babylon—well-nigh the centre of the then known world. His power among earthly kings was supreme. Neighbouring monarchs were his vassals. In all his wars he had been successful. Israel and Syria, Egypt and Arabia, lay at his feet. His throne was strong, and his fame reached, as it seemed, to heaven. Nor did his rule appear, on the whole, injurious. The peoples found protection under his sceptre. He encouraged the growth of art and science. But this military glory fed and pampered his pride. He deemed himself something more than man. He imagined himself a demi-god. The prosperity was outward, material, plausible. It did not touch and transform his inner nature. His body was nursed in luxury, but he was starving his soul. The flower opened in unrivalled beauty, but there was a worm at the root. Ah! deceitful sunshine.

II. A PICTURE OF AWFUL REVERSE. It is no uncommon thing for prosperous men

to suffer a sudden and complete reverse. "Riches make for themselves wings, and fly away." The props of a throne are soon snapped. The arm of military power is soon broken. Kings have ended life in a dungeon or on a scaffold. Not more complete is the contrast between a fruit tree in spring and the same tree in the frosty days of winter, than the conditions of some men—in the morning prosperous, in the evening stripped and naked. Can Fortune's best gifts be worth much, which give no warrant of continuance? The calamity which was preparing for Nebuchadnezzar was certainly the most severe that could befall a man. Worse than disease! Worse than leprosy! Worse than death! He who had "set his heart as the heart of God," who had aspired to a place among the stars, was to fall below the level of a man—was to have the heart of a beast, abject weakness instead of imperial might, imbecility in place of boasted wisdom. This disaster is said to be proclaimed by a holy watcher. This language was an accommodation to prevalent beliefs. The unfallen angels, being unburdened with a corporeal nature, and having, therefore, no need of sleep, are ever wakeful to execute the commissions of Jehovah. These watch our course, grieve over our declensions, and correct us for our follies. So did an angel scatter the hosts of Sennacherib. So did an angel smite Herod with a fatal disease. "Are they not all ministering spirits?" "Excelling in strength, they do his commands, hearkening to the voice of his word."

III. TWIN RAYS OF HOPE. The Divine sentence proceeds with a succession of melancholy chastisements, until the word "nevertheless" is reached; then the deepening darkness is relieved by a gleam of hope. The stump of the root was to be preserved. This, of course, implied that the overthrow was not absolute and final. Room was yet left for repentance and restoration. Special means were chosen to preserve the stump from rot and injury. So all God's judgments, in this life, are corrective and are designed to be remedial. Judgment and mercy are blended in human discipline. The affliction, though severe, was not to be permanent and eternal. There was a limit in respect to duration: "Till seven times are passed over him." A sad apprenticeship in the dark prison of insanity, for seven years, was to be endured. And then, what? This was the momentous question. Was the issue, then, to be death? Or repentance, amendment, life? Tremendous issues hung upon the man's use of God's judgment. Every man is upon his trial. We are here "prisoners of hope." A ray of mercy gilds our path, which ray may broaden and brighten into eternal noon, or may be quenched in blackest night.

IV. A MERCIFUL DESIGN. There is no room for caprice or chance in the government of our world, nor in any of the affairs of men. Does insanity fall upon a man? It is by a heavenly design. "The purpose of Jehovah, that shall stand." Mark, that God's intention was not simply the good of *one* individual man, but the good of all living. God uses one to teach many—disciplines *one*, that he may be a blessing to multitudes. "No man liveth unto himself." We receive good and evil mediately from the human race. We transmit blessing or bane to the future ages. God's high design is to teach men religious truth—"that the living may know that God ruleth." To know God, as the living, reigning God,—this is among the highest blessings we can obtain. If we know God, we shall long to be reconciled to him, to enjoy his friendship. Acquaintance with God will quicken the aspiration to be like him. To know him is the way to virtue, wisdom, eminence, peace. It is comparatively easy to instruct the beggar, it is very difficult to instruct the monarch, in this lore. How hardly shall they that have riches confess themselves poor! How hardly shall they that have dominion acknowledge their dependence! The poorest in this way may become the richest; the meanest among men may become the mightiest in the kingdom of heaven.—D.

Vers. 19—28.—*Prophetic counsel.* The true prophet is God's messenger to men. He has a definite mission to perform, and his service here is unspeakably precious. We have here several marks of a genuine prophet.

I. REAL SYMPATHY WITH HIS FELLOW-MEN. As a servant of the most high God, he can have no sympathy with self-indulgence, pride, ambition, or any form of sin. But he has real affection for men. Beneath the thick crust of worldliness, he perceives a precious soul, bearing still some lineaments of the Divine image; and his aim is to

release and rescue the real man. The prophet feels for him, enters into his perplexities, bears with him the burden of sin. He would, if he might, take those burdens on his own shoulders, and bear them to the feet of the Sin-destroyer. To a large extent he identifies himself with suffering and enslaved humanity. Daniel's silence was more eloquent than any speech, and if he could have averted the monarch's doom he would have done so.

II. CLEAR INSIGHT INTO UNSEEN REALITIES. The prophet of God has commerce with the invisible realm. He knows, as a matter of fact, that there is a sphere of life encompassing us on every side, though unseen by mortal eye. The world, which is patent to the senses is a very small world compared with the territory unrevealed to sense. The visible creation is full of pictures and symbols of the invisible. Moral truths are adumbrated for us in allegorical forms. The objects and events, with which we are familiar in daily life, serve as hieroglyphs, and reveal to our dull understandings heavenly lessons. The trees of the field illustrate man's growth, prosperity, decadence, sudden fall. His frailty may be read in the grass of the field. No material scythe is needed to mow him down. He falls before the east wind. We are dullards and fools if we do not read lessons of wisdom from the scenes of nature, especially when the messengers of God have furnished a key with which to unlock the door of interpretation.

III. PERSONAL REPROOF. God's prophet is bold as well as skilful; fearless as well as affectionate. Being God's messenger, he is bound to represent God; and, with all God's might for his defence, nothing can really harm him. Beside, his very eagerness to promote men's welfare inspires him with courage. He is conscious that he has no other end in view, except to please his Master and to benefit men; hence he proceeds straightway to put his finger upon the plague-spot of men's disease, and to prescribe the remedy. In dealing with those who desire their guidance, God's prophets cannot be too plain, too pointed, or too faithful. If a wanderer seeks guidance through a perilous wilderness, his guide cannot be too plain in his instructions, nor too persistent in requiring a faithful following of his words. Fearless vindication of the truth is a mark of a genuine prophet.

IV. WISE ADMONITION. "Wherefore, O king," said Daniel, "break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." It is quite probable that this monarch had not been scrupulously upright in his administration of public justice; quite probable that the poor had been enslaved and oppressed. In the enlargement and embellishment of his capital, it is more than likely that forced labour had been largely exacted from the poor. Possibly the captives from Palestine and from other lands were included in these oppressive measures. Anyhow, Daniel traces the coming disaster to its real fount, viz. the personal sin of the monarch; and, like a true friend, he implores the king to endeavour by repentance to avert the awful doom. If the end can be obtained by methods less severe—the end, viz. man's salvation—God has no wish to employ harsher discipline. His aim is man's good. "Judgment is his strange work." But repentance must be thorough, genuine, practical. It must show itself in *real* fruit. No half-measures will suffice. The great Physician *will* have a perfect cure. No human eloquence, however persuasive, will induce men to repent without the attendant and subduing grace of Jehovah. Along with our own efforts, there should be earnest supplication for Divine help.—D.

Vers. 29—33.—*The sudden collapse of pride.* Careful and costly measures had been furnished by God to restrain Nebuchadnezzar from the brink of ruin, to which he was fast hastening. The dream, with its appalling omens; the human messenger; the king's conscience;—all these were voices from the supreme court of heaven. But conscience was silenced, the prophet was forgotten, the sense of danger diminished; Nebuchadnezzar persisted in his sin, until the patience of God was exhausted.

I. WE SEE PRIDE VAUNTING ITSELF IN BOASTFUL VAIN-GLORY. A year had elapsed since the faithful voice of Daniel had awakened the conscience of the king. At first the monarch intended to reform, but procrastination destroyed the sensitiveness of feeling, blinded him to the imminence of danger, and gave momentum to his downward course. The city grew in magnitude and in magnificence. The royal plans proceeded towards completion. Outward prosperity shone upon him in still clearer

glory. Notwithstanding, the hour of reckoning was about to strike. Walking upon his elevated palace-roof, and surveying the grandeur of the city, Nebuchadnezzar gave the reins to natural pride—thought and spoke as if there were *none* greater than he. This is the end pride ever aims at, viz. to make man a god unto himself. Yet was there a solitary stone in that vast pile that had been created by Nebuchadnezzar? Was the mind that designed the whole self-originated? Were the ten thousand artisans who had daily wrought upon those buildings the workmanship of man or of God? Pride is idolatry. Pride becomes mad atheism. There is no sin that is so frequently and freely condemned in Scripture as pride. By it the angels lost their high estate. Into this pit Adam fell. “Ye shall be as gods,” the tempter said. “God resisteth the proud.” They are a smoke in his nostrils. “Pride goeth before destruction.” One step only between haughtiness and hell. Insolent arrogance verges on madness.

II. WE SEE HUMAN PRIDE MOVING TO ACTIVITY THE COUNSELS OF HEAVEN. If the statesmen or the artisans in Babylon overheard the utterance of the king, they might have regarded it as a harmless outburst of vanity. Yet God doth not so regard it. It disturbs the tranquillity of heaven. It is regarded there as the language of hostile defiance. The limit of God’s forbearance was reached. There is a time to be quiet and a time to act. The cup of Nebuchadnezzar’s sin was full. He had despised the messages of kindly exhortation from Jehovah, and now no delay was permitted. The king had barely ceased to speak when Jehovah responded. But the words of Nebuchadnezzar were not intended for the ears of God. Ah! still he heard them. He regarded them as an indirect menace to him, and he at once replies. The verdict has passed the Judge’s lips. The kingdom is alienated. In a moment empire is lost. Rank, honour, power, are lost. Manhood is lost. Intelligence, memory, reason, love, —all lost. Bare existence only remains. Like the prodigal boy, he descends step by step into a deeper degradation, and at length herds with the beasts of the field. Yet this is but an outward and visible portraiture of the *inward* degradation.

III. WE SEE HUMAN PRIDE MEETING WITH FITTING RETRIBUTION. We have here in concrete form—in the history of a living person—the abstract truth, “He that exalteth himself shall be abased.” This is its natural and fitting outcome—its proper fruit. We cannot doubt that every form and degree of sin has, in the Divine code, a suitable and adequate punishment. There is not simply one rigid penalty for every mode and measure of transgression. The justice that presides on the eternal throne has eyes of subtlest discrimination and balances of exquisite nicety. Every step in the judicial procedure of God is accordant with natural principles. Even the forces of material nature will possibly be employed in vindicating the Divine Majesty. The indolence and sensual indulgence of the Babylonian palace served to emasculate Nebuchadnezzar. The rousing energy which war had demanded in earlier years had braced the monarch’s mind. But now the years of public peace had been so misused that inertia bred softness and luxury produced effeminacy. Step by step character deteriorated, though, perhaps, not detected by mortal eye. At length, by the Divine fiat, Reason abdicated her seat; the animal got the better of the man. In his imbecile condition the king imagined himself an ox, and preferred to browse in the fields. He was held fast by this hallucination. His relatives and attendants, very possibly, feared to resist him. They humoured his infatuation until, in the royal paddock, his hair grew ragged and coarse, his nails became long and bent like eagles’ claws. This is the monarch who disdained to recognize God—the monarch who plumed himself on his self-sufficiency! Draw near, all proud defiers of God, and see this portrait of yourselves!—D.

Vers. 34—37.—*Light at eventide.* It is a perilous thing to abuse any of God’s gifts. Thereby we interfere with the order of his government, and justly provoke his anger. The darkening of intellect with prejudice is no mean offence. Bribing reason with sensual delights not to recognize God—this is a serious injury to one’s self, and daring rebellion against God. Such was the aggravated sin of Nebuchadnezzar; yet the judgment of God was tempered with mercy. The abuse of reason resulted in its loss, yet the loss was temporary. The deplorable darkness was designed as a prelude to clearer light.

I. PRESENT CHASTISEMENTS ARE NOT FINAL. This is a gracious alleviation of the severity. The darkest element in the Divine judgment is absent. There is scope for amendment, repentance, return. A ray of hope lights up the darkness of the scene. Yea, more; the chastisement, however severe, may be transfigured into supremest blessing. "It was good for me to be afflicted." "Out of the eater may come forth meat." A rough and prickly shell may enclose the sweetest kernel. The fire which consumes the dross may only beautify the gold. Loss may be only an unrecognized form of gain. Through faith in God's faithful love we can "glory in tribulation also." "At the end of the days" the king's insanity ceased.

II. LOSS OF REASON DESTROYS MAN'S SENSE OF SELF-SUFFICIENCY. God had taken pains, on previous occasions, to convince Nebuchadnezzar that the invisible Jehovah was the true God of the universe, but the king had hardened his heart against the conviction. His inveterate pride prevented his belief. Fain would he be his own god. "Our wills are our own: who is Lord over us?" Such was his favourite doctrine. It was pleasant to be self-contained. It was a sweet morsel for the carnal appetite, this flattering unction that his own skill and strength had gained him this success. And so ingrained into his nature had this habit of self-trust become, that only the severest discipline from God could dislodge it. But when his understanding became dark, and memory failed, and Reason abdicated, and manhood became a wreck, he learnt in the school of personal experience what he refused to learn before, viz. how frail and dependent is man—how absolute a sovereign is God. At last self-sufficiency is rooted out, and a spirit of meek humility takes its place. Be it ours to learn the lesson without so severe a discipline!

III. RECOVERED REASON TEACHES US GOD'S ETERNAL SOVEREIGNTY. The native tendency of man's mind is to circumscribe its thought about itself. It makes self a centre round which all its thoughts and plans revolve. It vaguely imagines that when personal self fails, the world will collapse. It thinks little about the past, and what has led up to our present privileged position; it cares little about the remote future. But when foolish man "comes to himself," after his aberrations and follies, he learns that for untold ages One has ruled on the throne of the universe, and is making all events to work out his designs. He was King long before we appeared upon the earthly scene; and he will remain Master of the situation long after we have passed away. His authority none can dispute. Yet, for his honour and for our consolation, it shall be said that his will is right and just and good. "His will is our sanctification." "It is the Lord: let him do what seemeth him good."

IV. THE RIGHT USE OF REASON IS TO GLORIFY GOD. It is the primary and pressing duty of every man to learn the proper use of his faculties. When we have reached years of discretion we should often ask ourselves, "What is God's intention in giving me this understanding, this conscience, this reason?" Our plainest duty is to ascertain, if possible, his intention, and to follow that intention closely. To be self-consistent, we must either deny that he is our Master, and repudiate his every claim, or else we must acknowledge his authority over every part of our nature, and over every moment of our lives. A partial obedience is no obedience at all. This would be a setting up of self to be the judge when obedience should be rendered, and would be a virtual dethronement of God. Here hesitation or debate is excluded. If my reason be an endowment from God, I am bound, by every tie of obligation, to use it for his honour, and to magnify him therewith. Therefore the first principle of genuine religion is this: "Man's chief end is to glorify God, and to enjoy him for ever."—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER V.

Vers. 1—31.—BELSHAZZAR'S FEAST.

In regard to this chapter the peculiar state of the Septuagint text has to be noted. At the beginning of the chapter there are DANIEL.

three verses which seem to be either variant versions of the Septuagint text, or versions of a text which was different from that from which the Septuagint has been drawn. Throughout the chapter, further, there are traces of doublets. Most of these variations occur in the Syriac of Paulus Tellenius.

Ver. 1.—**Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand.** As we have just indicated, there are two versions in the Septuagint of several verses in this chapter, and the verse before us is one of these. The first of these is "Baltasar the king made a great feast on the day of the dedication of his palace, and invited from his lords two thousand men." The other reading, which appears to have formed the text, is, "Baltasar the king made a great feast for his companions." The first version seems to have read the dual instead of the singular—a proof of the state of the language, for the dual has practically disappeared in the Targums. The second version has evidently read רבין instead of רבין. Theodotion reads, "Baltasar the king made a great feast to thousands of his lords, and drank wine before the thousands." The Peshitta agrees with the Massoretic text. The numeral is thus omitted in the text of the Septuagint, inserted in the dual in the margin, and appears in Theodotion in the plural. As the shortest text is also the oldest, and omits the numeral, we feel inclined to do so also, the more so as the numeral may have resulted from אלף (*alph*) being put as the interpretation of רבין (*rabrab*). The clause in the marginal version, "on the day of the dedication of his palace," or, as it is rendered by Paulus Tellensis, "in the day of the dedication of the house of his kingdom," is worthy of notice. From the fact that early in his reign every Ninevite king seems to have begun a palace, this statement has a great deal of verisimilitude. The clause in the Massoretic text, "and drank wine before the thousand," is meaningless, unless as a rhetorical amplification. From the fact that only the first clause appears in the text of the Septuagint, the authenticity of the rest of the verse is rendered doubtful; the more so that קובל (קובל) means "a feast" in Eastern Aramaic, though not in Western. It is a possible solution of the presence of the clause that קבל, excluded from the text and its place supplied by לם, was placed in the margin. לקבל, however, means "before." If there was also in the margin אלם, "thousands," in the emphatic state; as the translation into Hebrew of רבין (Gen. xxxvi. 17, 15 Onkelos). If, further, חברין, "companion," appeared as a various reading for רבין, that would easily be read רבין, "wine;" the verb "to drink" would be added to complete the sense. We have thus all the elements to produce the different versions

of the story of the feast. The fact that in what we regard as the marginal reading the clause appears quite differently rendered, confirms us in our suspicion that the Massoretic text presents a case of a "doublet." The reading which begins the chapter in the LXX. may be due to regarding קבל as the verb "to receive." The name Belshazzar has been the occasion of much controversy. It was regarded as one of the proofs of the non-historicity of Daniel that this name occurred at all (as Bertholdt). We were told that the last King of Babylon was Nabunahid, not Belshazzar. The name, however, has turned up in the Mugheir inscription as the son of Nabunahid, and not only so, but in a connection that implies he was associated in the government. From the annals of Nabunahid (2 col.; vide 'Beiträge zur Assyriologie,' Delitzsch and Haupt, 1891-92, pp. 218—221) we find that from his seventh to his eleventh year, if not from an earlier to a later date, Nabunahid was in retirement in Tema, and "came not to Babil," and the king's son (*Mar Sarri*) was with the nobles (*rabuti*) and the army. Even when the king's mother died, the mourning was carried on by the king's son, Belshazzar. Dr. Hugo Winckler ('Geschichte Babyloniens u. Assuriens,' pp. 315, 316) says Nabunahid remained intentionally far from the capital, and abode continually in Tema, a city otherwise unknown. Not once at the new year's feast, where his personal presence was indispensable, did he come to Babylon. What occasioned it, we know not; but it appears as if he had devoted himself to some kind of solitary life, and would not disturb himself with the business of government. Not once while Cyrus was marching against Babylon did he rouse himself, but allowed things to take their course. The government appears to have been carried on by his son, Bel-shar-utzur, for while Nabunahid lived in Tema in retirement, it is mentioned that his son, with the dignitaries, managed affairs in Babylon, and commanded the army. Also in several inscriptions in the concluding prayer, he is named along with his father, while it is usually the name of the king that is there mentioned. Belshazzar is, then, no mere luxurious despot, like the Naboandel of Josephus, no incapable youth flushed with the unexpected dignity of government in the city of Babylon, while his father was shut up in Borsippa; he is a bold capable warrior. Tyrannical and imperious he may be, yet faithful to his father, as had Nebuchadnezzar been to Nabopolassar his father. We need not even look at the identifications of Belshazzar with Evil-Merodach, with Labasi-

marduk, or with Nabunahid. The name *Bel-shar-uzur* means "Bel protects the king," and is rendered in the Greek versions "Baltasar," and in the Vulgate "Baltasar," and identical with the name given to Daniel, as we have remarked elsewhere. In the Peshitta the name here is rendered "Belishazzar," while Daniel's Babylonian name is "Beletshazzar." We do not know when this feast took place. If we take the Septuagint text here as our guide, it did not take place at the capture of the city by Cyrus. If for five, six, or seven years he was practically king, Belshazzar may have built a palace, and the feast may have been held at its dedication. We know that the Babylonians were notorious for their banquets—banquets that not infrequently ended in drunkenness. Although the number of the guests is doubtful from diplomatic reasons, the number itself is not excessive. We read of Alexander the Great having ten thousand guests.

Ver. 2.—Belshazzar, while he tasted the wine, commanded to bring the golden and silver vessels which his father Nebuchadnezzar had taken out of the temple which was in Jerusalem; that the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, might drink therein. The Septuagint has included the last clause of the Massoretic recension of the first verse, "And he drank wine, and his heart was lifted up, and he commanded to bring the vessels of gold and of silver of the house of God, which Nebuchadnezzar his father had brought from Jerusalem, and to pour out wine in them for those companions of his (*ἐν αὐτοῖς τοῖς ἐταίροις*)." The translator seems to have regarded the first syllable of the name Belshazzar as a separate word, and has translated it according to the meaning the word has in Eastern Aramaic, "heart" (Exod. xii. 23, Peshitta). After this initial mistake—if mistake it was—the remaining change was easy. The syntax here, according to the Massoretic text, is different from what we should expect. *אמר* (*'amar*), "to say," is translated "command" in eight cases in this book, and in every other case it is followed immediately by the infinitive of the action commanded. Hence we are inclined, with the LXX., to omit "while he tasted the wine." While the LXX. Aramaic seems to have בָּרַךְ, "in them," it has not had "king," "wives," or "concubines." As the Septuagint is the shorter, on the whole, we prefer it, though we maintain the Massoretic reading of "in them," referring to the vessels. Theodotian and the Peshitta follow the Massoretic reading. Whether or not the libation offered to the gods was in the mind of the writer, the mere fact that the sacred vessels were used

for the purposes of a common feast was desecration. The addition of the "wives" and "concubines" adds at once to the degradation in the eyes of an Eastern, and to the stately rhetorical cadence of the verse. This renders all the stronger the suspicion engendered by the omission of these features in the Septuagint. It is to be observed that the Septuagint translator must have had an Eastern Aramaic manuscript before him, or he could never have translated *bal* "heart." At the same time, the presence of women at Babylonian feasts was not so uncommon as it was in the rest of the East, as we learn from the Ninevite remains. Certainly Quintus Curtius mentions this in connection with Alexander's visit to Babylon (v. 1). But was an obscure Jew likely to know this in Palestine? It is very difficult for a person writing in a different age to keep strictly to verisimilitude in these matters. Even a contemporary may make a blunder in writing, not a novel, but a biography, as Froude, in his 'Life of Carlyle,' declares he was "quietly married in the parish church of Temple." To be quietly married in a parish church in any part of Scotland, in the early years of this century, would be a contradiction in terms. Yet Froude had often been in Scotland, and knew Carlyle well. Could a Jew living in Palestine have all his wits about him so as to note every varying feature which distinguished the habits of Babylon from those of the rest of the East? The question may be asked why were the vessels of the Lord in Jerusalem singled out to be desecrated by a common use? It might, of course, be that the sacred vessels of the temples of the gods of all conquered nationalities were brought in, and thus that the singling out of the Jewish sacred vessels was due, not to the preference of the Babylonian monarch, but to the Jew, who saw only those. We think this can scarcely be. It was certainly the policy of Nabunahid to draw all worship to Babylon (Annals of Nabunahid, col. iii. line 20, "The gods of Akkad, which Nabunahid had brought to Babylon, were carried back to their city"). But this would lead him to avoid anything that would savour of disrespect to these gods whom he had brought to dwell in Babylon. We do not think it would have been merely the beauty of those vessels that led to their desecration, for the temple at Jerusalem had suffered several plunderings before the capture of the city, and the period between the age of Hezekiah and Zedekiah was not one in which wealth and artistic talent were likely to increase. Some suspicion must have reached the court of Babylon that the Jews were in league with Cyrus; perhaps the contents of

the second Isaiah had reached the knowledge of the Babylonian police. If so, the act of Belshazzar was an act of defiance against Jehovah of Israel.

Vers. 3, 4.—Then they brought the golden vessels that were taken out of the temple of the house of God which was at Jerusalem; and the king, and his princes, his wives, and his concubines, drank in them. They drank wine, and praised the gods of gold, and of silver, of brass, of iron, of wood, and of stone. The corresponding verses in the Septuagint differ in several points from those above; the Septuagint third verse contains, condensed, the Massoretic third and fourth verses, but adds new matter in its fourth verse: "(3) And they were brought, and they drank in them, and blessed their idols made with hands; (4) and the God the eternal, who hath dominion over their spirit ('breath,' *πνεῦμα*), they did not bless." In the introductory portion, which contains, as we think, marginal readings, we have the second and fourth verses brought into connection, "In that day Baltasar, being uplifted with wine, and boasting himself, praised in his drink all the gods of the nations, the molten and the carved, but to God the Highest he gave not praise." The reading of the latter portion of this seems better than the text, as it is briefer; the description of God as he that has power "over their breath," is a preparation for what we find in ver. 23, "and thy breath is in his hand." Theodotion is, as usual, much nearer the Massoretic text, but while the Massoretic only mentions the "golden" vessels being brought, Theodotion mentions the silver also, and the verb *hanpigoo* is translated singular, as if it were *hanpayg*, and "Nebuchadnezzar" understood. A various reading adds, "and the God of eternity, who hath power of their breath, did they not bless," according to the Alexandrine and Vatican codices. In both these cases Jerome follows Theodotion. The Peshitta agrees only in the latter, putting the verb in the singular. Modern translators, as Luther and Ewald, the Authorized and Revised English Versions, retain the plural, but make the verb passive, as if it were written *honpagoo*. Calvin alone preserves both number and voice. The French Version, which makes it impersonal, is probably as good as any. It is, however, not impossible that the true reading is *huphal*; that seems better than Calvin's suggestion, that what Nebuchadnezzar had done is now transferred to all the Babylonians. The praises of the gods being sung was especially natural, if this were a dedication of a palace. In such a case the various elemental deities would be invoked to bless the residence of the king.

The fact that the vessels belonging to the temple of the God of the Jews were brought forward from the treasury of Bel would afford an occasion for praising Bel, the god who had given them the victory. While they praised these gods of the nations, they did not even mention Jehovah—an addition in the text of Theodotion and the LXX., both text and margin, and therefore one that, we think, ought, in some form, to be in the text. It is singular that in the Cyrus Cylinder, 17, the overthrow of Nabunahid is attributed to Marduk, "whom Nabunahid did not fear." The reason of Belshazzar thus ostentatiously praising the gods might be to get over the reputation of unfaithfulness to the gods, which was weakening them, father and son, in their struggle with Cyrus. Belshazzar most likely was, at this very time, carrying on war against Cyrus. The object of this festive gathering of his nobles might be to hearten them in their struggle against the King of Persia.

Ver. 5.—In the same hour came forth fingers of a man's hand, and wrote over against the candlestick upon the plaster of the wall of the king's palace: and the king saw the part of the hand that wrote. The two versions given in the Septuagint here do not seriously differ from each other or from the Massoretic text, only that they both omit "the part of," and represent the king as seeing the hand. Theodotion has *ἀσπράγδους*, which may be rendered "finger-joints;" otherwise this version is very like both the Massoretic and the LXX. The Peshitta presents no point of remark. The word translated "lamp" (*nehrashta*) became in Talmudic times the equivalent of *menorah*, "the golden candlestick." From this it has been supposed that "the candlestick" was the golden candlestick which later proved the crowning glory of Titus's triumph, and is still to be seen carved on his arch. When the other vessels of the house of the Lord were brought to deck the table of the monarch, it would not be unnatural that the golden candlestick should also be brought. In the great hall in which a thousand guests were accommodated, more lamps than one would be required. The Septuagint (text) adds, "over against the king:" this would individualize the lamp referred to; but there does not seem to be any support for this reading, which may be due to the desire to explain the *status emphaticus*. Gesenius derives the word *נְהַרְשְׁתָּא* from *נֹר*, "light," and *שָׂא*, "flame." As *ו* as a consonant was unused in Assyrian, this derivation is by no means impossible. We know that the Ninevite monarchs surrounded the great halls of their palaces with *bas-reliefs* of their victories. The remains of Babylon have not given us anything like

the gypsum slabs of Kouyoujik. Yet the Babylonian monarchs not unlikely followed the same practices as those of Nineveh. The walls were built and plastered, and then the slabs were moved up to them. In the case of Belshazzar, the palace walls might well be fresh; no gypsum slabs had yet recorded his prowess. As he looks to the white plaster, the fingers of a hand come out of the darkness, and write opposite him. "The king," thus it is in the Massoretic text, saw the "part" of the hand that wrote. *Pas* is the word. Fürst renders it "wrist;" Gesenius, "the extremity;" Winer, *vola manus*, "the hollow of the hand;" with this Buxtorf agrees. The balance of meanings seems to be in favour of "hollow of the hand," only it is difficult to understand the position of the hand relatively to the king when he saw the hollow of the hand. The smoke from the numerous lamps would obscure the roof of the hall of the palace; however numerous the lamps, their light would be unable to pierce the darkness, so out of the darkness came the hand.

Ver. 6.—Then the king's countenance was changed, and his thoughts troubled him, so that the joints of his loins were loosed, and his knees smote one against another. The Septuagint differs in a somewhat important degree from the Massoretic text, "And his countenance was changed, and fears and thoughts troubled him." In this clause not improbably *φόβοι* and *ἐκδηνοίαι* are double renderings of *ῥῥ*. "And the king hastened and rose up, and looked at that writing, and his companions round about him (*κύκλῳ αὐτοῦ*) boasted." It is clear that the text from which the Septuagint had repeated the verb *ῥῥ* (*b'hal*), which means originally "to hasten," and had the word "king" after it; if the Septuagint Aramaic were the original, we can easily understand how the word repeated might be omitted by *homoioteleuton*. While *ῥῥ* could easily be read *ῥ* after the square character had got place, *ῥῥ* could not in the script of the Egyptian Aramaic papyri be easily read *ῥ*; consequently we are inclined to look on the reading of the Septuagint here as being the primitive one. The king, according to this verse, saw the handwriting, but not till he rose did he see what was written. This representation of the succession of events is natural, whereas the statements about his loins being loosed is mere amplification. The last clause seems to be a misreading of the clause which appears in the Massoretic at the end (which see). The first word seems to have been misread *h'bercen*, and thus a meaning is violently given to the other parts of the clause. The probability is in

favour of the Massoretic reading here. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The omen of a hand appearing to write on the wall of the palace was one that might easily cause the thoughts of the king to trouble him. Much more was the omen of importance when the king saw that the hand which had appeared to write had actually left certain words written. It was but natural that the brightness of the king's countenance should depart from him when he saw the hand thus awfully coming out of the darkness, and writing, and that his knees should smite one upon another when what was written gleamed upon him from the wall before him. He might well be sure that the message so communicated would be laden with fate. Fear is naturally the first emotion occasioned by any mysterious occurrence; and then Babylon was, in all likelihood, being pressed by the advance of Cyrus. If he had any suspicion of the treachery that had sapped the power of his father, his apprehensions would be all the greater.

Ver. 7.—The king cried aloud to bring in the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and the soothsayers. And the king spake, and said to the wise men of Babylon, Whosoever shall read this writing, and show me the interpretation thereof, shall be clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall be the third ruler in the kingdom. The Septuagint here also differs from the Massoretic text, "And the king cried out with a great cry to call in the enchanters (*ἐπαοιδούς*) and sorcerers (*φαρμακούς*), and Chaldeans, and soothsayers, to announce to him the interpretation of the writing, and they came in for inspection (*ἐντὶ θεωρίαν*), to see the writing.¹ And they were not able to make known to the king the interpretation of the writing. Then the king made commandment, saying, Any man who shall show the interpretation of the writing, he shall put on him a purple robe, and shall put round his neck a golden chain, and authority shall be given him over a third part of the kingdom." Theodotion is an exact rendering of the Massoretic text in the sense represented by the English versions, save that it wholly omits the conjunctions between the various classes of wise men, so that *Χαλδαίους* might be an adjective qualifying either *μάγους* or *γασαρηνοὺς*, and the article is also omitted, which is represented in the Massoretic text by the *status emphaticus*. The Peshitta has

¹ Schleusner thinks that here two readings have coalesced. As Paulus Tellensis gives the reading thus, the coalescence must have been early.

four classes of wise men called in; as the Septuagint has, otherwise it agrees with the Massoretic text. It is a matter of some interest to observe that the position of the Chaldeans is somewhat precarious here, as in the second chapter. They disappear wholly from the list in the next verse, which really seems to be another version of this. It is a marginal gloss that has crept into the text. If we accept the reading of the Septuagint here, so far at least as to assume the entrance of the wise men before the king's declaration of the reward, the succession of events becomes more natural. The king calls for the presence of these interpreters of omens, and then, when they fail to interpret the writing to him, he proclaims his offer of a reward to whoever can do so. It is to be noted that there is in the Septuagint no question of ability to read the writing, but simply to interpret it. It has been pointed out to me by a friend that if these words were written in cuneiform, the signs that would represent them might have a great variety of possible sounds, and with these differing sounds, differing meanings. Sometimes a sign was phonetic and a syllable, sometimes it was ideographic and might represent a whole word. There is this to be said for this view—the Assyrian was the writing expected in inscriptions. Still, from the fact that the Septuagint omits the demand that the inscription should be read, we may regard the matter as doubtful. Assuming that the wise men were required to read the inscription, some of the Jewish interpreters, as Jephthah ibn Ali, think that the letters of the word were inverted; others have it that the letters were arranged in columns. Even, however, if the words were written correctly enough as Aramaic words, it would be a difficult matter to put any meaning in them as they stood, as we shall see when we consider Daniel's interpretation. The reward promised is of special interest. The word *argvānā*, translated "scarlet," appears in Assyrian as *argammā*; *hamneeka*, the word rendered "necklace," is of doubtful origin. We find in the Ninevite sculptures and on the cylinders from Babylon many instances of splendid robes (*vide* Rawlinson, 'Five Great Monarchies,' 560); the rich necklace is also to be seen (*ibid.*, ii. 497, 499). The great difficulty has arisen over the rank given to Daniel, "the third ruler in the kingdom." The difficulty is that the ordinal here is not in its usual form, although Petermann gives *taltu* as one of the forms of the ordinal. There is, further, the unusual position of the numeral in relation to the verb, though the abnormality is less than Professor Bevan represents it, as the Peshitta follows word for word the arrangement of the

Massoretic text.¹ The truth seems to be that the word really was *toolta*, as in the Syriac, and the difficulty has arisen in not recognizing the transference from one dialect of Aramaic to another. It is used in the Peshitta (2 Cor. x. 2) of the third heaven. Professor Bevan's interpretation, that it means "every third day," may be dismissed as absurd. Ewald (*in loc.*) regards the title as one of a board of three—not an impossible meaning, in the light of what we find in the following chapter. Yet his reasoning, that it cannot be third in rank, because the queen-mother could not be counted in, is inept now, when we learn that Belshazzar was colleague with his father, and so the third place was all he had to give. On this question Behrmann takes the view discarded as impossible by Ewald, and holds that Daniel was placed third because of the queen-mother. It is one of the commonplaces of the criticism of this book that the history ascribed to Daniel is borrowed from the history of Joseph: why was the position offered not made "second," as was that of Joseph? We have the reason in what we know of the history of Babylon at the time. The Septuagint and Josephus were unaware of the facts, and translated as they did.

Ver. 8.—Then came in all the king's wise men: but they could not read the writing, nor make known to the king the interpretation thereof. As we have already said, the Septuagint here repeats the list of wise men, and omits "the Chaldeans." If the word "Chaldean" had been in the text originally, the fact that astrologers were frequently called Chaldeans would render it unlikely that the word should be omitted. Whereas from this very ground

¹ Professor Bevan is mistaken in asserting (p. 102) that the Peshitta, following the Septuagint in translating this passage, renders the clause, "ruler of the third part of the kingdom." In Dr. Lee's text this is certainly not the case. Castelli certainly gives *tertia pars* as the meaning of the word here. If, however, Professor Bevan had verified Castelli's references, he would have seen that some of them did not support that translation; when it does mean third part, it is not followed by *?*, but *?*. It is amusing to see Professor Bevan in this connection quoting Josephus as an authority for translating the clause as the Septuagint does, making *taltu* "third part," when in p. 4 of his commentary he had declared the knowledge Josephus had of the book to be superficial. Josephus is no authority when brought in in favour of Daniel, but is an authority when he may be used against him.

It was a word specially apt to be added on the margin, and once on the margin it would easily drop into the text. Even in the case of the Massoretic text, there seems to be a repetition here. It is certainly more obvious in the Septuagint text. The verse according to the Septuagint is, "And there entered in the enchanters, the sorcerers, and the astrologers, and were not able to announce the interpretation of the writing." Theodotion agrees here with the received text; the Peshitta omits "all." The only way in which we can escape the idea of this being a repetition is by holding that the word "all" is emphatic. The omission of the word "all" from the Peshitta is against this. It is to be observed that in the Septuagint there is no reference to "reading the writing;" it is only to announce the interpretation.

Ver. 9.—Then was King Belshazzar greatly troubled, and his countenance was changed in him, and his lords were astonished. This verse presents signs also of being a repetition. The last clause appears to be the original form of the mysterious clause at the end of the sixth verse according to the Septuagint; the word *mishtabsheen*, which occurs here, seems to have been read *mishtabhareen*, from שִׁבְרָה (*shab'har*), "to be glorious," in the itta-
phel; this becomes "to boast one's self," as in the Targum of Prov. xxv. 14, also the Peshitta of the same passage; also 2 Cor. xii. 1. And this is the word used by Paulus Tellenius to translate *καυχῶνται*. The Septuagint has a verse here that has no equivalent in the Massoretic text, "Then the king called the queen about the sign, and showed her how great it was, and that no one had been able to declare to the king the interpretation of the writing." This verse avoids the repetition we find in the Massoretic text, and explains the presence of the queen in a much more plausible way than the received text does. In the Massoretic text it is the noise and tumult that pierces the women's apartments, and brings out the queen-mother; though not impossible, this is unlikely. The action of the king, as given in the Septuagint, is very probable. The wise men are baffled by this mysteriously appearing inscription. What is to be done? Belshazzar calls his mother, the daughter of Nebuchadnezzar, as she at least possibly was, to see if she knows anything in the past that might be a guide in such a matter. He not only shows her the sign, the inscription, but shows how great it was, by telling of the hand that had come out of the darkness, and had written it. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. While the repetition is obvious, it is also true that the failure of all the wise men in Babylon to read the writing,

as the Massoretic text has it, would increase the trouble of the king, and this trouble would naturally spread to the courtiers.

Vers. 10—12.—Now the queen, by reason of the words of the king and his lords, came into the banquet-house: and the queen spake and said, O king, live for ever: let not thy thoughts trouble thee, nor let thy countenance be changed: there is a man in thy kingdom in whom is the spirit of the holy gods; and in the days of thy father light and understanding and wisdom, like the wisdom of the gods, was found in him; whom the King Nebuchadnezzar thy father, the king, I say, thy father, made master of the magicians, astrologers, Chaldeans, and soothsayers; forasmuch as an excellent spirit, and knowledge, and understanding, interpreting of dreams, and showing of hard sentences, and dissolving of doubts, were found in the same Daniel, whom the king named Belteshazzar: now let Daniel be called, and he will show the interpretation. No one can fail to feel the presence of rhetoric here, especially in the last verse, which, we may remark, has no equivalent in the Septuagint. We see the rhetorical character of these verses more clearly when we consider the ineptitude of the special powers ascribed to Daniel to meet the present difficulty. Interpretation of dreams was a common attribute ascribed to wisdom in the East of old, as it is yet. But this was not a dream, and therefore the qualification was not to the purpose; still less to the purpose are the attributes that follow. *Showing of hard sentences.* Giving riddles that nobody could read was an evidence of wisdom all over the East (see Josephus, viii. 5. 3; besides Talmudic stories of Solomon). This, however, is not a case of competition in riddles; above all, there is no opportunity of one giving riddles in return. "Dissolving of doubts" is the solving of these riddles. These qualities, which the queen-mother, according to the Massoretic text, ascribes to Daniel, might make him delightful as a boon companion, but were not at all to the purpose in the matter troubling the king. The version of the Septuagint is much briefer, and, it seems to us, much more satisfactory, "Then the queen reminded him concerning Daniel, who was of the captivity of Judæa, and said to the king, The man was understanding, wise, and excelling all the wise men of Babylon, and there is a holy spirit in him, and in the days of the king thy father, he showed difficult (*ὑπερόπκα*) interpretations to Nebuchadnezzar thy father." This has every sign of having been translated; thus the phrase, *Ἐμνήσθη πρὸς αὐτὸν περὶ τοῦ Δανιήλ*, which we have rendered, "reminded him concern-

ing Daniel." This use of *πρὸς* after *μυνησκω* is unknown in classic Greek. In Homer's 'Odyssey' it is accusative of person; in Plato, 'Laches,' 200 D, it is dative of person; in 'Legg,' iii. 688, it is accusative of person. It is, however, exactly parallel with Gen. xl. 14, *μνησθήσῃ περὶ ἐμοῦ πρὸς ᾧ*. *Πρὸς* represents *לִּפְנֵי* in the Hebrew; in the Targum of Onkelos and in the Peshitta this is translated by *עֲדָה*; in Paulus Tellenensis it is rendered by *h*. Moreover, according to the Massoretic text, Belshazzar asks Daniel if he is "that Daniel which art of the captivity of the children of Judah, whom the king my father brought out of Jewry?" The queen-mother had said nothing, according to the verses before us as given in the Massoretic recension, of Daniel being a Jew. According to the Septuagint, the queen-mother tells him whence Daniel is. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic text, save that it inserts "watchfulness" instead of "light," and omits the repetition of "thy father." The Peshitta is also substantially at one with our received text. One of the great difficulties which commentators have found in this part of the incident is how Belshazzar could be ignorant of Daniel. Various means have been adopted to get over the difficulty. One is that Daniel was away from Babylon up to this time (Jephth-ibn-Ali). Archdeacon Rose is certain he must have known about him. The explanation of this is as incumbent on the opponents of the authenticity of Daniel as on its defenders, for they—the latter—declare it the work of one author, and it has had powerful effect on people: it must be artistically written if it is not a record of facts. No artist in fictitious narrative would present to his readers so obvious a difficulty. We learn now what was the probable reason of Belshazzar's ignorance of Daniel. Nabunahid, a usurper, was at variance with the whole clergy, as we may call them, of Babylon, and most likely Daniel acted with the others, and possibly, as far back as the revolution in which Evil-Merodach perished, had been away from the court. It is the height of unfairness of any one to press the name here given to Nebuchadnezzar, "my father." That title was very loosely used among the Babylonians and Assyrians. Jehu is called "the son of Omri," although he had swept the race of Omri off the face of the earth. So Dr. Hugo Winckler, in his 'Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte,' p. 53, note, says, "This word 'son' after the name of a Chaldean prince, is only to be taken in the sense of belonging to the same dynasty." Had the phrase used been that "Nebuchadnezzar slept with his fathers, and Belshazzar his son reigned in

his stead," something might have been said for the view maintained by all critics, that the author thought Belshazzar the son of Nebuchadnezzar. How can the critics assert this, and yet, as does Professor Bevan, maintain this author intimate even with the minutest portions of Jeremiah, Kings, and Chronicles? If so, how is it that he did not know that both Kings and Jeremiah asserted Nebuchadnezzar to have been succeeded by Evil-Merodach? This information occupies too prominent a place in both books for him to have been ignorant of it. We can only understand his action in thus putting down Belshazzar as the son of Nebuchadnezzar by assuming his acceptance of usage. The critics cannot explain it. Those who maintain the traditional view may do so by saying that Daniel, writing at the time, knowing the real state of matters, the claim of Belshazzar to be descended from Nebuchadnezzar, the fact that Evil-Merodach had been killed, simply relates facts. Had he been inventing history, and acquainted with the holy books, and all the information they conveyed to everybody, he would of necessity have spent some pains in explaining how his history came to differ so much from what one could draw from the Books of Kings and Jeremiah. The two accounts of Saul's meeting with David are not comparable with this, as we find the reason of the contradiction in the coalescence of two different accounts.

Vers. 13—16.—Then was Daniel brought in before the king. And the king spake and said unto Daniel, Art thou that Daniel, which art of the children of the captivity of Judah, whom the king my father brought out of Jewry? I have even heard of thee, that the spirit of the gods is in thee, and that light and understanding and excellent wisdom is found in thee. And now the wise men, the astrologers, have been brought in before me, that they should read this writing, and make known unto me the interpretation thereof: but they could not show the interpretation of the thing: and I have heard of thee, that thou canst make interpretations, and dissolve doubts; now if thou canst read the writing, and make known to me the interpretation thereof, thou shalt be clothed with scarlet, and have a chain of gold about thy neck, and shalt be the third ruler in the kingdom. There is a great deal of rhetoric in this, and the attempt to restore the stately etiquette of the Babylonian court. The king is represented as repeating very much what his mother had told him. It is to be observed that, although the queen-mother—as the Massoretic text records her words—has not spoken a word of Daniel's origin, and implies that Belshazzar knew nothing of

him, yet when he comes, Belshazzar addresses him as knowing who and whence he is. The suspicion that is engendered by the mere reading of the text as we have it is confirmed by a study of the Septuagint text, where these four verses shrink into very modest dimensions. "Then Daniel was brought to the king, and the king answered and said, O Daniel, art thou able to show me the interpretation of the writing? and I will clothe thee with purple, and put a gold chain about thy neck, and thou shalt have authority over a third part of my kingdom." The brevity of this, the utter want of rhetoric, not to speak of its dramatic verisimilitude to the speech of a man beside himself with terror, make it the more probable text. Condensation was rarely the work of a *falsarius*; he might omit statements that were antagonistic to some preconceived notion, or, if only a leaf or so remained of a parchment otherwise filled up, he might endeavour to utilize the space left him by putting down as much as he could of some work he valued. Then, in such a case, a copyist might really condense. But neither of these causes can explain the omission of the rhetorical passages here. We are compelled, then, to regard the text behind the Septuagint in this place as the true Daniel. Theodotion, while on the whole agreeing with the text of the Massorettes, is briefer in some respects. There is one addition, the insertion of "magicians" between "wise men" and "astrologers." This shows the process of the evolution of the Massoretic text. The Peshitta, though but little, if at all, later than Theodotion, is in yet closer agreement with the text of the Massorettes. Yet the Massoretic text shows certain peculiarities. The presence of א , in the second personal pronoun, which was disappearing from Targumic, but is regularly found in Daniel, is to be observed. Further, there is אמ with the suffix of the first person, which is not Targumic, but is found in the Sindschirli inscription. In the Targums it is אמא , not אמי , as in Gen. ix. 34, Onkelos. Eastern Aramaic retained it, as may be seen in the Peshitta Version of the passage before us, and of that to which we have referred. This is another of the many slight indications which all point to the Eastern origin of the Book of Daniel. It may be observed that we have not here תל'ת (*tal'ti*), but תל'תא (*tal'ta*). This is regarded by Behrmann as *status emphaticus*. The king in his terror makes appeal to one who, perhaps, had been dismissed the court on suspicion of being opposed to the new dynasty. That dynasty had displaced and murdered Evil-Merodach, the son of Daniel's old master and one who had shown himself

specially favourable to the Jews. As the text of the Septuagint gives the narrative, we have the king eager to have his terrors laid, and, to lead this opponent, whom his father, if not also Nerigissar, had displaced, and put in opposition to his rule, to look favourably on him, he mentions the reward he offers.

Vers. 17-23.—Then Daniel answered and said before the king, Let thy gifts be to thyself, and give thy rewards to another; yet I will read the writing unto the king, and make known to him the interpretation. O thou king, the most high God gave Nebuchadnezzar thy father a kingdom, and majesty, and glory, and honour: and for the majesty that he gave him, all people, nations, and languages, trembled and feared before him: whom he would he slew; and whom he would he kept alive; and whom he would he set up; and whom he would he put down. But when his heart was lifted up, and his mind hardened in pride, he was deposed from his kingly throne, and they took his glory from him: and he was driven from the sons of men; and his heart was made like the beasts, and his dwelling was with the wild asses: they fed him with grass like oxen, and his body was wet with the dew of heaven; till he knew that the most high God ruled in the kingdom of men, and that he appointeth over it whomsoever he will. And thou his son, O Belshazzar, hast not humbled thine heart, though thou knewest all this; but hast lifted up thyself against the Lord of heaven; and they have brought the vessels of his house before thee, and thou, and thy lords, thy wives, and thy concubines, have drunk wine in them; and thou hast praised the gods of silver, and gold, of brass, iron, wood, and stone, which see not, nor hear, nor know: and the God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified. We have gathered these verses together, as they all relate to one matter and come under one condemnation. Long ago von Lengerke, and more recently Hitzig, have shown that such an insulting speech as Daniel addressed to Belshazzar would certainly be visited with punishment. The king had no guarantee that the promised interpretation of the writing on the wall would be true, especially when the interpreter had such an animus against him. Then the fact in the twenty-ninth verse, that Daniel received the gifts he had rejected, makes his conduct here all the more extraordinary. A writer of fiction, of even moderate skill, would not make the blunder here made. It could easily be made by a *falsarius* interpolating a speech he thought suitable to a Jewish prophet in the presence of a heathen king, who had dishonoured the

sacred vessels by drinking wine in them himself, and his wives, and his concubines. It is to be noted that the princes are omitted from the enumeration here. In proof that our contention is correct, we find the mass of this entirely omitted from the Septuagint. There are signs of confusion, and coalescence of different readings in the text of the Septuagint, yet we have no hesitation in claiming that it represents a much earlier state of the text than we find in our Hebrew Bibles, "Then Daniel stood before the writing, and read, and thus answered the king: This is the writing: It hath been numbered; it was reckoned; it has been removed." The marginal reading which we find in the beginning of this chapter has, *Mane, Phares, Thedel*. The interpretation here follows a different succession, "And the hand which wrote stood"—a phrase that seems to be a mistaken rendering of the latter clause of the twenty-fourth verse as we find it in the Massoretic text. It seems difficult to imagine what Aramaic word has been translated *ḥorā*. Paulus Tellenius has *Ἀσὸν* (*asōn*, *q'math*), which may have been mistaken for *sh'hiach*, though it is not easy to see how. The clause is, at all events, misplaced. The following clause also is misplaced, and is a doublet of the first clause of the twenty-sixth verse. The twenty-third verse seems to be the nucleus of the speech ascribed to Daniel, "O king, thou madest a feast to thy friends, and thou drankest wine, and the vessels of the house of the living God were brought, and ye drank in them, thou and thy nobles, and praised all the idols made with the hands of men, and the living God ye did not bless, and thy breath is in his hand, and he gave thee thy kingdom, and thou didst not bless him, neither praise him." The wives and concubines are not mentioned here. There is no word of the madness of Nebuchadnezzar. Although from the disturbed state of the text in the immediate neighbourhood one is inclined to suspect the authenticity of this twenty-third verse, given in the LXX., yet there is nothing that contradicts the position created by the two early decrees of Nebuchadnezzar, which placed Jehovah the God of the Jews on a par with the great gods of Babylon to whom, though no worship was decreed, at all events no dishonour was to be done. Belshazzar is not so much blamed for praising the gods of wood and stone as for omitting to praise Jehovah. Belshazzar had dishonoured Jehovah, and therefore this ominous message had come forth. The first clause here seems the primitive text. What was more natural than that Daniel, coming into the presence of the king, should go and stand before the mys-

terious writing, and then, having read it himself, turn to the king and address him? The words of the Massoretic and of the text behind the Septuagint differ very considerably, but not so much but that the former may have grown out of the latter by expansion, and the insertion of paraphrastic additions. A peculiarity to be observed in the Massoretic text (ver. 17) is *להיגיון* (*lehayogyan*), the third plural imperfect of *יג*, "to be." It is difficult to understand this form of the third person, save on the supposition that Daniel was written in a region where *ל* was the preformative. This preformative along with *י* was used in Babylon so late as the period of the Babylonian Talmud. Theodotion and the Peshitta practically agree with the Massoretic text. Even when we omit all the insulting elements, we have Daniel's speech to Belshazzar as we find it in the Massoretic text; no reader can fail to notice the difference of Daniel's demeanour towards Belshazzar as narrated here, from that towards Nebuchadnezzar as narrated in the preceding chapter. When he learns the disaster that impends on the destroyer of his city and the conqueror of his nation, Daniel is astonished and silent, and bursts out from his silence, "The dream be upon thine enemies, and the interpretation thereof upon them that hate thee." He shows no sign of sorrow when he learns the fate impending on Belshazzar. We can understand this, if we regard Daniel's love for the splendid conqueror making him feel the blood of his murdered descendants, Evil-Merodach and Labasi-Marduk called for vengeance. So far as we can make out from external history, Belshazzar was a gallant young prince, who seemed to be able to maintain himself against Cyrus, while his father lived in retirement in Tema; but the judgment of God often falls on those who are not worse than their predecessors, only guilt has accumulated and ripened. Louis XVI. was not worse than, but really greatly superior to, his two immediate predecessors, yet on him, not on them, broke the vengeance of the French Revolution. There probably was, as said above under ver. 2, a special defiance of Jehovah, which therefore merited special punishment.

Ver. 24.—Then was the part of the hand sent from him; and this writing was written. As we have seen, the real equivalent of this verse in the Septuagint is a clause in ver. 17, "And the hand which had written (*γράφειν*) stood." If we take this to mean that the hand now "ceased to write," then the original text might be *קָטַץ כְּתָבָא*, the verb being written *plenum*, in Mandæan manner. Then it would easily

happen that ρ (In the older script ϕ and χ) was resolved into γ (in the older script χ and χ). In support of this, it may be observed that while in the fifth verse the older construction of construct state and *status emphaticus* is used to exhibit the genitival connection, in the present case the relative γ is used as a sign of the genitive. Starting with this, it is easy to see how the Massoretic text arose; but, on the other hand, it is difficult to see the sense of the reading of the Septuagint, unless this fiery hand is to be imagined as tracing and retracing the characters on the wall of the palace, and that the hand only ceased when Daniel stood before the inscription to read. Theodotion differs very little from the Massoretic text, and the Peshitta coincides with it. The word for "writing," $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ (*rsheem*), is really "engraving," and therefore peculiarly descriptive of the Assyrian mode of impressing on clay tablets or incising in stone the thing to be preserved.

Vers. 25—28.—And this is the writing that was written, MENE, MENE, TEKEL, UPHARSIN. This is the interpretation of the thing: MENE; God hath numbered thy kingdom, and finished it. TEKEL; Thou art weighed in the balances, and art found wanting. PERES; Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and Persians. The Septuagint has two versions of this passage, one in the text, the other in the portion at the beginning, which we think is really composed of marginal readings. In the text the Aramaic is not given at all. As we have already seen, the verse which corresponds to ver. 25 here is really the latter part of ver. 17 of the Septuagint, "This is the writing: It hath been numbered; it is reckoned; it has been carried away." In the verses which are appended to the beginning of the chapter, we have the Aramaic words, but given in a different order, and without the repetition of the first word: "MANE, PHARES, THEKEL. MANE, It has been numbered; PHARES, It is carried away; THEKEL, It has been set up." Here not only is the order different, but the meaning assigned to *phares* is singular. $\rho\alpha\varsigma$ means in Syriac, "spread out." It would seem that $\epsilon\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omega$ meant "stretched out" as well as "carried away." It is still more difficult to understand how *thekel* can mean "set up," unless the words, $\epsilon\nu \zeta\upsilon\gamma\gamma\epsilon$, "on the balance," are understood. The Septuagint of the best version is briefer than the Massoretic, though less so than it is in some of the other passages, "Numbered is the time of thy kingdom; ceases thy kingdom; cut short and ended has been thy kingdom; to the Medes and the Persians has it been given." The word interpreted

is not repeated as in the Massoretic text, and $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ is derived from $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$, which in some of the conjugations means "destroyed," whereas in ver. 17 it is rendered $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$, "it is reckoned," a rendering of $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ which makes it mean "weigh." The Septuagint rendering of the first clause is an evident attempt at explaining the numbering implied. The Massoretic reading involves a pun in both the last words; there is a play between $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ (*tekel*), "to weigh," and $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ (*q'el*), "to be light," although the introduction of $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$ rather conceals this. In the last the play is between $\kappa\alpha\tau\epsilon\lambda\omicron\gamma\iota\sigma\theta\eta$, "to divide," and $\rho\alpha\varsigma$, "a Persian." Theodotion avoids the repetition of the first word, otherwise he is in somewhat close agreement with the Massoretic text, "MANE, God hath measured thy kingdom; THEKEL, It is set on the balance, and found wanting; PHARES, Thy kingdom is cut asunder, and given to the Medes and the Persians." The Peshitta is in close agreement with the Massoretic text. The actual meaning of the words, taking them as they appear in the Massoretic text, as Aramaic words, is, to give English equivalents, "a pound, a pound, an ounce, and quarters;" hence the impossibility of interpreting the words. We find all these words, *mena*, *tekel* (*shekel*), *phares*, in the Ninevite inscriptions. As the words are interpreted, we cannot fail to be impressed with the peremptory style of the inscription, as Hitzig has it. Zöckler refers to the sculptural style (*lapidarstil*). This brevity rendered it difficult for the soothsayers to put any meaning into the words at all. In all the versions the fact that the kingdom is to be given to the Medes and Persians is emphasized, but, moreover, the play on words in the last clause implies the Persians as the prominent assailants of the Babylonian power, but really that the two powers were united. It seems extraordinary that any one, in the face of this, should maintain that the author of Daniel separated the two powers, and thought the Median power succeeded the Babylonian, and then that the Persian succeeded the Median. We know now that Herodotus's representation of the history of Media and Persia is utterly false and misleading.

Ver. 29.—Then commanded Belshazzar, and they clothed Daniel with scarlet, and put a chain of gold about his neck, and made a proclamation concerning him, that he should be the third ruler in the kingdom. The Septuagint runs thus: "Then Baltasar the king clothed Daniel in purple, and put on him a golden necklace, and gave authority to him over a third part of his kingdom." The only difference here is that

there is no word of a proclamation. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. We have *אָפֶל* here instead of *אָפֶל*. The presence of the haphel form instead of the aphel, is to be noted. No reader whose attention is directed to it can fail to be struck with the magnanimity of Belshazzar; he had promised that whoever would interpret the inscription should be clothed in purple and gold, and be made third ruler of the kingdom. Had he been a mean man, he might have higgled about the matter; he might have declared an uncertainty as to whether Daniel did not, out of his spite against the murderers of the son of Nebuchadnezzar, invent the evil interpretation. The treatment Ahub meted out to Micaiah the son of Imlah shows the way a tyrannical monarch may act towards one who has uttered unpalatable prophecies against him. He might, according to the Persian story, have proclaimed Daniel exalted to all the promised honours, and then instantly had him executed. But, no; in noble simplicity he fulfils his promise to the last letter, without any apparent after-thought of vengeance. If Belshazzar is intended to represent Antiochus Epiphanes, certainly the portrait is singularly unlike anything we know of that monarch. Cruel and treacherous, he was very unlikely to keep such a promise to one who had made such a prophecy concerning him. Even if he could have done so, no Jew, with blood boiling from the indignities and cruelties heaped upon the Jewish race, could have pictured him doing this. Even the natural instinct that makes us think that specially terrible misfortune must be the result of specially unbroken wickedness, would certainly have led the writer of Daniel, if drawing on his imagination, to make Belshazzar meanly refuse his rewards, or, having given them, to threaten the receiver with death. It is no answer to say, with Ewald and Jephth-ibn-Ali, that the reward once promised was irrevocable, for the accuracy of the reading of the writing might have been contested, and the correctness of the interpretation denied. Further, as has been pointed out by Keil, there is no evidence that Epiphanes ever desecrated the sacred vessels at a banquet; he was regardless enough to have done so, but his financial necessities were too pressing for delaying the coining of these golden treasures. Moreover, in Antiochus such desecration would be without purpose, whereas, as we have seen, there might be a purpose in the action of Belshazzar. The idea maintained by commentators of the critical school, that there is any reference in the description

given here of the feast of Belshazzar and its results to the feast which Antiochus gave to the people of Antioch, as described by Polybius, xxvi., is mere nonsense. The points of contrast are vastly more prominent than the points of resemblance. Belshazzar's feast is over in one night; Antiochus's feast lasted several days. Belshazzar's feast was given in his palace, to "a thousand of his lords;" Antiochus invited the whole populace of Antioch to revel in the grove of Daphne. While, as we have seen, there is blasphemy against Jehovah and defiance of him in Belshazzar's feast, there is no kind of debauchery. In regard to the feast of Antiochus, on the other hand, while there is maddest excess of every kind, a very orgy of lust and drunkenness, there is no word, either in Polybius or in the Books of the Maccabees, of any special act of defiance to Jehovah, or blasphemy of his Name. The only point of identity is that both the banquet of Belshazzar and the orgy of Antiochus have been called "feasts." Altogether, the idea that Belshazzar represents Antiochus Epiphanes is nearly as absurd as that Nebuchadnezzar does. Did the orthodox interpretation involve such an identification, what boundless scorn would be poured on the unfortunate maintainers of such a view?

Ver. 30.—In that night was Belshazzar the King of the Chaldeans slain. The version of the LXX. is here very different, "And the interpretation came upon Belshazzar the king, and the kingdom was taken from the Chaldeans, and given to the Medes and the Persians." There seems no possibility of connecting these two readings so that either should be shown to have come from the other. The Massoretic text, which is here supported by Theodotion and the Peshitta, is the shorter; but in this instance, as neither can have sprung from the other, brevity has less probative force. If we look at the probability of the situation, we are compelled to accept the Septuagint reading. If the Massoretic reading had been the original, the dramatic completeness of the disaster, following with such rapidity on the back of the prophecy, would certainly have been preserved in every translation. Whereas the desire for this dramatic completeness might lead to the Massoretic verse being fabricated. Further, when we look at the events of the night, it seems impossible to place all of them in the short interval of one night. The feast had begun after sundown, for the lamps were lighted. It had already gone on some time ere Belshazzar thought of the vessels of the house of God. Then, in contempt of Jehovah, the guests sang praises to the gods of Babylon. It is after

all this that the writing appears. There is next the calling of the wise men, who were in the vicinity of the palace. On their failure to explain the writing, the other wise men are summoned by proclamation; they assemble, essay the reading, and fail. The queen-mother comes—either is called, or, hearing the tumult, comes in herself—and tells Belshazzar of Daniel. Daniel is summoned, and reads the writing. Even if we maintain—although it does not seem the natural reading of the passage—that the proclamation of a reward to him who could read the writing followed immediately on the order to call in the astrologers and other wise men, still, it is difficult to imagine all the events, especially the summoning of all the wise men in Babylon by proclamation, and the finding out of Daniel and bringing him to the court, taking place in one night, and that in that very night was Belshazzar slain. On the other hand, the Septuagint makes no such demand on our belief. According to it, the prophecy was not so closely connected with its fulfilment. The feast recorded here may have taken place six, eight, or ten years before the actual fall of Babylon. We know that from his seventh year till some time between his eleventh and seventeenth year Nabunahid was in Tema. This feast might be the inauguration of Belshazzar's viceroyalty; in that case it would be nearly ten years before the capture of Babylon by Cyrus. If that is so, the supposed contradiction between this verse and ch. viii. 1 vanishes. We need only look at the various theories of who Belshazzar was. Niebuhr assumes it as a second name for Evil-Merodach—a view for which Keil has some sympathy. Niebuhr ingeniously combines the statement from Berosus, that his reign was ἀνδρως καὶ ἀσελγώς. This, however, might mean a favour for the Jews, shown by the special honour given to Jehoiachin—a thing which would be readily regarded by the Babylonians as “lawless and outrageous.” He maintains that the change of dynasty implied in Babylon was the assumption of the supremacy by Astyages the Mede, who, according to Niebuhr, is Darius the Mede. After one year's personal reign, he placed Neriglissar on the throne. This view is definitely contradicted by the contract tables, which have no reference to a reign between Evil-Merodach and Neriglissar. The other theory is that he is Labasi-Marduk. This view is maintained by Delitzsch and Ebrard. All of them assume the murder of the king the very night of the feast—a thing which is in the teeth of probability, and not supported by the Septuagint reading.

Ver. 31.—And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about three score and two years old. It is probable that the Massoretic division of the chapters here is to be preferred. According to it, this verse is assigned to the beginning of the next chapter, but most of the more ancient versions, Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate, agree with our English arrangement. The Septuagint, like the Massoretic text, assigns this verse to the sixth chapter. Its rendering manifests several striking peculiarities, “And Artaxerxes of the Medes received (παρέλαβε) the kingdom, and Darius was full of days, and reverend (ἐνδοξος) in old age.” This is the product of doublets ἄρταξερξης, Artaxerxes, being suggested by some scribe as in his opinion a more probable name than Darius. So the one name begins the first clause, and the other the second. The last clause is evidently due to קָבַר (*kabar*), “about” (“as the son of”), being read קָבַר (*kaber*), “great,” “multiplied”—a meaning this word has in Syriac, but not in Chaldee (Gen. xxxv. 11). Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The uncertainty as to the name has to be noted. We shall reserve for fuller discussion the question of Darius the Mede, only we would say that the name not improbably was modified from a less-known name to one somewhat like it but well known. We know that “Gobbaru,” or “Ogbaru.”—“Gobryas,” in Greek—was appointed governor by Cyrus when he conquered Babylon, and that, in the script of the Sindschirli monuments, *Gobryas*, WQ99A or 499A, is not unlike *Darius*, W4Z7A. One point to be noted is the fact that the verb used is wrongly translated “took.” קָבַל really means “received.” When this is said, we naturally expect some one, either God or man, from whom he has received this honour. If this purported to be a history of Babylonia, then it might be reasoned that the implied source from whom the kingdom was received was God; in such a case קָבַל would be used of one who succeeded to the kingdom by inheritance; this cannot be the meaning here. In this passage it is merely incidentally mentioned in order to explain the events that immediately follow. The more natural interpretation is that he was put on the throne by another person, his superior. The instance quoted by Professor Bevan, in which this verb is used of the accession of Julian the Apostate, tells really against his contention. Julian expected to have to conquer the empire; but, by the death of his cousin, he received it as an inheritance. Nothing could be more unlike what occurred in

Babylon, according to his theory of what the author of Daniel meant. He maintains that the author of Daniel thought Darius conquered Babylon, and so ascended the throne. The example he brings does not show that *haz* could be used in that sense.

HOMILETICS.

Ver. 5.—The writing on the wall. We have here a declaration of judgment, the circumstances, form, and effects of which are full of significance.

I. THE CIRCUMSTANCES OF THE DECLARATION OF JUDGMENT. 1. It was in the *king's palace*. The guards who may keep off the human intruder cannot shut out the Divine messenger. Judgment may find a man in his own home (Isa. xxxvii. 38; ch. iv. 29; Luke xii. 16). 2. It was at a time of *pleasure*. The intoxication of pleasure may blind us to approaching judgment, but cannot stay it. It is foolish to rest our security on our experience of present enjoyment. The moment of greatest pleasure may bring us to the brink of the deepest ruin. 3. It was in the midst of *sinful revelry*. Drunkenness, profligacy, and profanity were rioting at the feast when the judgment came. So the sinner is sometimes summoned to judgment in the midst of his sins. It is a delusion to suppose that all of us will have good warning and time for repentance, before we are called to meet the Judge. 4. It was under circumstances of *gross negligence*. The enemy was at the gates; yet the king was revelling in effeminate orgies. Negligence as to the danger into which our sins have brought us is itself a sin, and one which will meet with certain, merited punishment (Jer. vi. 14; Matt. xxiv. 38).

II. THE FORM OF THE DECLARATION OF JUDGMENT. 1. It was *public*. The message was not given to the king privately. It was written up on the wall of his banquet-chamber, in the presence of his courtiers. Sin may be secret; but judgment will be public (Luke xii. 3; 1 Cor. iv. 5). 2. It was *silent*. There was no awakening trumpet-blast, but a silent hand writing on the wall. God often speaks quietly (1 Kings xix. 11, 12). This method is often the more impressive to the observing; and until we are observing, no method is of much use. It is most fitting in the solemn declaration of judgment. In speaking of future punishment, it is most seemly not to indulge in noisy declamation, but to use quiet, weighty words, bordering on awestruck silence. 3. It was *decisive*. Written words are more decisive than spoken words. They are generally more weighed. They are more enduring. They admit of more study. Illustrate this by Pilate's reference to the superscription on the cross (John xix. 22). Apply it (1) to the written Bible; (2) to the written book of judgment; (3) to the written names in heaven. 4. It was *mysterious*. The king and his courtiers and his wise men could not read the writing. All doom is mysterious till it falls. Scriptural intimations of doom are generally vague, though terrible. Note in particular (1) sinful indulgence blunts the spiritual sense for discerning Divine truth; (2) the language of heaven is an unknown tongue to the godless man; (3) God's revelations to the heathen need interpretation by his clearer revelations to his prophets and apostles.

III. THE EFFECT OF THE DECLARATION OF JUDGMENT. 1. It produced *terror*. The mystery and supernatural character of the event alarmed the king and his courtiers (vers. 6—9). (1) Here is an instance of the common human weakness in presence of what appears to be supernatural—a weakness which is as great in the proudest monarch as in the lowest slave. Before the unseen we are level in our common humanity. (2) The terror was augmented by guilt. Sin fears to meet the spiritual world. (3) It was deepened by the surprise of unfamiliarity with the unseen. Daniel was in frequent converse with the other world, and could meet its messages with calmness. Belshazzar was buried in sensuality, and felt the first touch of the spiritual with the shrinking of startled horror. What alarm and confusion the engrossed sensualist will experience, when after death he wakes to his first vision of the spiritual! 2. It led to the introduction of the *best counsellor*. Daniel had been neglected by the dissolute king in favour of more congenial companies. Now he is sent for. Trouble is good if it leads to wisdom. Though the wisdom which comes too late may only deepen the consciousness of our punishment, it must be better to meet this intelligently, than with the blindness of a brute.

Ver. 23 (last clause).—*Natural religion.* I. WE HAVE NATURAL RELATIONS WITH GOD. Men often act as though we had no relations with God but those we voluntarily assume in religious worship, so that if we chose we could have nothing to do with God. This is a gross delusion. We have relations with God (1) apart from our will; and (2) apart from our consciousness, dependent upon our very nature and existence in the world. 1. *Our life is dependent on God.* In his hand our "breath is." He is the First Cause—the Origin of life (Gen. i. 24—27). He is also the constant Sustainer of life, and without him we could not continue to exist for one moment, any more than we could live without the air we breathe (Job xii. 10; Acts xvii. 28). Therefore the existence and the continuance of our life depend on his will (Numb. xvi. 22). These facts are not affected by our ideas about God. If they are facts, they apply as much to the atheist as to the theist, and to the most godless as to the most devout. 2. *Our destiny is shaped by God.* "Whose are all our ways." We think to carve out our own career, and no doubt it is largely dependent on our conduct; but it is subject to numberless apparent accidents, which are really governed by the providence of God (Jas. iv. 14, 15).

II. OUR NATURAL RELATIONS WITH GOD MAKE IT OUR DUTY TO GLORIFY HIM. As our primary relations with God are not dependent on our own will, so our obligations toward God cannot be regulated by our free choice. Religious obligations are not simply determined by our "profession," nor can they be discarded by our renunciation of any connection with religious worship, Church relationship, etc. We are all subjects of God's spiritual kingdom, whether we will or no. The man who refuses to submit to its laws is not to be regarded as an alien, but as a deserter and a rebel. Therefore, though Belshazzar had never professed obedience to God, he was not exonerated from blame when he failed to render it. 1. The universal human duty of glorifying God is *determined* by the fact that we are all enjoying life and its advantages simply as the *fruits of the goodness of God*. 2. It may be enforced by the reflection that since we are entirely *in the hands of God*, no attempt to rebel against him can ultimately succeed (Isa. xl. 15).

III. THE NEGLECT OF OUR DUTY TO GLORIFY GOD IS THE ROOT OF ALL SIN. This is the one sin to which Daniel calls attention, although Belshazzar was guilty of all kinds of wickedness. So long as we live in the effort to honour and serve God, our conscience will be kept pure; but when God is dethroned from the shrine of our hearts, all forms of evil take his place. Idolatry, the worship of false gods, is only possible when the worship of the true God is neglected. Profanity is the direct opposite of the reverence which glorifies God. Indulgence in sinful pleasures is only possible when the pure pleasures of Divine things are lost. Thus the special sins seen in Belshazzar in the incident of his feast are all connected with the neglect of the honour and service of God.

Note: 1. The very blessings which are proofs of the goodness of God are often used as temptations to allure us from our duty to glorify him. 2. Godlessness may bring present delights, but it must ensure future ruin.

Vers. 25—28.—"*Found wanting.*" The mysterious writing on the wall of Belshazzar's palace is a revelation of the judgment which must certainly follow all misuse of the talents and opportunities of life. It brings vividly before us the summons, the trial, and the sentence which awaits every one who neglects and abuses his mission in the world.

I. THE SUMMONS. "Numbered" is the first word. The days of the Babylonian supremacy are numbered, and the days of the life of King Belshazzar are numbered; their end has come, and now he and his nation are called to give account of their stewardship. 1. *Every life has its limit.* God gives us all sufficient time and opportunity for the work which he requires of us, and, conversely, he requires no more of us than our faculties are equal to. Therefore we have no reason to murmur at the brevity of life, and no excuse for neglecting our proper duties on account of it. But there is a limit to our opportunities. We have not the leisure of eternity before us. We cannot postpone the work of to-day till to-morrow, without interfering with the work of the morrow (John ix. 4). The time draws on apace when the end will come to all these opportunities of doing our work in the world. How foolish not to consider

what our position will be at "the end of the days"! How vain to be satisfied with present ease, since these days of sinful idleness are few and shortening! Who of us will be able to say at the end of life, "It is finished"? 2. *Abuse of opportunities will lead to the loss of them.* The kingdom appears to be "numbered and finished," swiftly, abruptly, and in judgment. Both king and people might have been spared longer, if they had lived better. Time is a talent which is justly taken from those who do not make a good use of it (Ps. xxxvii. 9; Matt. xxv. 28, 29). This applies with special force to kingdoms—the judgment of which belongs to this world (Isa. xiv. 22).

II. THE TRIAL. The second word, "weighed," is explained by Daniel to mean that Belshazzar and his kingdom have been "weighed in the balances, and found wanting." 1. There is a *judgment awaiting us all*. Our future will not be determined by chance, or fate, or easy indifference. It will depend on our past. This will be revealed, examined, proved, tested, weighed in every thought and word and deed, for every moment of life. None can expect to escape this trial. The greatest king is here subjected to its searching scrutiny. 2. This judgment will be effected by *weighing our conduct*, and testing it by a Divine standard. We shall be weighed in the balances. On Egyptian mummy-cases there may be seen representations of the soul weighed in scales with truth as a counterpoise. The truth or ideal conduct by which we shall be tested may be variously viewed as (1) absolute right; (2) God's will; (3) God's idea of our life; (4) duty and vocation;—these being shaped and modified according to our powers, our opportunities, and our light (Rom. ii. 6—12). 3. The ground of condemnation will be to be "*found wanting*." As darkness is the absence of light, so evil is the absence of good. We can only keep out sin by being filled with holiness (Rom. xii. 21). To be "wanting" in truth, or purity, or love, is the essence of sin. More particularly we shall be judged by our defection of duty, not merely by our commission of offences. Mere negative harmlessness will be of no avail if we have failed in our positive service (Matt. xxv. 42—45).

III. THE SENTENCE. The third word, "divided," is interpreted to mean that the Babylonian "kingdom is divided, and given to Media and Persia." 1. After a verdict of "guilty," there must be a sentence of *punishment*. Whatever be the nature of future punishment, justice, present analogies, and revelation concur in pointing to the certainty of its execution. For individuals this is mostly reserved to the future world; but for kingdoms, which remain in this world for successive generations, allowing time for moral laws to work out their ends here, it is executed on earth and is witnessed by history. 2. The most natural punishment is the *loss of the honours and powers* which have been abused. The kingdom is taken away. The unused talent is taken away (Matt. xxv. 28, 29). 3. The worst form of punishment is *death*. The kingdom is to be divided—to die as a kingdom. Corruption, disintegration, dissolution, spiritual death in outer darkness, are the awful mysterious doom of sin unrepented and persisted in to the end (Jas. i. 15).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—4.—*The downward road.* "Belshazzar the king made a great feast to a thousand of his lords, and drank wine before the thousand" (ver. 1). The history of the fall of Babylon must form the background of any homiletical treatment of this chapter (see the histories; and the Exposition above). The clearing up of the difficulty of this portion of Scripture, of the seeming discrepancy between Daniel's statements and the records of secular history, by the discovery of clay cylinders, simultaneously by M. Oppert and Sir Henry Rawlinson in 1854, is one of the most interesting episodes in the history of Christian apologetics; and is eminently suggestive in that line of things, showing particularly how easily Biblical mists would be cleared away if only we could have at hand *all* the facts. But we turn here to the bearing of the passage on the ordinary life of man.

I. THE POSITION OF PRIVILEGE. Guilt must ever stand related to knowledge. What were the king's opportunities of knowing the will of God? They were more than some may think, such as ought to have saved him from the degradations of that night. The parallel with our own position is clear. Though our advantages are in

degree greater. For Belshazzar there was: 1. *The witness of creation.* 2. *The open page of providence.* (See ver. 22.) 3. *The voice of that moral nature* which is common to every man. 4. *The interpretation of them by the high Chaldean culture;* e.g. the revelation of the glory of God in the stars of heaven was one that shone with special clearness on the Chaldean plain (see Sir G. C. Lewis's 'Astronomy of the Ancients,' ch. v.). 5. *Special Divine revelations;* e.g. in the interpretation of Nebuchadnezzar's dream (he had not been dead twenty-three years); in the deliverance of the heroic three, by the presence of the Saviour in the fire; by the insanity and recovery of the king. Nor must we forget that Belshazzar was not further away from the Divine than a modern worldling; for in his own realm lived the Church, with whom lay the oracles of God. Compare Louis XIV. and the Huguenots. And enough had been done to draw attention to these.

II. THE STARTING-POINT. The sin of the king was nothing else than that *practical atheism* (vers. 22, 23) which so often shows itself callously indifferent to all those serious considerations which even people of ordinary prudence entertain (note: the city at the moment in a state of siege); and which usually is associated with epicurean life.

III. THE ROAD DOWN. A distinct gradation in evil is marked in this, as in every other career. The steps may be different with different sinners; but there is a gradual descent with all, though it must be admitted that on "that night" some were taken by the king at lightning speed. The king: 1. *Ignored all the circumstances of his position.* This was indeed terrible. For long the Persian lines had been drawn round the city; engineers had been turning the river from its bed. At this hour things were becoming critical. Facts are stubborn things, which even a heathen might note. 2. *Defied Providence.* Such extravagance at such a time. Imagine the authorities of Paris banqueting in the late siege. A false security the presage of ruin. 3. *Sacrificed his own dignity.* As king—as man. Not usual for Babylonian kings to make themselves the boon companions of their subjects—even the highest. We owe respect to men, as made in the image of God—rational, moral, immortal, etc.; but not the less to ourselves. 4. *Plunged into drunkenness.* The lightning leaps which immediately follow are to be distinctly assigned to the drunken condition of the king. Much may and should be here said on the intimate relation existing between moral and spiritual degradation generally and alcohol; and also on the close connection between alcohol and many forms of vice. It is the root of many vices. (The writer of these notes feels that educated men are still the children of many illusions anent this powerful chemical agent; these are well dealt with in 'Dialogues on Drink,' by Dr. Richardson.) 5. *Jested with things sacred.* Sure mark of a "fool" in the Bible sense. "Holy vessels will we have for such delicious wine," may the king be supposed to say. (Matthew Henry is full and good on this.) 6. *Violated the decencies of domestic life.* The bringing the harem into the banquet-chamber was a gross offence against even the Oriental idea. (On this see Dr. Raleigh, 'Esther,' lect. ii.) 7. *Insulted God.* Drank they out of vessels sacred to him, unto other gods. So the indifference of a passive practical atheism culminates in open defiant antagonism against God.

IV. THE DREADFUL END. The loss of everything—kingdom, life, etc. Many things will need to be looked at ere the final ruin of the night comes up for consideration; but this is the place specially to observe that *it was the king's own sin and folly of that very hour that led straight to ruin.* Had the king and "the lords" been on the alert, not even the turning of the river from its bed had laid them at the mercy of the besiegers. But the revelry incapacitated them. Sin is its own avenger!—R.

Vers. 5—17.—*The crisis of awaking.* "Then was Daniel brought in before the king" (ver. 13). In introducing the present subject the following features and incidents of the history need vivid and powerful setting: suddenness of the apparition—only fingers writing—in ancient Hebrew characters (same as those of the two Sinaitic tables)—on the plain plaster over against the candlestick—seen by its light—the effect upon the king, pale, trembling, sobered (he will not die drunk)—a great cry for help—why "third ruler"? (Belshazzar co-regent with his father Nabonadius)—inability of the magi—consternation and confusion of the assembly—Daniel still in

the king's employ, but probably in some obscure position (ch. viii. 1, 27)—appearance of the queen-mother on the scene—Daniel called—the advent of the seer, now more than eighty—had been sixty-eight years in Babylon. Picture the tremendous scene, with a background of night, through which seen obscurely the action of the besieging army.

I. To the sinner sooner or later comes A MOMENT OF AWAKING. It is somewhat hazardous to make a universal affirmative; but all we know of God and his dealings with men justifies us in asserting that, sooner or later, God effectually awakens every sinner to his own condition and the Divine claim. 1. *The means.* (1) *Words from God.* Give breadth to the contents of this phrase, whilst insisting on the fact that God oft appeals to sinners by giving a new setting and power to *Scripture* words. The truth is to be impressed that he speaks variously to men—by aspects of nature, providence, etc. (2) *Accompanied by some evidence of the Divine.* Along with the mystic characters the king saw "the fingers," but *only* the fingers. (3) *But not all that would be possible.* The hand, the arm, the whole form of the agent writing might have been discovered. The effect overwhelming. But, no! This ever like God in all his dealings. No evidence of the Divine so overpowering as to shut the mind up to one irresistible conclusion. Nothing like mathematical demonstration. If so, where were the moral elements? This is nevertheless what sinners ask, and what God will not, cannot (respecting man's moral nature) grant. (4) *Coming with impressive undemonstrativeness.* No vain show, or noise, or thunder, or lightning; no flaming sword! Only writing! "A still, small voice!" 2. *The immediate effect.* Note: (1) *What it was.* Terror. (2) *Why it was.* Nothing in the writing to alarm, so long as uninterpreted. The reason lay there in the king's own conscience. God set his own thoughts against the king. 3. *The final end.* Not necessarily judgment; the rather mercy. Nor do we know the warning wasted. Many who began the night in revelry may have been awed to penitence and prayer ere they slept the sleep that knows no waking.

II. At such a moment HE MAY FLY FOR SALVATION TO THE INCOMPETENT. To look at matters in the light of modern experience, we may observe that the king fled for help to the scientists real or pretended. The following propositions may well be insisted on in our time: 1. *Scientists fall into three classes.* (Scientists, here, they who know.) (1) Those acquainted with things *material*. (2) *Mental*—things of the *ψυχή*. *Moral, spiritual*—things of the *πνεῦμα*. This classification may not be philosophically perfect, but can be "understood of the people;" and is sufficient. 2. *A false science is useless.* Such was much of the magian learning. 3. *A true science avails only in its own sphere.* A competent leader in natural philosophy or in psychology may be of no use in dealing with a conscience awakened and alarmed. Disregard of this in our modern life. Scientists of the first class (see above) dogmatizing in both metaphysics and theology (Col. ii. 18). 4. *Man needs one who knows the moral nature, and its relation to God, and both lighted by special revelations.* Such was Daniel—the Christ in Daniel (John i. 9; 1 Pet. i. 11)—the Christ of all the ages, and they who have his Spirit.

III. BUT ONLY TO BE DRIVEN BACK ON GOD. In this case the king was constrained to seek unto God in the presence of his representative Daniel.—R.

Vers. 11, 12.—*The representative of God.* "There is a man in thy kingdom, in whom is the spirit of the holy gods" (ver. 11).

I. SOME OF HIS CHARACTERISTICS. 1. *Intelligence.* "Light, understanding, wisdom" (ver. 11). 2. *Excellence of spirit.* (Ver. 12.) 3. *Faculty.* (Ver. 12.) 4. *Experience.* Some achievement (ver. 12). 5. *The indwelling of the Divine Spirit.* (Ver. 11.)

II. A POSSIBLE POSITION. 1. *Comparative obscurity.* 2. *Even after years of distinguished service.*

III. THE CERTAIN CALL. When God wants a man, he is sure to call (by providence, by his Spirit); and when he calls, man must answer.—R.

Ver. 16.—*The dissolving of doubt.* "I have heard of thee, that thou canst make interpretations, and dissolve doubts," etc. A most important subject (not growing

exegetically out of the passage, nevertheless) is suggested by the text, which is admirably treated by Horace Bushnell, in 'Sermons on Living Subjects.' For the sake of any who may not have access to the book, we give a brief outline, for the most part in Bushnell's words.

I. THE PREVALENCE OF DOUBT. The prevalence of doubt is exhibited and illustrated at considerable length. "Science puts everything in question, and literature distils the questions, *making an atmosphere of them.*"

II. CAUSES OF DOUBT. "They never come of truth or high discovery, but always of the want of it." 1. *All the truths of religion are inherently dubitable.* They are the subjects of moral evidence, not of absolute demonstration. 2. *We begin life as unknowing creatures that have everything to learn.* 3. *Our faculty is itself disorder;* e.g. a bent telescope; a filthy window.

III. THE DISSOLUTION OF DOUBT. 1. *Counsel negative.* Not "by inquiry, search, investigation, or any kind of speculative endeavour. Men must never go after the truth to merely find it, but to practise it and live by it." 2. *Counsel positive.* Bushnell asserts and illustrates at length that man has universally the *absolute* idea of right and its correlative wrong; and then enforces, with power and manifoldness of illumination, this: "Say nothing of investigation till you have made sure of being grounded everlastingly, and with a completely whole intent, in the *principle of right-doing as a principle.*" (No condensation can give any idea of the grasp and fulness with which this is exhibited and applied.)

IV. THE RESULT. "A soul thus won to its integrity of thought and meaning will rapidly clear all tormenting questions and difficulties. They are not all gone, but *they are going.*" "The ship is launched; he is gone to sea, and *has the needle on board.*"

V. SUPPLEMENTARY DIRECTION. 1. *Be never afraid of doubt.* 2. *Be afraid of all sophistries and tricks and strifes of disingenuous argument.* 3. *Getting into any scornful way is fatal.* 4. *Never settle upon any thing as true, because it is safer to hold it than not.* 5. *Have it as a law never to put force on the mind or try to make it believe.* It spoils the mind's integrity. 6. *Never be in a hurry to believe; never try to conquer doubts against time.* "One of the greatest talents in religious discovery is the finding how to hang up questions and let them hang without being at all anxious about them. . . . What seemed perfectly insoluble will clear itself in a wondrous revelation." And here is a thought: "It will not hurt you, nor hurt the truth, if you should have some few questions left to be carried on with you when you go hence, for in that more luminous state, most likely they will soon be cleared, *only a thousand others will be springing up even there,* and you will go on dissolving still your new sets of questions, and growing mightier and more deep-seeing for eternal ages."—R.

Vers. 17—31.—*At the bar of God.* "The God in whose hand thy breath is, and whose are all thy ways, hast thou not glorified" (ver. 23). In this tremendous scene Daniel may be regarded as counsel for the crown—for the everlasting crown, for the throne of eternal righteousness, against the unhappy prisoner placed by these awful events at the bar. As such he is the representative of all earnest preachers of righteousness. He was marked by *zeal* for the right of the crown; *fidelity* to the position; *sympathy* for the arraigned (this may be argued from what we know and have seen of Daniel); *fearlessness*; and absolute *disinterestedness* (ver. 17, any honours given and received might have been recognized by any new king). All these should make every one that pleads with man or against man (ultimately to win the man to the right side) for God.

I. THE INDICTMENT. In order to make forcible modern applications, it will be better to formulate the indictment in the most general way. Belshazzar's particular sins may not be just ours; but he and we both commit sins that fall under like categories. 1. *Infidelity to accorded revelations.* (Ver. 22.) 2. *Substituting shadows for God.* (Ver. 23.) In the king's case there had been inflation of himself against God; sacrilege; indecency; drunkenness; prostration before idols, which are "nothing in the world." The inflations, profanities, improprieties, sensualisms, and idolatries of the nineteenth century differ in form, but are quite as real as those

of Belshazzar. 3. *Failure in man's prime duty*; viz. to glorify God. (1) *The duty*. To honour God. We put the highest honour on him when we repeat his likeness. To glorify God is to reflect God, as the lake does the heaven above with all its light. This the final end of our creation. (2) *Its ground*. Our complete dependence. That dependent life should be devoted life is a truth of natural religion (see ver. 23). (3) *The default* is so general and notorious as to require no proof (Rom. iii. 23).

II. THE AGGRAVATIONS OF GUILT. The king's guilt had been aggravated by what he had been permitted to see of the way of the Divine mercy and of the Divine judgment. 1. *The vision of the Divine goodness, in his grandfather's prosperity*. (Vers. 18, 19.) 2. *The vision of sin, in his grandfather's misuse of position*. (Ver. 20.) 3. *The vision of judgment, in his grandfather's punishment*. (Ver. 21.) 4. *The vision of mercy, in his grandfather's restoration*. (Ver. 21.) Note: (1) *For every sinner a vision of the great realities of the moral world*. (2) *Coming off in very affecting forms*, as here, through the experience of the near and dear.

III. THE ABSENCE OF DEFENCE. The sinner dumb at the eternal bar. No defence possible. Judgment goes by default. There is no counsel for defence; for *there is no defence*. Sentence must pass. The only thing that can be done, can be done *them*, viz. show ground for free pardon. This the atoning Saviour undertakes. But—

IV. THE JUDGMENT OF THE COURT. Of the supreme court—the court of heaven—the judgment of God against the sinner; in this case written with the very finger of God—the same finger which traced ages before “the Law of the ten words.” In the “Mene, Mena, Tekel, Upharsin,” read these *permanent* truths: 1. *The day of probation is limited*. “Numbered!” and numbered to the end! 2. *The character of the probationer is exactly estimated*. “Weighed!” Yes, and found light. “God does as perfectly know a man's true character as the goldsmith knows the weight of that which he has weighed in the nicest scales.” Note the moral import of phrases like this: “a man of weight and character;” “a light and frivolous man.” 3. *Deprivation of endowment is the punishment of infidelity to trust*. “Divided!” Given away (see parable of the talents).

V. EXECUTION. It was: 1. *Swift upon the climax of a life of sin*. “In that night.” 2. *Sure*. By an agent long prepared (Isa. xlv. 1—6). 3. *Sudden*. Utterly unexpected.

VI. A GLEAM OF HOPE. The king died sober: did he die *penitent*? The way in which he received the awful words of Daniel look very like it (ver. 29). A star of hope shines above the dark cloud in the horizon.—R.

Vers. 1—9.—*Blasted merriment*. All merriment is not forbidden. Banqueting is not in itself a sin. Jesus Christ himself honoured with his presence a marriage festival, and contributed, by miracle, the wine for the occasion. On the restoration of the prodigal son, a banquet was prepared, while music and dancing were the fitting exponents of the father's joy. God is not a foe to rational pleasure. He gives both the capacity and the occasion for joyful hilarity. But when excess of wine inflames the carnal passions, when it degenerates into sensuality, extravagance, and profanity, it is a sin.

I. ROYAL REVELRY. We are not told what was the occasion of this banquet. Possibly it was to celebrate the anniversary of the king's accession; or else an annual festival in honour of Chaldaea's gods. But: 1. *It was an unseasonable banquet*. The foe was already besieging the city. Belshazzar was presuming that Babylon could resist any siege, and that their supplies could last for an indefinite period. There is a time to be merry, but there's also a time for fasting and penitence. The man is a fool who cannot be serious at fitting times. Gravity is more seemly than gaiety when disaster occurs. He is a doomed man who will not listen when God speaks with voice of thunder. But he *shall* hear. 2. *The revelry proceeded to the extreme of self-abandonment*. Wisdom, dignity, good sense, decorum, reason, were all drowned in the depths of the wine-cup. The king led the way to extravagance, revelry, folly, debauchery. He who should have been a guide to virtue, and a pattern of propriety, uses his high influence to pervert and to pollute men. Belshazzar alone is mentioned as the leader of these bacchanalian orgies. All manliness and nobleness were sacrificed at that foul shrine of pleasure. 3. *Excess led to wanton profanity and sacrilege*.

We do not attempt to measure the sin of these Oriental lords by the standard of modern refinement or modern religious belief; but judged only by the standard of public conscience prevailing in that age, they stand censured and condemned. The ancient nations, however strong their attachment to their peculiar deities, allowed other peoples to worship *their* chosen gods, and held it to be the grossest sin to lay violent hands on temple furniture. Throughout the long reign of Nebuchadnezzar, the gold and silver vessels of Jehovah's temple had been scrupulously preserved; and the captive Hebrews had always cherished the hope that these precious vessels would again adorn the temple in Jerusalem. Though Belshazzar had now reigned probably eighteen years, he, too, had not ventured to secularize these sacred things. Nor do we think he would have done so now unless he had been madly inflamed with wine. Sensuality is twin-sister to impiety.

II. AN ALARMING OMEN. It came in the form of *writing*. God might have chosen other signs to betoken his displeasure. An earthquake might have shaken the palace to the ground, and buried these revellers in the dust. Fire from the seven-branched candlestick might have streamed forth, and consumed both king and guests. A voice of thunder might have announced, in unmistakable tones, Jehovah's anger. But this unveiling of his presence and his indignation implies the calm and undisturbed patience with which God proceeds. The kings of Babylon had been famous for writing grave decrees. God will show them that a mightier King than they is upon the scene, and that he too can write decrees in the sight of all. And there was an element of kindness mingled with this judgment. It did not proceed with summary and overwhelming suddenness. Though destruction was near at hand, there was yet time for repentance. But why should king and courtiers be so terrified? Why should they conclude that the portent was unfavourable? Perhaps it was an indication of approaching conquest: tidings that the siege should be raised? Why tremble? What cowardice is here? Why is conscience lashing them with thongs, and afflicting them with such strange alarms? They have just been praising their gods of silver and stone. Will not *these* protect them now, and recompense their homage with good things? Alas! a sense of sin has fastened itself on them. Self-accusation has sent its fangs into their inmost souls. In a moment they are like dead men. After all, justice slumbereth not. "Verily, there is a God in the earth!"

III. IMPOTENT PRIESTCRAFT. The astrologers and soothsayers are summoned to the scene. These were the royal counsellors in matters of religion, and professed to know the secrets of the gods. They had been maintained at the king's expense, and surely should render some proper service in return. But in the hour of urgent need these false supports fail. Ah! better not to lean upon a staff than to lean upon a *rotten* staff! Better not to trust to a cable in a storm than to have a cable with a faulty link! Every scheme which the king can devise to stimulate these men to attempt the solution is done; but in vain. He does not upbraid them with their empty pretentiousness. He tempts them with fascinating bribes. They shall be raised to affluence and to honour if only they will relieve the king from this scare of terror. Yet the "oracles are dumb." Stricken with feebleness and silence are all the votaries of idolatry. False religion may serve some temporary advantage as an instrument of worldly government; but when a storm of Divine anger beats upon a man, no refuge nor retreat can false faith furnish. When sharp disease invades the vital parts of the body, it is of unspeakable importance that the medicine should have genuine virtue. But no comparison can fitly set forth the momentous urgency of having sterling piety. To be deceived in matters of the soul is to imperil everything—is to lose body and soul everlastingly.—D.

Vers. 10—16.—*Good counsel in perplexity.* One had abstained from that scene of insane revelry, and she alone in the royal household was competent to take the helm amid the consternation and panic. Possibly the king had declined to invite her to the carousal; he did not, however, decline to receive her judicious counsel. This queen (or queen-mother) was by far the worthier sovereign, and now used the regal power with regal skill.

I. TRUE WISDOM TREASURES UP THE EXPERIENCE OF THE PAST. If we condemn the spendthrift, who has never learnt the value of money, and only wastes it upon

trifles, much more must we condemn the man who throws thoughtlessly away the lessons taught by history and experience. Whether we know it or not, we are responsible for the right use of the past. "A burnt child dreads the fire." A sensible navigator will avoid the hidden reefs on which former mariners have suffered shipwreck. If our father has found a wise and worthy friend, we shall be fools if we do not trust him too.

II. TRUE WISDOM IS SUPERIOR TO ALL PREJUDICE. Daniel had been elevated, for his virtues, to the chief place among the magicians; and if, after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel was consigned to obscurity, we can attribute it to nothing else than sheer prejudice. He was a foreigner—of the number of the Jewish captives—therefore whatever his goodness or skill, he must be degraded. So prejudice robbed the king of an able and worthy statesman. But the wisdom of the queen advocated that the services of this injured man should again be sought. The occasion was precisely such a one in which his skill was priceless. No matter what his origin, or nationality, or outward condition, if he have superior wisdom or prudence, he is the man for the public exigency. There is a littleness and a meanness about prejudice that genuine wisdom cannot endure.

III. TRUE WISDOM GAINS HER ENDS AT LAST. She has often to hide her head for a time, while Folly is jingling her bells and is making a blustering noise; but her occasion is sure to come. Her voice will prevail at last, and men will chide themselves bitterly that they had not followed her counsels at an earlier day. Wisdom is always patient, because she knows that, sooner or later, her presence will be sought and her guidance followed. Belshazzar had "sown the wind;" now he was "reaping the whirlwind;" and, dismayed with the menacing storm, he became a docile pupil of Wisdom. Without hesitation or delay, he sent for the counsellor whom he had long neglected, and confessed his need of the prophet's service. Even the king is dependent on his subjects for a thousand things. Supercilious pride is the sure forerunner of disaster.—D.

Vers. 17—29.—*The value of a good man.* The value to a community of a wise and good man is not to be measured by rubies. The safety, welfare, and happiness of society hang upon him.

I. THE GOOD MAN'S GENEROSITY OF MIND. Daniel does not refuse to come when sent for in haste by the king. He might have taken occasion, from the fright of the king, to remind him of past neglect. He might have accused the king of selfish incourtesy, in that he had dishonoured Daniel in the days of kingly prosperity, but was prompt to use him in the hour of dire adversity. But Daniel was too noble a man on such an occasion to think of himself. He speaks not of his good services to the king's grandsire, nor mentions the ill requital he had received. Nor will he permit the king to imagine that he is now moved to render fresh service by any prospect of reward. This very offer of royal reward had stung the mind of the prophet with pain. Pride and mercenary selfishness were ingrained in the nature of the king, or he would not, on an occasion like this, have spoken of rewards. His vile, base nature could not appreciate the generous nature of his Jewish subject. So Daniel declined the king's proposal with high disdain. They who are employed in the service of God are content with the rewards which their own Master gives. It would savour of treason if an ambassador from the British court should take the pay of a foreign empire.

II. THE GOOD MAN'S RECOGNITION OF GOD. An ambassador to a foreign court will be forward to present his credentials, and will take every public opportunity of maintaining the rights of his sovereign. So, in the very preface of his address, Daniel requires recognition of the supreme authority of God. He reminds Belshazzar of the majesty and glory and dominion which Nebuchadnezzar enjoyed before him—a degree of power far superior to that wielded by Belshazzar—but even Nebuchadnezzar had been compelled to admit that this extensive sovereignty was but a grant from God—a trust delegated by the Most High. Even Nebuchadnezzar was but a vassal prince, and was required to bring his tribute to the supreme Monarch of the skies. To reject the jurisdiction of God is contemptible folly and weakness.

III. THE GOOD MAN'S FAITHFUL REPROOF FOR THE PAST. The effect of God's judgments on Nebuchadnezzar ought to have been the exhibition of pious humility in

Belshazzar. God's chastisement of a father is intended to benefit a son, and God's intentions cannot be frustrated with impunity. To despise the lessons of the past is wanton sin and irreparable loss. If Belshazzar's pride had only been equal to that of his grandsire, the guilt would have been greater, because *he* had inherited all the warnings of the past. In proportion to men's advantages are their responsibilities. Daniel, though a subject and a captive, does not spare his monarch's sins. No prospect of preferment, no fear of disfavour, weakens the severity of his reproofs. He charges the monarch with his haughty pride, with his blatant atheism, his sacrilegious profanation of sacred things, his insane trust in graven images. He arraigns his monarch, as if he were a prisoner at the bar brought up to receive sentence for his crimes. He accuses him of ingratitude to the God who had daily sustained him; accuses him of a wanton misuse of power; accuses him of a flagrant abuse of the gift of life. *Now* the edifice of his guilt has been crowned! *Now* the last element of aggravation has been added! God's sacred vessels have been desecrated for human debauchery. The die is cast; the hour has struck. "Because judgment against an evil work is not executed speedily, therefore the hearts of the sons of men are fully set in them to do evil."

IV. THE GOOD MAN'S FORECAST OF THE DEBAUCHEE'S FUTURE. God is not so highly exalted that he cannot see what occurs upon the earth; nor is he so indifferent to human actions that he will pass by any sin with impunity. The hand that wrote the ten commandments on stony tablets—the hand that wrote Belshazzar's doom upon the palace-wall—records all *our* misdemeanours also. Never still is that Divine hand. The Chaldean monarch's days were all exactly numbered; the sands had nearly run out; there was but an hour or two for repentance. The Orientals had a belief in future rewards and punishments, and were accustomed to represent the supreme Judge as weighing, in the separate scales of a balance, men's good actions, and the bad. Here God accommodated himself to this prevalent belief, and represented himself as weighing in *his* balances the character of the king. Daniel plainly announced the result, "Thou art weighed, and"—oh! dread conclusion—"thou art found wanting." The final stroke was near and overwhelming. The thunder-cloud was, even then, gathering under the dark covert of night, and was about to discharge its fatal contents over the doomed city. Not another sun should rise upon Belshazzar's earthly life. His course was run; and in his ruin ten thousand others would be involved. We cannot sin alone; we entice others into the fatal way. We cannot suffer alone; we drag others into the whirlpool of destruction. "In that night was Belshazzar, King of the Chaldeans, slain."—D.

Vers. 30, 31.—*The Word of God verified.* It is not often that the word of Divine warning is so swiftly and so visibly accomplished as it was here. Frequently God allows time (according to human calculation) to intervene. Yet, in every case, the agency is set in motion, so soon as the purpose is formed, and that agency, whether it moves slowly or swiftly, moves *surely* to its end. But the idea of time is human. The structure of the human mind compels us to introduce the element of duration. But God is superior to this limitation. "With him a thousand years are as one day," and *vice versa*.

I. THE SWIFTESS OF THE RETRIBUTION. Although this one act of sacrilege and self-debauchery is the only event in Belshazzar's life which is recorded in the page of sacred history, we are warranted in the conclusion that his public life, and probably his earlier private life, were series of guilty and impious acts. No man reaches great excesses of sin at a single step. In all likelihood God had condescended to warn and counsel Belshazzar again and yet again, and this last daring act of defiance was the climax of his degenerate course. This was Belshazzar's reply to God's patient expostulations, and sudden destruction was the most fitting penalty. We are surprised, not at the rapid execution of God's warnings, but at his unparalleled forbearance.

II. THE SUDDENNESS OF THE CALAMITY. We are not informed by Daniel the minute steps of the royal overthrow; but possibly Belshazzar had retired to rest, little supposing that retribution was at his very door. It may be that his senses had been overcome by wine and fear; that deep stupor succeeded, as the natural reaction of his sensual excess; and that the noise of the city's capture did not reach his ear.

Very likely he heard no rumour of alarm until some bold and reckless besiegers gained the palace, and slew the king in his bed. In this case he scarcely woke to die. It is not an uncommon thing for punishment to come on the ungodly at last, suddenly, as "a thief in the night." At the moment when Daniel declared the heavenly Monarch's will, amendment was too late. The king was not in possession of his faculties. He had drowned them in the wine-cup; and, before the fumes of his intoxication had worn off, he was a corpse. Our sin oftentimes disables us for true repentance. "No place for it is found, though we seek it carefully, and with tears."

III. THE COMPLETENESS OF HIS DOOM. It was not a partial disaster, such as the infliction of disease or the loss of his crown; not such a disaster as might yet be repaired by reformation or obedience. It was complete, final, irreparable. In a moment every possession he held ceased. His sovereign power, his worldly possessions, his health, his life, his hope,—all were destroyed at a single blow. The stroke was overwhelming. Nothing was left behind but an obnoxious reputation—a beacon to future voyagers. No human mind can estimate the extent of that calamity. What blacker hell can there be than for a man to awake to consciousness in the next life with a sense that he has lost *all*? He had a splendid opportunity, but he wasted it! He might have gained heaven, but he has irretrievably failed. Existence has become intolerable misery. Now he is compelled to hear this knell of doom, "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still."—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER VI.

VERS. 1—28.—DANIEL IN THE LIONS' DEN.

Vers. 1—3.—It pleased Darius to set over the kingdom an hundred and twenty princes, which should be over the whole kingdom; and over these three presidents; of whom Daniel was first: that the princes might give accounts unto them, and the king should have no damage. Then this Daniel was preferred above the presidents and princes, because an excellent spirit was in him; and the king thought to set him over the whole realm. The variations from the Massoretic text in the Septuagint are, in regard to the verses before us, very considerable. It assumes the last verse of the preceding chapter, and begins, "And he set up a hundred and twenty and seven satraps over all his kingdom. And over them he set three men as presidents (*ἡγουμένους*), and Daniel was one of the three men [and had authority over all men in the kingdom. And Daniel was clothed in purple, and was great and honourable (*ἐνδοξος*) before Darius the king, because he was honourable (*ἐνδοξος*) and understanding and prudent, and there was an holy spirit in him, and he prospered in the affairs of the kingdom which he did]. Then the king thought (*ἐβουλεύσατο*) to place Daniel over all his kingdom [(and the two men who stood with him and the hundred and twenty-seven satraps) when the king thought to place Daniel over his whole kingdom]." The passages within brackets, we think, are additions to amplify the description, and to connect it with the honour given Daniel by Belshazzar. The

bracketed parts are easily separable from the rest, and then what remains forms a continuous narrative. Theodotion differs, though slightly, from the Massoretic text, Darius "set (*κατεστήσεν*) Daniel over the kingdom"—did not merely take counsel to do it. The Peshitta agrees also very closely with the Massoretic, only the word for "princes" is not, as in the Massoretic text, *ahashdarnayya*, but *rabu keel*. This is the common rendering in the Peshitta of this word, and points to the Massoretic term being an adaptation. The use of the word "satrap" here has led to the idea that this is derived from the hundred and twenty-seven provinces (Esth. i. 1). This identification is supported certainly by the LXX., which gives a hundred and twenty-seven as the number of the satraps set up by Darius. Josephus, it may be noted ('Ant.' x. 11. 4), mentions the satrapies as three hundred and sixty—a reading that seems scarcely to be drawn by any conceivable mistake from the Massoretic text, nor any tradition of the actual number of satrapies under the Persian rule. The probability is that there has been some early corruption of the number. On the supposition that Darius is Gobryas, these satraps would really be governors of cities and small districts in the populous province of Babylon. We have in the inscriptions of the Assyrian monarchs who intervened in the affairs of Babylon and Chaldea, notices of a large number of small kingships; each of these would require a special governor. In harmony with this, we are informed by Mr. Pinches that Gobryas appointed subordinate governors in the territory of

Babylon. The phrase which states this occurs in the *Annals of Nabunahid* (col. iii. line 20), "And Gobryas his governor appointed governors in Babylon." Delitzsch (*Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, ii. p. 256) points out that the sign of the plural after the second occurrence of the word "governor" proves that we cannot translate as if "Cyrus" were the nominative to the sentence, and "Gobryas," who was governor of *Gutium* or *Guti*, was object. From the fact that the text of Daniel was not protected by being regularly read in the synagogues, as was the Law, the Prophets, the Megilloth, the Psalms, and some other books, it was more at the mercy of scribes. The change of "Gobryas" into "Darius" led easily to other modifications. Probably *mrdeena*, "province," was the word in the original text, but it was modified to *malcoutha*, "kingdom," and "governors" of cities became "satraps" over provinces. After having appointed these subordinate governors, that a board of three should be set over them was a necessary arrangement. The name given to them, *sar'keen*, is asserted by some to be of Persian origin. On the other hand, the fact that the first syllable is *sar*, the Assyrian for "king," one is tempted to think of a Semitic etymology. The Authorized is wrong in making Daniel "first" of these presidents; all that is asserted is that Daniel was one of these presidents. That the king should have no damage applies most probably to the revenue. The country, in the East, is divided off into small districts for the purpose of tax-collecting, and in the division of the Persian Empire into twenty satrapies, this was greatly the object. The repetition of the word "king" here might imply that Darius was not the king whose loss of revenue was to be guarded against; but we would not be held as pressing this. Although Daniel was not, on the creation of this board, made chief of it, he soon acquired an influence over Darius which gave him, in effect, such a position. We are to understand that these officials were mainly Babylonians. We learn now that the capture of Babylonia by Cyrus was not accomplished by a skilful diverting of the waters of the Euphrates, so that the Persian troops were enabled to wade in by the bed of the stream, nor to the fact that in the revelry of a feast the river-gates were left open, and the sentinels were careless; but to the fact that the whole official class were at enmity with the court, and so treachery opened the gates to Gobryas, the governor of Gutium, the name given to Mesopotamia as a Persian province, and when morning broke one day, the sixteenth of Tammuz, the inhabitants of Babylon saw

the shields of Gutium guarding the citadel and the temple Esakkil. This being the case, naturally the official class of the former monarchy would be largely drawn upon to supply the needs of the new government; naturally the native Babylonians would think that the preference in all matters of office ought to be given to them; that, above all, the principal place should not be given to a Jew by Cyrus, or by any one under him, since Cyrus professed to be moved by reverence for the national gods of Babylon in his war against Nabunahid. And the king thought to set him over the whole realm. This really means over the province of Babylon, *malcoutha* being written instead of *mrdeena*. His object was not to make Daniel satrap instead of himself, but to make him his "vizier." His knowledge of the business of the province would of necessity be very thorough, dating, as it did, from the days of Nebuchadnezzar. He, as no other, would be acquainted with the various religious beliefs of the different captive communities in Babylonia. Himself belonging to one of these communities, his interest would be excited by all in similar circumstances. His age, the dignity he had enjoyed in the courts of Nebuchadnezzar and Nabunahid, along with his zeal and ability, naturally explain the desire of Darius (Gobryas) to make him his vizier.

Vers. 4, 5.—Then the presidents and princes sought to find occasion against Daniel concerning the kingdom; but they could find none occasion nor fault; forasmuch as he was faithful, neither was there any error or fault found in him. Then said these men, We shall not find any occasion against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the law of his God. The rendering of the Septuagint is here very paraphrastic, "Then the two young men (*νεανίσκοι*) took counsel, and planned among themselves with each other, saying, Since they found no error nor neglect (*ἀγνοίαν*) against Daniel, about which they might accuse him to the king, and they said, Come, let us make a decree (*δρισμόν*) among ourselves, that no man shall make any request, or offer any prayer, to any god for thirty days, but only from Darius the king, and if not he shall die; in order that they might lower (*ἡττώσῃ*) Daniel before the king, and that he be thrown into the den of lions; for they knew that Daniel prayed and made supplication to the Lord his God three times a day." There are elements here of interpolation and of the coalescence of different renderings. It is difficult to understand how "the presidents" could be called *νεανίσκοι*. There seems no Aramaic word with that meaning, into which *sar'keen* could be read; certainly

it is as difficult to imagine any one thinking of introducing that as a logical equivalent. Young men would not be put in such a responsible place, nor would they have thought of Daniel—a man of about eighty years—as a colleague with youths. There are evident traces of two readings having coalesced; thus we have ἀλλήλους λέγοντες followed by εἰπών, after the course of the narrative has been interrupted by an inserted clause. As to the punishment to befall the transgressor of this decree, one statement is, "If not, he shall die." The next version of the punishment is brought into connection with the humiliation to be inflicted on Daniel, that "he may be cast into the den of lions." At the same time, the fact that we hear of the decree in connection with the consultation of these conspirators in the present text, is in harmony with what we find in the fourth chapter. In the original document not improbably the statement would be given—as in Gen. xli. in regard to Pharaoh's dreams—alike when the conspirators devise the plan, and when they carry it out. In regard to some of the differences, an explanation may be hazarded, but we will not delay. Notwithstanding that the Massoretic here is shorter than the Greek text, we fancy it is not difficult through it to find a shorter text still. The text of Theodotion is much briefer than either of the other texts, "And the presidents (κατασκευαί) and the satraps sought to find occasion against Daniel, and they found neither occasion, nor fault, nor error against him, because he was faithful. And the presidents said, We shall not find occasion against Daniel except in regard to precepts (νομίμους) of his God." The Peshitta agrees in the main with the Massoretic. It makes Daniel faithful "towards God." That these co-presidents and the under-governors should be indignant that a Jew, who had actually been employed in the court of Nabunahid, should be put above those Babylonians who had admitted the shields of Guti into Esakkil, was natural. Of course, they could not seriously plead this before the governor Gobryas. They could not accuse Daniel directly of worshipping his national Deity, for the Persian rule in Babylon, while zealous for the gods of Babylon, did not imply any assault on the deities of other subject races. It is to be noted that in the Septuagint the plot is concocted by the two "youths," Daniel's co-presidents. They, most likely men of high rank, would feel most keenly that they were superseded by a Jew, and their feelings would naturally spread to those beneath them.

Vers. 6—9.—Then these presidents and princes assembled together to the king, and

said thus unto him, King Darius, live for ever. All the presidents of the kingdom, the governors, and the princes, the counsellors, and the captains, have consulted together to establish a royal statute, and to make a firm decree, that whosoever shall ask a petition of any God or man for thirty days, save of thee, O king, he shall be cast into the den of lions. Now, O king, establish the decree, and sign the writing, that it be not changed, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. Wherefore King Darius signed the writing and the decree. The Septuagint, in regard to these verses, is much briefer, and reveals a better text. "Then those men came and said before the king, We have made a decree and a statute, that any man who offereth prayer or presents petition to any god for the space of thirty days, save only to Darius the king, shall be cast into the den of lions; and thus Darius decreed, and confirmed it." The fact that requests to other men are not forbidden is to be observed. The long catalogue of officials is omitted; the whole conspiracy is the work of Daniel's co-presidents. Theodotion and the Peshitta are in practical agreement with the Massoretic text. To understand the point of this decree, that seems to us so absurd, and comprehend how any one with sufficient mental vigour left to be placed by Cyrus as governor in Babylon could be led to yield to confirm it, we must recognize the state of matters in Babylon. During the reign of Nabunahid there had been many religious changes. The seclusion of the monarch had led to the neglect of many of the regular rites of the gods of Babil. The policy he pursued of bringing the gods of various provinces to Babylon tended, as did the similar policy in Rome, to draw off from the importance of the national religion by forming rival cults. One of the first acts of Cyrus's reign was to order the replacing of these deities in their ancient shrines. This would necessarily be most distasteful to the worshippers of these imported deities. There would be much murmuring among the huge heterogeneous population; and there would be thus a well-grounded fear of a religious riot. A bold soldier as Gobryas (Darius) was, he probably was but a timid ruler, and nothing would he dread more than a religious riot. Would it not be a plausible way of meeting this difficulty to order for one month all worship to cease? The British Government in India regulates the religion of the inhabitants as summarily, forbidding religious observances that are liable to cause excitement in votaries of rival creeds. Thus Moses assigned, as a reason for refusing to sacrifice in Egypt, the wrath of the

Egyptians (Exod. viii. 26). The offering of a prayer among heathen peoples generally meant the offering of sacrifices, also accompanied possibly by processions. That the decree was made by Darius in the absence of his favourite minister might have two reasons: either from the fact that the word used (*hargishoo*) implies that the presidents rushed in tumultuously into the royal presence; that there was an emergency which must be met by instant action; or that, being a weak man, he did not wish his other counsellors to think that he was so under the influence of this Jew that he could do nothing without first consulting him; so, by way of showing his independence, he signed the decree. As for the practical deification of himself required from the subject races, that would not appear to him a matter of importance. It might even seem to him as the surest way of doing away with the rancour of religious rivalries to give these conflicting creeds a common object. He, Gobryas, was the representative of Cyrus, in whom deity was incarnate, therefore let them worship him in his representative capacity. That Daniel should be affected by this decree might easily never occur to Gobryas. Jewish worship, now that the temple at Jerusalem was in ruins, must have become very much the synagogue worship of the present day. A worship that had neither idols nor sacrifices, neither temple nor altar, would seem to the Babylonians, and for that matter to the Medians and Persians also, as much the same as atheism. Christianity seemed so to the Roman Government. Darius, then, would readily think that Daniel could make no serious objection to this order. That Daniel always spoke of a God in heaven did not matter much, since, to all appearance, he never worshipped him. Some have maintained that the punishment was an impossible one. It is certain that Ashur-bani-pal inflicted a similar punishment on Saulmugina, a rebel King of Babylon, and did it in honour of the gods.¹ The main objection has been urged from the mistaken assumption that the text implies that the lions' den was a bottle-shaped dungeon. There is nothing in the narrative that necessitates this. In regard to the decree, there is reference to the "laws of the Medes and Persians," "the Medes" being placed first. It has been attributed to court flattery, as Darius was a Mede; probably, however, there may be another explanation. The small canton of Ansan,

over which Cyrus was king, lay between Elam and Media, but belonged more to the former than to the latter of these countries. Both countries had been overrun by a nomadic race, the Mandæ, under Astyages, who had overthrown Cyaxares the King of Media. Against Astyages Cyrus rebelled, and gathered to him the Medes, Elamites, and other cognate races. Dr. Winckler thinks that, on his victory over Astyages, Cyrus assumed the name Persian, *Parsu*, from his race. The name *Persia* appears in connection with the Medes in an inscription of Shalmaneser, where it seems to indicate a small kingdom occupying much the same geographical position as Ansan. By taking this old name, not impossible Cyrus avoided making the Medes feel themselves subject to the Elamites, or the Elamites to the Medes, or either to the little kingdom of Ansan. The Median had comparatively recently been an imperial power, therefore its laws and constitution would be placed before the more recently prominent Persian. One thing that must be observed is that, while the writer of Daniel mentions Medes separate from Persians, he mentions them conjointly. Had the writer been under the delusion attributed to him by all critical interpreters, that the Median Empire came between the Babylonian and the Persian, he would not have represented the Median courtiers as saying anything about the Persians or their laws; the Medes, and the Medes alone, would be considered. According to the Greek account, from which it is alleged Daniel drew his information, Persia was a small, undeveloped country before Cyrus raised it to empire. What right, then, would it have to have its laws mentioned in the same breath with those of imperial Media? If, however, Cyrus had been raised to such power, so as to be able to encounter successfully Astyages and his Scythian hordes by the adhesion to his cause of the Medes, the laws of the Medes might well get a preference, as the Medes were, in all probability, more numerous than the Persians, though the laws of the Persians would be mentioned. The claim that these laws were immutable must be regarded as on a par with several other Eastern exaggerations. *Signed the writing and the decree.* The reading of the Septuagint seems superior, "And so King Darius decreed (*ἐταρξε*), and confirmed it." At the same time, the verb *r'sham*, translated "sign," really means "engrave," and therefore might naturally enough be used for affixing a seal to a clay tablet; only *h'sham* is the word usually used for "sealing" a document. Behrmann thinks it does not refer to the signature of the sovereign, but

¹ Smith, 'Asshurbanipal,' p. 160. The treatment meted out to Vaitah, son of Hazail, by the same monarch, is somewhat akin (*ibid.*, p. 261).

to the engraving the decree on the clay. If we imagine *y'geen* to have fallen out before *sara*, we have a reading not unlike the LXX. In the seventh verse there is a list of officials omitted from the Septuagint; it is almost identical in members with that which we find in ch. iii., but in a slightly different order, only the *sar'geen* are added and the *edargaz'reen* omitted.

Ver. 10.—Now when Daniel knew that the writing was signed, he went into his house; and his windows being open in his chamber toward Jerusalem, he kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed, and gave thanks before his God, as he did aforetime. The Septuagint rendering differs only slightly from the Massoretic, "And when Daniel knew the decree which was passed (*ἐσθησε*) against him, he opened the windows of his upper chamber, and fell on his face three times a day, according as he did aforetime, and prayed." The Septuagint translator read *לפ*, "against him," instead of *לפ*, "went." It seems to us that the Massoretic reading, "went to his house," is an addition due to misreading *לפ*. That the variations of the Septuagint are not due to paraphrase is proved by the fact that the next clause is literally translated. It would seem that the text before the LXX. had been altered, so that we have "fell upon his face," instead of "kneel upon his knees." The former phrase is an echo from ch. ii. 46. It is to be observed that "prayed and gave thanks" is omitted from the Septuagint. As the omission can have no purpose, and we can understand the reason of the words being added, we prefer the LXX. reading here. Theodotion and the Peshitta are at one with the Massoretic. The action of Daniel is here that of a man of true conscientiousness; he does not obtrude his religion now that the practice of it implies danger, as did some Christian fanatics in the persecution of the three first centuries; nor, on the other hand, does he hide his acts of worship—he simply continued his previous habits. Had a Jewish fanatic of the time of the Maccabees written this, the action attributed to Daniel would have been much more uncompromising, as the story in the Midrash Rabba of Moses in regard to the crown of Pharaoh. Or Daniel would be represented as doing, as the Jews are said in Third Maccabees to have done to Ptolemy, bowing himself down in humble abasement before the king, to get him to reverse his decree, or, if not, to devise some means of its effect being averted. Daniel does none of these things. *His windows being open toward Jerusalem.* The windows were lattices, and as the room was an upper one on the roof of the house, the opening of the windows enabled everything done in

the apartment to be seen. The practice of prayer "toward Jerusalem" is acknowledged to have arisen in Babylon during the Captivity. Solomon, in his prayer at the dedication of the temple, refers to the contingency of captivity (1 Kings viii. 48), and prays that if the captives "pray unto thee toward their land, the city which thou hast chosen, and the house which I have built for thy Name, then hear thou their prayer" (see also Ps. v. 8 [7]). The practice of praying towards a particular point has been maintained by the Mohammedans, who pray towards Mecca. Mohammed originally made Jerusalem the *qiblah*, or point of prayer; but the Jews would not receive him as their Messiah, and so from Jerusalem it was changed to Mecca. The objection of Bertholdt hardly needs to be mentioned, that "the temple was in ruins"—the place was holy ground. "Three times a day" is referred to Ps. lv. 18 (17), "Evening and morning and at noonday will I complain."

Ver. 11.—Then these men assembled, and found Daniel praying and making supplication before his God. The Septuagint reading is very different, "And they watched Daniel, and found him praying three times a day every day." It is difficult to decide which is the preferable reading, and almost as difficult to deduce the one reading from the other. Theodotion has a reading akin to that of the Septuagint, "Then those men watched, and found Daniel praying, and making entreaty to his God." This is akin to the Septuagint at the beginning, but is close to the Massoretic at the end. The Peshitta is in close agreement with Theodotion. It seems more in accordance with the plan of these presidents that they should not, as the Massoretic text asserts, rush tumultuously into the house of Daniel, but rather, as the three versions represent them doing, setting a watch, and then, when information reached them of Daniel's habits, acting accordingly. Nothing in the narrative makes it probable that there was a general assembling of the governors against Daniel; it was the action of his colleagues in the presidency.

Vers. 12-14.—Then they came near, and spake before the king concerning the king's decree; Hast thou not signed a decree, that every man that shall ask a petition of any God or man within thirty days, save of thee, O king, shall be cast into the den of lions? The king answered and said, The thing is true, according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not. Then answered they and said before the king, That Daniel, which is of the children of the captivity of Judah, regardeth not thee, O king, nor the decree that thou hast signed, but maketh his petition three times

a day. Then the king, when he heard these words, was sore displeased with himself, and set his heart on Daniel to deliver him: and he laboured till the going down of the sun to deliver him. The version of the Septuagint, as usual, differs from the Massoretic text; "Then these men interceded (*ἐπέτυχον*) with the king, and said, King Darius, didst thou not confirm a decree that no man should offer prayer or present petition to any god for thirty days, save only to thee, O king, otherwise he should be cast into the den of lions? And the king answered and said, The word is clear, and the decree remaineth. And they said to him, We adjure thee by the laws of the Medes and the Persians that thou change not the commandment, nor be an acceptor of persons (*μὴ δὲ θανάσιμης προσώπων*), nor diminish aught of the thing spoken, but punish the man that abideth not by this decree. And he said, This will I do, according as ye have said, and the thing is confirmed (*ἔστηκε*) by me. And they said, Behold, we found Daniel, thy friend, praying, and making entreaty before his God three times a day. [And the king, being grieved, spake to cast Daniel into the den of lions, according to the decree which he decreed against him.] Then the king grieved exceedingly concerning Daniel, and laboured (*ἐβόηθη*) till the going down of the sun to deliver him out of the hands of the satraps." One of the verses here seems to have been an addition most probably to the Aramaic text, as the Semitic spirit and construction shine through. There is, further, an obvious instance of doublet; the clause within square brackets has all the appearance of being a marginal note summarizing the contents of the verse. The words, "out of the hands of the satraps," have been added as explanatory. Theodotion is in practical agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta differs in some minor points, e.g. inserting the common Eastern mode of addressing royalty, "O king, live for ever." The clause, "concerning the decree," is omitted; the other differences are unimportant. The fact that his Jewish origin is put in the front of their accusation of him indicates what Daniel's great offence was. The Septuagint places the fact that he was the king's friend in that position. It seems little likely that even to a satrap would any courtier venture to bring forward a taunting reference to his friendships. The king is caught in a trap; but no courtier would venture to press his advantage, lest he himself be taken at unawares. Darius's efforts to save Daniel are to be noted. His effort would most probably be directed to find some way out of the constitutional dilemma into which

he had been entrapped. His subordinate position, occupying the place of King of Babylon merely for a season, instead of Cyrus, would make it more difficult for him to override any constitutional maxim. In the Septuagint the presidents seem to compel the king by moral arguments—a thing that seems possible, though also a feature that might very naturally be added to the story. In the Massoretic text there is an endeavour to poison the king against Daniel. Daniel has despised the king and his commandment. This is more natural than the conduct imputed to the presidents in the Septuagint. These efforts were not successful, as probably they scarcely expected they would be; the king is convinced of his own hastiness, and of their treachery also, but not of any failure on the part of Daniel, in due respect to him, as the representative of the great king.

Ver. 15.—Then these men assembled unto the king, and said unto the king, Know, O king, that the law of the Medes and Persians is, That no decree or statute which the king establisheth may be changed. The corresponding verse in the Septuagint is much shorter, "And he was not able to deliver him from them." This verse in the Massoretic text has very much the appearance of a doublet modified to fit a new position. The first clause has occurred already twice before in the sixth verse and the fifteenth. The last portion of the verse is a modification of what is stated in vers. 9 and 13. The first clause is omitted by Theodotion, but inserted by the Peshitta. The probability is that this verse, in its Massoretic form, has been inserted to explain the opposition the king strove in vain to overcome.

Ver. 16.—Then the king commanded, and they brought Daniel, and cast him into the den of lions. Now the king spake and said unto Daniel, Thy God whom thou servest continually, he will deliver thee. The Septuagint Version here is not so likely to represent the original text, as there are symptoms of displacement, "Then Darius the king called out and said to Daniel, Thy God whom thou servest continually three times a day, he will deliver thee out of the power of the lions; till the morning be of good cheer." The opening clause of the next verse in the Septuagint really represents the first clause of the verse before us, "And the king was grieved, and spake to cast Daniel into the den of lions." Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The circumstances cannot fail to remind the reader of Herod with John the Baptist, and the still greater crime wrought by weakness—Pilate and our Lord. Darius had failed to overbear the

opposition of the legalists who had determined on Daniel's death; he is obliged, therefore, to give the order that the sentence be executed. In doing so he commends his friend to the God, or the gods, if we take the K'thiv instead of the Q'ri. Darius probably knew nothing of Daniel's religious beliefs, and therefore would be prone to imagine that he worshipped several gods, and to them he commends him. The addition of the Septuagint is picturesque, "Be of good cheer until the morning." Moreover, it fits in to what follows, and at the same time it is not of such a nature as that it should suggest itself to the ordinary interpolator.

Ver. 17.—And a stone was brought, and laid upon the mouth of the den; and the king sealed it with his own signet, and with the signet of his lords; that the purpose might not be changed concerning Daniel. The Septuagint text begins, according to Tischendorf, with a passage elsewhere considered, "And the king was grieved, and commanded to cast Daniel into the den of lions, according to the decree which he had made concerning him." This is repeated from the fourteenth verse, where it appears alike in the Chisian Manuscript and in the version of Paul of Tella, "Then Daniel was cast into the den of lions, and a stone was brought and placed at the mouth of the den, and the king sealed it with his own signet and with the signets of his lords, in order that Daniel might not be raised by them or delivered by the king out of the den." The reason assigned for the double sealing of the stone, while a very probable one, is from its very probability to be suspected; it is most likely an explanatory marginal remark, that has slipped into the text. It will be observed that the clause with which the Septuagint Version of this verse begins is the equivalent of the opening clause of the preceding verse. Theodotion's rendering does not differ from the Massoretic reading. From the similarity of the dialects, the resemblance of the Peshitta to the Massoretic is even closer. There are few criticisms of Daniel more unfair than that founded on the assumption that the writer had a bottle-shaped dungeon in his mind, that might be covered over as a well by one large stone. Nothing in the words used implies this. While *gob* certainly means a "pit" or a "cistern," it was by no means necessarily of small size or covered over with one stone, so that within it would be darkness. There were probably walls rising from the sides of the pit which formed the den; in that wall there would be naturally an aperture through which food could be passed to the lions. Through

this door was Daniel cast, and when he had been so cast in, a stone was rolled up to the aperture and sealed. There is no necessity for arguing, as Hitzig and von Lengorke do, against this incident. The passage the former refers to in Xenophon's 'Anabasis' (v. 5. 25) applies to dwellings of human beings, and even if we could transfer its description to the present case, it would not damage our argument. In these dwellings Xenophon tells us "were goats, sheep, oxen, birds, and their young; all the cattle are fed within with green fodder." These critics forget that lions' dens were in use not only among the Assyrians and Babylonians, but also among the Greek monarchs, and so, even if the writer was of the late date attributed to him by critics, still he would not speak nonsense about what he could not fail to know something. Hitzig sees in Daniel being let down into the den of lions an imitation of what befell Joseph at the hands of his brethren. Certainly the same word is used in the Targum of Onkelos, Gen. xxxvii. 22, but identity of name does not prove identity of thing. No one could argue that the pit of a theatre was necessarily dark, dirty, and damp, because a coal-pit is. That Reuben persuaded his brethren to put Joseph in the pit in order to save him alive, and the rulers had Daniel put in the lions' den in order to destroy him, is nothing to the purpose, it would seem; that there were lions in the pit or den in which Daniel was placed, and no venomous beast in that into which Joseph was let down, is also of no moment. The further fact that this letting down into the pit occurs in the beginning of Joseph's career, and in Daniel's case it is near the end of a long and prosperous life, is not noticed. The life of Daniel must be proved to be written in imitation of the life of Joseph, so any means are good enough to secure this predetermined conclusion. While this resemblance is only superficial, there is another resemblance that is, at all events, full of interest. In later history there was another sealing of the stone that was rolled to the mouth of a grave—it may be noted that *gob* is used for a "grave" also—and fear here also was lest the innocently condemned might be taken away.

Ver. 18.—Then the king went to his palace, and passed the night fasting: neither were instruments of music brought before him: and his sleep went from him. In the Massoretic text one of the clauses, "Neither were instruments of music brought before him," has caused great difficulty. The word *dahvan*, translated "instruments of music," is rendered by Fürst, "dancing-girl;" Gesenius, "concubine;" Rosenmüller

renders, "odours." The Mediæval Greek Version translates, "instruments of music." Fürst speaks with favour of the Syriac rendering, "food-tables." *Han'ayl*, the aphol of 'ilal, has to be noted as a sign of antiquity. The version of the Septuagint is very wide from the Massoretic in the latter part of the verse, "Thus the king returned to his palace, and went to bed fasting, being grieved about Daniel."¹ It is evident that the Septuagint translator had before him *d'heel* instead of *dahvan*—*nun* in the script of Egyptian Aramaic is very like *lamed* in the later mode writing, as also *yodh* and *vav*. It is possible that the name "Daniel" was read *han'eel* or, *vice versa*, as two of the letters are identical. If we can accept the Septuagint reading, the difficulty of this mysterious *dahvan* disappears. Another clause is added here in the Septuagint from ver. 22 (23) Massoretic, though with variations. "Then the God of Daniel, taking thought for him (*πρόνοιαν ποιούμενος αὐτοῦ*) closed the mouths of the lions, that they did not hurt Daniel." This statement is not inserted in Daniel's answer to the king in the Septuagint, as it is in the Massoretic text. It would almost seem that our present text in both cases is a condensation of a more extended document. This view receives support from the rendering of Theodotion, "And the king departed to his house, and went to bed supperless, and viands were not brought to him, and his sleep went from him, and God closed the mouths of the lions, and they did not hurt Daniel." It will be seen that the last clause here agrees with the concluding clause of the Septuagint. The mysterious word *dahvan* is rendered here "food" (*ἰδέσθωρα*)—a version that is suspicious from the fact that it merely repeats, under another form, the statement that the king went to bed fasting. It is supported by the Peshitta and the Vulgate. This difference can scarcely be due to a various reading. Otherwise the Peshitta and the Vulgate agree with the Massoretic text. The king's sorrow and humiliation could not be better pictured than it is here: even the feast of the palace had no pleasure for him, he was so grieved about Daniel. But we must also bear in mind that fasting had among the Jews, and, indeed, in the East generally, a relationship to prayer (see Esth. iv. 16, where fasting takes the place of prayer; see also Dan. x. 3). It means also repentance (Jonah iii. 6—8). Darius,

then, repented his hasty decree, and prayed for the deliverance of Daniel.

Vers. 19, 20.—Then the king arose very early in the morning, and went in haste unto the den of lions. And when he came to the den, he cried with a lamentable voice unto Daniel: and the king spake and said to Daniel, O Daniel, servant of the living God, is thy God, whom thou servest continually, able to deliver thee from the lions? "Very early" is really "the glimmer of day" (*shapharpara*). The word used occurs in the Targums. It may, however, be doubted whether the word here is not the Syriac *shaphra*. The writing here presents so many peculiarities that suspicion is forced upon the reader. The first *sh* is small, and the second is large. There is the further difficulty that *nogah* is nearly equivalent to *shaphra*. One might suspect a doublet, as Behrmann maintains, here, did not the versions indicate something like this as the meaning of this clause. A *lamentable voice* (*atzeeb*) seems to mean "sad" or "grieved." The version of the Septuagint shows traces of addition, "And King Darius rose early in the morning, and took with him the satraps, and went and stood at the mouth of the den of lions. Then the king called to Daniel with a loud voice, with weeping, saying, O Daniel, if thou art alive, and thy God whom thou servest continually, hath he saved thee from the lions? and have they not harmed thee?" It is possible the addition of "the satraps" may have been due to *shapharpara* being read *ahashdarpnayya*. Certainly if the purpose of the double sealing was what it is assigned to be in the first verse, then the satraps would accompany him; only the suggestion is such a natural one that it might readily slip into the text. Ver. 20 (21) in the LXX. has traces of expansion. The omission of *y'heel* and the change of *sheezab* to the finite preterite is possible enough, and may indicate that in the original text the word rendered "able" was not found. Theodotion renders ver. 19 (20) in accordance with the Massoretic reading, but, in ver. 20 (21) instead of "lamentable voice," has "strong voice," a reading that seems somewhat confirmed by the LXX. Further, he translates the interrogative *ka* as if it were the Hebrew *kee*, "if."¹ The Peshitta, though agreeing in the nineteenth verse with the Massoretic, has some minor differences in the following verse—"high voice" instead of "lamentable voice," and "faithfully" instead of "continually." The Vulgate singularly inserts in ver. 20 *putasne*? "dost thou think?" That Darius should thus

¹ Josephus, 'Ant.,' x. 11, seems to have read with the LXX. here, Darius "spent the whole night fasting and sleepless, as he was anxious (*ἀγωνιῶν*) about Daniel."

¹ Josephus, 'Ant.,' x. 11, supports Theodotion by rendering *ἀνέβησε*.

hasten in the semi-darkness of the first glimmer of dawn to the lions' den to see whether Daniel were yet alive, was but natural. As the sealing of the lions' den suggested the sealing of the holy sepulchre, so the hastening of Darius to the den in the earliest dawn suggests the action of the women who got up "a great while before day." When Darius calls Daniel the "servant of the living God," there is no necessary confession of faith in him on the part of the king. It is for him simply an act of politeness to a Deity who, if this were neglected, might resent. It is to be noted that this attribute "living" is omitted in the Septuagint.

Vers. 21, 22.—Then said Daniel unto the king, O king, live for ever. My God hath sent his angel, and hath shut the lions' mouths, that they have not hurt me: forasmuch as before him innocency was found in me; and also before thee, O king, have I done no hurt. The Syriac construction, *mailel 'im*, is to be observed. The rendering of the LXX. differs from the Massoretic text in a way that can scarcely be due to differences merely of reading, "Then Daniel called with a loud voice, and said, O king, I am yet living, and God hath saved me from the lions according to the righteousness found in me before him, and before thee, O king, was neither ignorance nor sin to be found in me; but thou didst hearken to men who deceive kings, and hast cast me into the den of lions for my destruction." It is not impossible that the opening clauses of the Massoretic and the LXX. respectively, "O king, I am yet living," and "O king, live for ever," have been derived from the same source. The last clause is to all appearance an expansion. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. Daniel answers the king, and declares his safety. The angelology of Daniel is an interesting subject, but here the question is complicated by the fact that there is no reference to angelic interference in the Septuagint. Still all through Scripture God does most of his works through the intervention of angels. To Darius, if he had any such beliefs as afterwards are found associated with Zoroastrianism, the ascription of deliverance to an angel would be natural enough. It is doubtful whether Cyrus and his followers were not idolaters. The rebuke implied in the statement that not only before God was Daniel innocent, but in the sight of the king, is sufficiently clear without passing beyond the lines of courtly decorum. The expansion in the LXX. is unnecessary, and mars the stately picture; though, on the other hand, the simple answer to the king's question is more likely than the courtly "O king, live for ever."

Ver. 23.—Then was the king exceeding glad for him, and commanded that they should take Daniel up out of the den. So Daniel was taken up out of the den, and no manner of hurt was found upon him, because he believed in his God. The verse that occupies the same place in the Septuagint is not a translation of the present verse at all, but looks as if it had been a sentence in the original longer documents which followed the above Massoretic verse, "Then all the powers gathered together, and saw Daniel, that the lions had not hurt him." It is barely possible that the first clause here represents Aramaic that might be misread into the Massoretic text. Although it is supported by the later versions, the Massoretic text has a suspicious appearance. The last clause is a moral reflection, unlike anything else in the Book of Daniel, and is omitted, as we saw, from the Septuagint. The assertion of the king's gladness, too, differs in colour from the other statements in the book; thus compare the language concerning Nebuchadnezzar when the three Hebrew youths were delivered from the fiery furnace. At the same time, it is to be observed that the use of the hophal form in the verb *hoosag* is an evidence of the antiquity of this portion of the verse. The hypothesis that this narrative has been condensed from a longer one, has much to support it. The lesson inculcated, that faith in God would result in deliverance, is very true, even though it was not in the text. The irregular form of the adjective *t'ayb* points out a possibility that there has been some modification of the text. Sometimes words not understood have resulted in known words being written in an irregular way.

Ver. 24.—And the king commanded, and they brought those men which had accused Daniel, and they cast them into the den of lions, them, their children, and their wives; and the lions had the mastery of them, and brake all their bones in pieces or ever they came at the bottom of the den. Here the Septuagint text is superior to the Massoretic, as briefer, "Then those two men who had borne witness against Daniel, they, their wives, and their children, were cast to the lions, and the lions slew them, and brake their bones." In this account of the punishment meted out to the accusers of Daniel, the victims are only two, with their wives and children. Hitzig contemptuously remarks that the lions' den must have been large to contain a hundred and twenty-two men along with their families—that number he gets by adding to the governors of the provinces the two presidents, colleagues of Daniel. If, however, we assume the Septuagint text to be correct, then this objection falls to the ground. The phrase,

"or ever they came at the bottom of the den," is an intensification of the narrative. In the Massoretic text it is "all their bones;" in the LXX. it is simply "their bones." Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The slaughter of the wives and children of offenders, with the guilty persons themselves, was the common practice. There are two other accounts of this event—one preserved in the apocryphal story of Bel and the Dragon, and the other in the pages of Josephus. According to the story of Bel and the Dragon, the king, who thus condemns Daniel, is no less a person than Cyrus the great conqueror. The reason of the condemnation is not a decree forbidding all worship, but because Daniel had laid bare the deceit of the priests of Bel, and killed the sacred dragon, the people of Babylon were incensed, and threatened Cyrus that they would burn his house if he did not deliver Daniel into their hands to be cast into the lions' den. The seven lions were starved in order that they might be sure to devour Daniel. For six days he was there in the den. In order that Daniel might not starve, whatever befell the lions, Habacu was brought from Judæa, carried by the hair of his head, to feed the prophet. The destruction of Daniel's accusers is stated in a more compendious fashion. The fact that this version is referred to by Irenæus ('Adv. Hæres,' iv.), Tertullian ('De Jejuniis,' vii.), and Clement of Alexandria ('Strom.,' i. p. 329, Morel), shows that early in the second century this narrative was incorporated with the canonical Daniel. This makes it almost necessarily before Christ in the date of its origin. If so, it is difficult to imagine the canonical version to be only a century and a half older. Josephus shows no signs that he knew of this apocryphal addition, but adds a feature for himself, "The enemies of Daniel, when they saw that nothing evil had befallen him, unwilling to attribute his deliverance to Deity and his providence, declared that the lions had been filled with food, and therefore neither attacked Daniel nor approached him, and maintained this to the king. But he, hating their malice, ordered that much flesh be thrown to the lions, and when they had gorged themselves, that the enemies of Daniel be cast into the den, in order that he might learn whether the lions would spare them on account of their being satisfied. It was then manifest to Darius, when the satraps had been thrown in, that Daniel had been preserved by miracle, for the lions spared none of them, but tore them all to pieces as if they had been famishing."

Vers. 25—27.—Then King Darius wrote unto all people, nations, and languages, that dwell in all the earth; Peace be multi-

plied unto you. I make a decree, That in every dominion of my kingdom men tremble and fear before the God of Daniel; for he is the living God, and stedfast for ever, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed, and his dominion shall be even unto the end. He delivereth and rescueth, and he worketh signs and wonders in heaven and in earth, who hath delivered Daniel from the power of the lions. This decree has a resemblance to the decrees of Nebuchadnezzar. In the Septuagint there is less magniloquence, though the divergence is too great to be the result merely of difference of reading, "Then Darius wrote to all nations and tongues and countries dwelling in all his land, saying, Let all men who are in my kingdom stand and worship, and serve the God of Daniel, for he alone abideth, and liveth to generations of generations for ever. I Darius will worship and serve him all my days, for none of the idols that are made with hands are able to deliver as the God of Daniel did Daniel." It is to be observed that it is only to the inhabitants of his own land that Darius writes, and further, it is "all men in his kingdom" he commands, not "every dominion in his kingdom." There is no notice taken of the kingdom of God; it is God himself who liveth and abideth for ever. The last verse, again, in the Septuagint, in which Darius professes his faith in Jehovah, is evidently spurious. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. Removing the exaggerations from it, the decree of Darius does not mean any more than we found in the decrees of Nebuchadnezzar; it is simply a warning against showing any disrespect to a Deity with such formidable powers as Jehovah. It may be regarded as connected with the dualistic view of the universe maintained by Zoroastrianism, that deliverance from lions is spoken of with such awe. The lion was one of the beasts specially representative of the evil principle, as we see in Persepolis. There was thus evidence given that the God of the Jews was supreme over the powers of evil; therefore, without forbidding any subject of Babylonia from worshipping his own ancestral divinity, Darius yet commanded him, in so doing, to watch his conduct, so that nothing disrespectful to the powerful God of the Hebrews should be done by him.

Ver. 28.—So this Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius, and in the reign of Cyrus the Persian. The Septuagint follows a different reading, "And King Darius was gathered to his generation. And Daniel was established in the reign of Darius, and Cyrus the Persian inherited the kingdom"—a reading due to the influence of Xeno-

phon's 'Cyropædia.' Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text. The statement that Daniel prospered in the reign of Darius and in the reign of Cyrus, does not necessarily imply that they were successive. The reign of Gobryas, a satrap, and perhaps in some way "King of Babylon," would coincide with the reign of Cyrus as "king of nations." Moreover, if Darius (Gobryas) was King of Babylon for two years, then Cyrus would succeed him in this position. Certainly in some of the earlier contract tables of his reign, Cyrus is not called "King of Babil."

Excursus on Darius the Mede.

There is no character in Scripture who has given rise to more hypotheses than Darius the Mede. Every person whose name has come into prominence in early Persian history may be said to have been pressed into service. The apocryphal addition to Daniel—Bel and the Dragon—identifies Darius the Mede with Cyrus. Josephus implies that Darius is Cyaxares II., as he declares him to be a relative (*συγγενής*) of Cyrus and son of Astyages. Eusebius ('Chronicon' ad Olym., 54) identifies him with Astyages. Later critical commentators, e.g. Bevan, have assumed that Darius Hystaspis is intended. Still more recently, by Mr. Pinches, it has been suggested that Gobryas (Gobaru), who took possession of Babylon on behalf of Cyrus is Darius the Mede.

As a preliminary to discussing the question, we must look at what is said about Darius the Mede in Daniel. He received the kingdom when he was sixty-two years of age. He was the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes. From the fact that only the "first" year of his reign is mentioned, we may deduce that he reigned little more than a year. He appears in the Massoretic text especially as a supreme monarch, who appoints governors under him. We must, however, bear in mind the fact that the evidence from the Book of Daniel is complicated by the proofs of expansion which we find in it. Even when the Septuagint Version coincides with the Massoretic recension, we are not even then quite sure that the work of modification had not begun before the two families of recension were established. Bearing this in mind, let us gather up the information we have concerning Darius here. He is asserted to be an old man when he "received the kingdom." The verb used here is used of legitimate succession; thus in Paulus Tellensis Cyrus is said "to receive," *קָבַץ*, the kingdom on the death of Darius. From the connection this is out of the question. It must

mean that from some higher power he "received" his appointment. His age we may assume to be correctly stated, notwithstanding the Septuagint rendering; this seems to have been drawn from the Massoretic reading by taking *כָּבֵד* in a Syriac sense. This view is confirmed by the fact that the resulting construction is not a natural one. Further, the exactitude of statement gives a presumption of truth, as there is no reason in the narrative why this age should be taken and not another. We are not necessitated to maintain that the governors were satraps in the large sense of the word. The fact that "satraps" were Persian governors would lead that word to be inserted. As to the name, we cannot lay much stress on this, as variation in the matter of names is not uncommon in Hebrew literature, a less common name being replaced by one better known. This is rendered the more likely as in the Septuagint the name Darius is replaced by Artaxerxes in one instance.

If we take the Septuagint text, there is nothing that necessitates anything more than that the province of which he might be the governor was affected by his appointing these so-called "satraps." As to the title "king," we must remember that that title was used very loosely. Cyrus claims to have several ancestors who were "great kings" (*Cylinder*). Darius Hystaspis declares eight of his ancestors to have been "kings." Ansan, of which Cyrus and his ancestors were kings, was a canton under the power of Elam, and Hystaspes remained satrap under his son.

Let us now investigate the various hypotheses that have been brought forward, and we shall take them in order of their probable age.

The first hypothesis is that Darius is Cyrus. This we find, as we have said, in the second apocryphal addition to Daniel—Bel and the Dragon—as we find it in Theodotion. So far as the letters are concerned, it is not an impossible thing to fancy that *Ko'resh* was read into *Daravash*, the *resh* and the *shin* being present in both words in the same position, and in the Aramaic characters of b.c. 100 *daleth* and *caph* were like. There is hardly any reason to lead one to read more readily the one name than the other. Although Darius could not fail to be a well-known name among the Jews, since three of that name successively reigned over the Persian Empire, and still in the East, Dara (Darius) is a name synonymous with "magnificence;" yet to a Jew what monarch of Persia could compare with Cyrus, "the servant of the Lord," his "shepherd," his "anointed," who allowed Judah to return and sacrifice

once more to be offered? The fact that he is also called Artaxerxes in the LXX., and the further fact that in the LXX. Version of Bel and the Dragon the name is omitted, are significant. The name must be laid aside as being of no evidential value. If now we look at the men—when we compare Darius, as presented to us by the narrative hero, with Cyrus, the skilful, self-contained conqueror, who had broken the power of Astyages, had built up a monarchy from the small cantons of the region east of the Tigris, and increased that monarchy to an empire—we see a vast, irreconcilable difference. Cyrus must have been at the maturity of his power when he gained possession of Babylon. Darius, we are told, was sixty-two years of age. Yet once more, he “received” his kingdom. Cyrus did not claim as inheriting from Nabunahid. We must, then, definitely decide against Cyrus being Darius.

The theory that has received the largest amount of support among those who maintain the ancient date of Daniel is that Darius the Mede is Cyaxares II. This is a personage introduced by Xenophon into his historical novel, the ‘Cyropædia.’ If his existence could have been proved, the character suited the position admirably. The weaknesses and fustiness with which Xenophon endows him does not contradict anything we see of Darius here. Only Xenophon nowhere says that Cyrus made his uncle king in Babylon. We are in a very different position in regard to many of these events now, than we were forty years ago. We know now that Astyages was not the son of Cyaxares I., the King of the Medes. He was King of the Manda or Umman-Manda, who overthrew the Median Empire. In Cyrus’s revolts against Astyages we have no word of any relationship subsisting between him and his opponent, still less that he was his grandson. There is, further, no reference to any son of Astyages being regarded as monarch under whom Cyrus fought. Yet this must be acknowledged that, though Xenophon is at sea as to the capture of Babylon, he knew that Gobryas took a principal share in it. He associates with him a certain Gadates, which seems to be a word made from “Guti,” the province from which Gobryas came. Herodotus, though he knows of a Gobryas who joined with Darius in conspiring against Smerdis, knows nothing of a Gobryas who took a principal part in the capture of Babylon. We are obliged, then, to dismiss Cyaxares II. as non-existent.

On the faith of a passage in Herodotus (i. 125) it has been supposed that Cyrus preserved Astyages, and may have set him as vice-king over Babylon. This, however,

has nothing to support it. A much more plausible theory has been devised by Marcus von Niebuhr, in his ‘Geschichte Assur. u. Babels.’ He maintained that Belshazzar was Evil-Merodach, and that he held the blasphemous feast narrated in Daniel, and that he was overthrown by a conspiracy assisted by the help of Astyages the Mede, and that Nergalsharezar (Neriglissar) reigned in Babylon as his subject-king. We know now that Astyages was not a Mede, but the King of the Manda. We know further that there is no trace in the contract tables of the conquest of the city, so that there should be a foreign overlord. This, however, might not be notified in fixing the dates on the contracts. But if Astyages was for a year actual king in Babylon, then that fact would appear in the tables, and this is part of Baron von Niebuhr’s hypothesis. Further, Astyages does not retain his overlordship in Babylon so far as we can judge from the proclamation of Nabunahid. We must, therefore, abandon this supposition also.

The followers of the critical method, which assumes that there must be something outrageously wrong, take for granted that the Darius here is the well-known Darius Hystaspis. The only point in him that suits Darius the Mede is that he is called Darius. It is true that Darius Hystaspis, after it had rebelled against him, took Babylon; there is nothing said of Darius the Mede doing anything of the sort, although it may be implied. Darius in Daniel is a Mede, Darius Hystaspis was a Persian; the Biblical Darius is the son of Ahashverosh (Ahasuerus), the other Darius is the son of Hystaspes; the Biblical Darius is an old man when he ascends the throne, Darius Hystaspis is young. Further, if we assume the writer of the fifth and sixth chapters of Daniel wrote also the eleventh, then he knew of Darius Hystaspis and of his son Xerxes, as well as of Cyrus and his son Cambyses. If these critics maintain the author of Daniel to be under the erroneous idea that Darius preceded Cyrus, how do they explain his knowledge that Darius reigned after Cyrus? We need not appeal merely to the eleventh chapter of Daniel. We are told to remark the fact that the names Daniel, Hananiah, Azariah, and Mishael all occur in Ezra and Nehemiah, as names of those who had returned from captivity, and we are expected to believe that from this source these came. If this writer studied Ezra so carefully as to pick out names to suit his purpose, how did he fail to see that Darius came not only after Cyrus, but after his two immediate successors, Cambyses and Smerdis? The critics are very ready to show us the sources of Daniel’s knowledge;

they forget to harmonize these alleged sources of knowledge with the stupendous ignorance they attribute to him whenever this is required by the necessities of their argument. Whoever Darius the Mede is, he cannot be Darius Hystaspis.

Another hypothesis has been started by Mr. Pinches of the British Museum—that Darius the Mede is Gobryas. We have seen that there is an uncertainty about the name. We know that in early Aramaic script the two names are not so very unlike, but that the less-known Gobaru might be read into the better known Darius. The main points known about both personages are in singularly exact historical parallel. Darius received the kingdom; Gobaru (Gobryas) was admitted into Esakkil by the Babylonian confederates of Cyrus, and was made by Cyrus governor of Babylon. He exercised a certain amount of authority; for we are told, as above mentioned, that he appointed governors.¹ Darius appointed governors. Darius was a Mede, and Gobryas was governor of the province of Gutu or Gutium, which was adjacent to Media, and therefore was not, improbably, a Mede. In thinking of this period, we are to dismiss from our minds all thought of the "Medes" being conquered

by Cyrus and the Persians. Both Medes and Persians were oppressed by the Manda—probably a Scythian horde—and Cyrus commenced the rebellion against the common oppressors, and united as one nation the Medes and the Persians. As to the character of Gobryas as compared with that of Darius, we have no data to go upon either to affirm or deny a resemblance. His age is not at all improbable. Altogether the balance of probability in the mean time points to Darius the Mede being Gobryas the governor of Gutium. That he is addressed always as "king" does not contradict this, for Media and Persia and all that region had monarchies of the most limited description, and these monarchs retained their titles even under Cyrus's rule; hence, in his Behistun inscription, Darius claims his father to have been a king, and this while Cambyes reigned as king over the empire. After his son Darius had mounted the throne, Hystaspes was satrap in Persia. He would be addressed as "King Hystaspes," since by his son he is called king. Hence, if, as was likely, Gobryas was king of some small town or canton when he became governor of Gutium, he would be always "King Gobryas," or, as it has been written, "Darius." On the whole, then, as we have said, the balance of probability at present indicates Gobryas as Darius the Mede.

¹ Mr. Pinches gives the credit of reading "appointed governors" to Delatre.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1-28.—*The lions' den.* The story of "the lions' den" may be regarded as an instance of persecution frustrated.

I. HIGH STATION OFTEN OCCASIONS SEVERE TRIALS TO RELIGIOUS FIDELITY. If it had not been for his rank and office, Daniel would have been left unmolested. There is safety in obscurity. 1. The customs of high places are often inimical to religious fidelity. Daniel must have been tempted by fashion before he was attacked by persecution. His religious habits were singular and marked. 2. High office provokes envy. It was not anti-religious zeal which stirred the enemies of Daniel. They used a religious question simply as an instrument for their private jealousy. Blamelessness of conduct is no security against this kind of enmity. 3. Prominent positions are exposed to searching criticism. Daniel's habits were keenly watched. Happily his integrity was unimpeachable, even in the eyes of his enemies. How many of us could stand such a test? His religious habits, however, were made public; and his fidelity to God, in opposition to the royal decree, was noted against him when the similar conduct of humbler men would have been disregarded.

II. OUR DUTY TO GOD MUST TAKE PRECEDENCE OVER ALL HUMAN OBLIGATIONS. Daniel was a servant of Darius, and the law of the king was absolute; yet he had no hesitation in setting this at defiance in obedience to the higher service of God (Acts iv. 19; v. 29). 1. All through life there are similar cases in which lower obligations are cancelled by higher ones. The duties of subjects to sovereigns, citizens to laws, children to parents, servants to masters, etc., must all be considered to have this limitation. 2. An unrighteous law is no excuse for unrighteous conduct. This should be remembered by people in commercial or legal situations, in which the state of the law is sometimes used as a cloak for ambiguous practices.

III. RELIGIOUS FIDELITY IS OFTEN ATTENDED WITH TEMPORAL DANGER. Though

jealousy was the first cause of the attack on Daniel, his religious fidelity afforded the immediate occasion for it. In the long run right will triumph, but *here and now* wrong often triumphs. 1. It is desirable to "*count the cost*," and not to expect all things to go smoothly, when we set out on the Christian warfare (Luke xiv. 25—33). 2. *Strength and courage and independence* of character are indispensable to a faithful Christian life (Josh. xxiii. 9; Eph. vi. 10).

IV. GOD CAN SAVE THOSE WHO TRUST IN HIM WHEN ALL HUMAN HELP IS USELESS. The weak king laboured till sunset to save Daniel, but in vain. When the worst was done by men, God interfered. 1. *The most savage creatures are under the control of God*. When they rage and destroy they are only obeying instincts planted in them by their Creator. When he turns these instincts aside they obey. Wild beasts do not disobey the will of God. Man alone rebels. 2. *To the faithful man the worst dangers are more alarming than harmful*. Daniel's lions looked terrific, but their mouths were shut. Bunyan's lions were chained. Spiritual evils often vanish when they are boldly faced (Jas. iv. 7).

V. THEY WHO MAKE UNJUST ATTACKS ON THE INNOCENT OFTEN BRING ABOUT THEIR OWN RUIN. The enemies of Daniel are themselves devoured by the lions. Compare this with the cases of Haman (Esth. vii. 10) and Judas (Acts i. 18). Thus wicked men sometimes fall into the vengeance they have prepared for their victim (Ps. lvi. 6). It is dangerous to show enmity to the weakest man who stands on the side of right. All the power of God is behind him.

Ver. 10.—*Habitual prayer*. This glimpse into the daily habits of Daniel is enough to reveal to us the secret of his fidelity and integrity among the fearful temptations of the world in which he was called to serve. Here we see the oil which saved the fire from being quenched. Daniel was a man of prayer.

I. DANIEL WAS NOT FORGETFUL OF HIS GOD IN SPITE OF THE DISTRACTIONS OF COURT LIFE. It was a *heathen* court, yet he remained faithful to the true God. It was a *dissolute* court, yet he lived in devotion to the God of holiness. It is more easy to withstand the outbreak of violent persecution than to remain pure and true amongst the daily and insidious allurements of a world of sinful pleasures.

II. DANIEL FOUND TIME FOR PRAYER AMONG THE MANY CLAIMS OF A BUSY LIFE. He had the responsibilities attendant on the highest office in the kingdom, and he fulfilled them so well that his most jealous enemies could find no fault with him. Yet he did not regard these public duties as an excuse for the neglect of prayer. 1. As our duty to God is of primary obligation, *no human duties* can afford an *excuse for neglecting it*. 2. Prayer is a *help to the performance of duty*. Time spent in prayer is not lost time, even as regards the work of the world. Hours of prayer can no more be neglected with profit, than the time for meals and sleep. Christ spent much time in prayer in the most active part of his life, and the more he worked the more he prayed (Matt. xiv. 23).

III. DANIEL PRACTISED REGULAR HABITS OF PRAYER. The observance of regular hours of prayer as a thing meritorious in itself is simply superstitious. Moreover, a spiritually minded man will live in an atmosphere of prayer, and not confine his devotions to set seasons (1 Thess. v. 17). 1. But on the other hand, there is great reason for observing regular *habits* of prayer. It is well that the mind should be at times entirely withdrawn from the world for spiritual exercises. The deeper and more far-reaching acts of prayer are only possible when we have leisure to collect our thoughts and meditate upon Divine things. 2. It is desirable, too, that these habits should be *regular*, because otherwise they may be neglected and crowded out by other concerns, and because the laws of habit will then help us to enter into them the more readily.

IV. DANIEL CONFESSED HIS PATRIOTISM IN HIS PRAYER. Praying towards Jerusalem was a touching proof of his true patriotism. Prayer brings out our deepest affections. We should remember our country in our prayers. It is well when high promotion does not lead a man to forget the associations of humbler days (Ps. cxxxvii. 6).

V. DANIEL SHOWED HIS SIMPLICITY AND HIS COURAGE BY THE PUBLICITY OF HIS PRAYER. He prayed with his windows open. Of course, prayer should never be ostentatious (Matt. vi. 5, 6). But if there are times when we should pray in the closet,

and with the door shut, there are also times when it may be our duty to let devotional habits be known. If the hiding of them suggests the abandonment of them in face of danger, it is our duty to let them be open and visible. We should thus avoid the appearance of evil. It is always wrong to be ashamed of our religion (Luke ix. 26). It is our duty to make a simple unpretentious confession of religion in face of persecution or of ridicule.

Ver. 12.—“*The law of the Medes and Persians.*” The unalterable character of “the law of the Medes and Persians” is evidently regarded with superstitious veneration, and considered to be a sound principle of government. But in the present instance it leads to gross injustice, and, instead of honouring, it humiliates the royal authority from which the decree emanates.

I. OBLIGATIONS RASHLY CONTRACTED OFTEN LEAD TO DISASTROUS RESULTS. Darius had never contemplated the effect of his decree, or he would not have signed it. 1. It is wrong to decide on a course which will affect the future on the mere *impulses* of the present. If decision must be made, it should be after prayer for guidance from him who lives in the future. This applies more particularly when, as in the case of Darius, our decision affects the happiness of others. 2. It is foolish to contract any serious obligations for the future which are *not necessary or plainly useful*. There was no good to be gained by the king’s decree; at best it was useless. Such decrees are best unsigned. It is well to turn our vows into prayers, and, instead of promising to do any hard thing, to seek grace to do it if it is God’s will.

II. SO LONG AS LAW-MAKERS ARE WEAK, LAWS WILL BE DEFECTIVE. It was foolish for such a man as Darius to rashly decree unalterable laws. He was kindly disposed. But he was overcome: 1. By *flattery*. The king was to be the honoured exception, and prayer might still be offered to him. 2. By *fear*. The satraps crowded about the king until he was terrified into signing the decree. 3. *Legal pedantry*. The unalterable character of his law was more to Darius than right and justice. While such law-makers exist, it is not wise to enact changeless laws.

III. ALL HUMAN LAWS MUST GIVE PLACE TO HIGHER DIVINE LAWS. The law of the Medes and Persians presupposes that there is no power greater than the state. But God’s laws are prior to ours. The most solemn decrees of state should only have force as *bye-laws* coming under God’s greater laws of right, and losing all obligation when they contradict these. The king should have broken his law, which violated the higher Divine law of justice.

IV. WITH FALLIBLE MEN CONSISTENCY OF CONDUCT IS NOT ALWAYS A DUTY. Some men worship consistency as a fetish. What they “have written, they have written,” and they stand to it. This conduct often arises: 1. From weakness and the fear of men. 2. From pride and the conceit of infallibility. 3. From obstinacy and self-will. Whenever repentance is a duty, consistency is a sin.

V. THE ONLY LAW WHICH IS NECESSARILY AND RIGHTEOUSLY CHANGELESS IS THE LAW OF GOD. This is founded on: (1) his infallible *wisdom* (Ps. xix. 7, 8); (2) his irresistible *power* (Ps. lxxvi. 3); and (3) his changeless *character* (Ps. xxxiii. 11). The forgiveness of the gospel does not frustrate God’s Law, but honours it in the atonement (1 Pet. iii. 18). The freedom of the new covenant does not abolish this Law, but substitutes the willing obedience of the spirit for the bondage of the letter (Rom. viii. 4).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—24.—*Strength of soul.* “Now when Daniel knew,” etc. (ver. 10). Daniel stands here before us a magnificent instance of strength of soul (Ps. cxxxviii. 3). We have also the advantage of seeing him contrasted with a blameworthy and contemptible weakness, as well as with something worse—with weakness passing into wickedness.

I. STRENGTH. As exhibited by the saint, statesman, and prophet. See it: 1. *Advancing to the throne in common life*. The new organization included a hundred and twenty satrapies; over these three presidents in close relation to the king; of these Daniel was “*one*” (not the “*first*”). But he stood out in bold relief against

the other ministers of the crown. By intelligence, experience, industry, and piety, he moved at once to the front (ver. 3). Religion king in every realm. Fidelity in common things (ver. 5). 2. *In the absence of egotism.* Shallow scepticism charges Daniel with egotism, partly on the ground of ver. 3. The tables may here well be turned on the adversary. Considering the exalted power and position of Daniel, that we have here too autobiography, the absence of self-allusion and self-praise is wonderful, and that throughout the book. Besides, this seeming self-praise was necessary to account for the action of enemies. Moreover, moral greatness does not quite preclude all allusion to self (Numb. xii. 3; 1 Cor. xv. 10; Nehemiah throughout). 3. *In Daniel's continuance in the habit of saintly life.* (Ver. 10.) Note: (1) *The simplicity of action.* "He kneeled upon his knees three times a day, and prayed." (2) *The absence of ostentation.* No opening of the windows in order that all might see. To have so done would not have been to exhibit religious courage, but foolhardiness. Such conduct would have been bravado. Religious courage is a calm, wise, brave thing. Picture the palace-house of one so great; the parlour on the roof; the lattices closed (as in hot climates) towards the east and south, but open (at least in the early hours, perhaps always) on the west, and intentionally "toward Jerusalem." (3) *The fearlessness of consequences.* (4) *The reason of the act.* "Because [Chaldee] he had done so aforetime." The persistence of the strong. "What he was as a dear little child, when his mother taught him, and prepared him with prayers and tears for the perils of Babylon—albeit she did not know he was to live the hard life of an exile—that he is now, though his hair be grey and his body bent with years." One holy, consistent life. 4. *In the permanence of his patriotism.* "Toward Jerusalem." 5. *In the grandeur of his faith.* After all these years and vicissitudes, the home of his soul was still in the Hebrew tradition—in the Hebrew history, literature, prophecies, liturgies, etc.

II. **WEAKNESS.** As illustrated in the character and conduct of the king. The moral weakness of the man appears: 1. *In the evasion of responsibility.* There is evident an indisposition to attend to the affairs of government, which are left in the hands of officials. No surer mark of moral weakness than to leave what should be alike our duty and honour to others—possibly to the incompetent. 2. *Accessibility to flattery.* Keil's view of the proposal of ver. 7 commends itself to us, that it referred only to "the religious sphere of prayer." On this assumption the king would be regarded as the living manifestation of all the gods, of the conquered nations as well as of Persia and Media; and the proposal was that all prayer to all divinities should for thirty days be stayed save to this divinity—the king. The inflated vanity which could accept so obsequious homage! 3. *Pliability to the will of others.* (Ver. 9.) He had not the courage to live his own life, to think his own thoughts, and act them out. 4. *Indifference to suffering.* Weakness of soul means usually the weakness of every part—a feeble, emotional nature, at least on its nobler side, as well as weakness of intellect, conscience, will. Note "the den of lions" (vers. 7, 24). Deficiency of sympathy, leading on to frightful cruelty, is oft the result of feeble moral imagination. No child or man could torture insect or man who vividly realized the exquisite agony. 5. *The violence of passion.* (Vers. 14, 18—20, 24.) Take the violence of his grief and indignation alike. 6. *Moral helplessness.* What an humiliating picture have we in vers. 14, 15! (The speech of the conspirators is clearly prompted by what they had observed on the part of the king—an attempt to evade the law, vers. 19, 20.)

III. The strength of Daniel, his magnanimity, is here set, not only against the weakness of the king, but also against the darker background of WICKEDNESS exhibited by those who conspired against the prophet. Moral weakness is not far off deep depravity; e.g. the depravity of Ahab—perhaps the weakest character in the Old Testament. Observe: 1. *The vision given to these men.* Of a saintliness like that of Daniel—elevated in its devotional life, ripe with the maturity of years, clearly manifesting itself in common scenes, excellent beyond all praise by their own admission (ver. 5). A beam, a ray from the holiness of God. 2. *The Divine aim* in the vision. Beneficent and moral we may be sure. To awaken admiration; to bring home the sense of defect; to lead to penitence; to arouse to efforts after likeness. 3. *The human frustration* of that aim. What was intended for salvation

became the occasion of moral ruin, the cause being the deep depravity of these hearts. Note: (1) *The audacity of their aim.* Men usually come to perpetrate great crimes step by step. These aimed at the ultimate of evil from the first—the utter ruin and destruction of the prophet. (2) *The recklessness of their counsel.* If there be no law sufficient to crush, they will make one. (3) *The pertinacity of their pursuit* of their miserable object. Shown in their dealing with the king (ver. 15). (4) *The meanness of their conduct.* Over that parlour on the roof of Daniel's palace-home a watch must have been meanly set. (5) *The mercilessness of their cruelty.* (Vers. 16, 17.) 4. *The judgment that befell.* (Ver. 24.)—R.

Ver. 22.—*Angel-ministration.* “My God hath sent his angel” (ver. 22). “Are they not all ministering spirits?” (Heb. i. 14). The text in Daniel suggests the whole doctrine of angel-ministration. That imperilled life guarded by a sentinel from heaven is no solitary spectacle. It has many parallels. There had been the ministration of angels before, as there has been a thousand times since. We cannot help looking upon the scene with memories charged with all that has been revealed of the relation of that higher world to the world of men. It was a remarkable instance of a universal fact in the experience of the Church of God—a fact not limited to particular ages, but existing from the beginning to the end of time. We suppose that the angel in this case may have been *invisible* to Daniel; Daniel having simply inferred his presence; and further, that the action of the angel may not have been strictly *supernatural*. The occasional supremacy of man over savage beasts may be an illustration of the dominance of the angel. The subject, then, is—*The ministration of angels.*

I. *THEIR EXISTENCE.* Say there are angels; and some would receive the statement with scepticism. But the evidence is: 1. *The analogy of the case.* The interdependence of material worlds points to a similar interdependence of moral worlds. The commerce of earth to a commerce between the varied worlds of God. 2. *The craving of the human mind.* There is a craving for the knowledge of creatures higher than ourselves. The craving universal. It points to an objective satisfaction. 3. *The testimony of Scripture.* Previous argument, only presumptive; this conclusive. Fulness of Scripture on the subject.

II. *THEIR NATURE.* 1. *They are spiritual.* “Are they not all spirits (*πνεύματα*)?” 2. *But “clothed upon” with some organization.* Of a material kind, for it may become an object of sense; men may see the angel-form. Note: (1) Angels appear in the human form. But: (2) *Glorified.* (Ch. x. 6.) (3) *Men after the resurrection are to become like the angels.* (Luke xx. 36.) We may infer that the organism of angels is well adapted to second the life abiding in it. Incorruptible, for the angel never dies; fit servant of high intelligence; offers no obstruction to their mighty power; no impediment to their swiftness; beautiful with immortal youth. The angels, like ourselves, are capable of everlasting intellectual and moral progress.

III. *THEIR PUBLIC LIFE.* Its essential characteristic is given in the question, “Are they not all *liturgic* (*λειτουργικά*)?” But what is the meaning? We must go to Athens, the home of the Greek tongue, for the answer. A few words, then, on: 1. *The Greek liturgy.* It was a public service—a ministration of the citizens to the commonwealth. Certain citizens were bound to contribute money, labour, time, towards making Athens splendid at home, triumphant abroad. Such a contribution was a “liturgy;” it stood for the public service of the Athenian people. 2. *The Hebrew liturgy.* The word was transferred from things Greek to designate the public ministration of the priests in the temple. As the liturgy of the Athenians was for the glory of the Athenian commonwealth, so the liturgy of Hebrew priests was for the glory of the Hebrew commonwealth—a ministration to its awful King. 3. *The heavenly liturgy.* Here thought ascends to a higher state, to a grander temple, in which angels contribute to the public service. Their wealth, energy, time, are given for the glory of the Eternal, and for the majesty of his kingdom. “Are they not all liturgic? Do they not minister to God in the exalted service of the heavenly temple? Are they not employed in the administration of the celestial government? Do not ‘thousand thousands minister to him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stand before him?’” “The chariots of God are twenty thousand.”

IV. THEIR APOSTOLIC CHARACTER. "Are they not all . . . sent forth?" Where he appoints, they go. Describe their coming and going as recorded in Scripture. But all this mysterious appearing and disappearing was not at all of their own self-moved will; they were "sent forth." They came on embassy, and the love that sent them was the Lord of angels and ours.

V. THEIR MINISTRATION. They are "sent forth" to bring us help, to aid the otherwise helpless. Look at this: 1. *Negatively*. Their main object is not any of the following, though angels have been commissioned for them all. (1) *To glorify some great event*; e.g. the Incarnation. (2) *To answer prayer*. (Ch. ix. 21.) (3) *To terrify enemies*. (Matt. xxvi. 53.) (4) *To destroy the doomed*; e.g. the Assyrian army. (5) *To advance their own knowledge*. (1 Pet. i. 12; Eph. iii. 10.) 2. *Positively*. *To bring help*. The lesson for us—not to live in the light that shines from superiors, not to enjoy the company of equals, but to minister to those below. (Why not include in this lesson from the angels, our duty of ministration to races of life below man?)

VI. THEIR RELATION TO REDEMPTION AND THE REDEEMED. 1. *Their general attitude*. (1) With reference to *redemption* generally. The attitude is one of anxious interest, which was *typified* in the aspect of the cherubim over the ark, "*towards the mercy-seat shall the faces*," etc.; and *declared* in the New Testament (1 Pet. i. 12). (2) With reference to the *redeemed* particularly. Interested are they in the beginnings and developments of regenerated life (Luke xv. 7, 10; 1 Cor. iv. 9). 2. *Their critical services*. Angels are prominent through all the great epochs of Divine revelation—in the patriarchal, legal, and prophetic dispensations. Keep watch and ward about the Person of Christ. (The annunciation to Zechariah, to Mary; the anthem at the birth; one in Gethsemane, twelve legions in waiting; two at the sepulchre.) They were active at the founding of the Church; are now agents in providence; will add to the glory of the last assize. 3. *Their combined action*. Militant action, we may call it. Much in the Bible to imply that the angels are ever exerting, on behalf of the saved, a moral influence, equal in extent, though opposite in kind and greater in degree, to that exerted by evil spirits. They are not idle spectators of the long-drawn-out moral conflict of this earth. 4. *Their individual ministration*. (See John i. 51; Matt. xviii. 10; Pss. xxxiv. 7; xci. 12; 2 Kings vi. 17; ch. vi. 22; Acts xxvii. 23.) (The "Angel-god" passages not referred to, because his appearances were those of the Lord Jesus.)

CONCLUSIONS. 1. *The majesty of their King*. Christ the Lord. Such a retinue. 2. *The greatness of the object of angel solicitude*. Salvation. 3. *The brightness of the Christian prospect*. "Equal unto the angels."—R.

Vers. 1—9.—*The murderous plot of envy*. As every climate and every condition of soil are favourable to the propagation of particular weeds, so every state of society offers facility for the growth of some sins. Prosperity has its dangers as well as adversity. If the refinements of civilization make grosser vices intolerable, the greater encouragement is given for the secret sins of envy, deceit, and uncharitableness. It is never safe for the conscience to fall asleep.

I. ENVY CAN EXIST IN THE BEST-ORDERED COMMONWEALTH. Whatever may have been the faults of Darius, he had a remarkable faculty for wise government. The difficult task of ruling a large empire was distributed among suitable orders of men. He was not only successful in war, but also skilful in council. Unlike many Oriental monarchs, he was neither an autocrat nor a tyrant. He did not suppose that all wisdom resided in himself, nor did he imagine that intelligent beings could be ruled by sheer will. Therefore he laid the basis for constitutional government, and appointed a prince in every province of the empire, whose business it would be to maintain the royal authority, and to secure to all subjects rights of freedom and property. But no human government, however wise or good, can check the growth of immoral principles. Human authority, at the most, can deal with overt crimes; it cannot check or punish the iniquities in the human heart. There is need for higher authority—for a heart-searching God—to control the tempers and passions of the soul.

II. ENVY IS EXCITED BY THE SIGHT OF SUPERIOR GOODNESS IN OTHERS. It is a strange phenomenon that virtue in one should be the occasion of vice in others. Yet

virtue is not responsible for this result. Eminent goodness either allures or repels men. Virtue may be the innocent occasion of wickedness: it is not its originating cause. The warmer the sun shines on our gardens, the faster grow the weeds on the dunghill. Yet the sun is not to be blamed. The peerless purity of Jesus Christ exasperated men to commit the foulest offence that our earth has ever witnessed. As a rule, it is not the virtue itself that is envied, but the advantages and rewards which virtue secures. Men, for the most part, wish to gain the *fruits* of virtue rather than the virtue itself; and if they cannot, with facility, rise to the elevation of their rival, they seek to bring him down to their level or else destroy him altogether. Because Daniel was preferred by the king on account of his probity and prudence, the evil nature in his competitors developed in the direction of bitter envy.

III. ENVY IS LABORIOUS IN THE SEARCH AFTER OTHERS' SINS. The base and contemptible nature of envy is seen in its occupations. It is not conducive to the health of men's minds to be perpetually engaged in the study of disease. There may be compensations and alleviations to be obtained from other sources. But the pursuit itself is injurious. Much more injurious to the soul is it to be on the search for diseases of the soul, and to find a satisfaction in the supposed faults of our fellow-men. In the case of Daniel, this search served only to bring more clearly into view Daniel's exceptional virtue. Not even the sharp lynx-eye of ambitious envy could find a blemish on his reputation. His unworthy detractors were at length compelled to acknowledge his private and his public virtues; so they confessed to each other, "We shall find no occasion of blame against this Daniel, except we find it against him concerning the Law of his God."

IV. ENVY SEEKS TO GAIN ITS END BY THE MOST DISCREDITABLE METHODS. It matters little to Envy whether she speaks the language of truth or of falsehood; whether she employs just or unjust measures. These jealous rivals of Daniel went to the king with a lie in their mouths when they said that "*all* the presidents" and princes had united in asking this decree. How sedulously busy is Envy in her intrigue! She counts no toil inordinate! She had paced up and down the land, whispered in the ear of every state official, and secured their adhesion to this deadly plot. Seeming success makes her bold. She will involve the king himself in her murderous scheme. A crafty use of flattery will win his powerful patronage. The intrigue shall be masked under the pretence of excessive loyalty. For thirty days the king shall be the sole dispenser of bounty to the people. His ear shall be open to every complaint. *This* will gain him wide popularity; *this* will bring pious Daniel within the meshes of contumacy. These professed believers in other gods will neglect *their* deities for a whole month in order to encompass the murder of the best and noblest man in the empire.

V. ENVY IS NOTHING BETTER THAN INCIPIENT MURDER. No tender or humane feeling can dwell in the same breast as Envy. She will gradually banish every virtuous occupant, and introduce instead the basest crew. Hide her final intention as she may, she must at length confess that murder is the final act in her programme. These jealous colleagues of Daniel would probably have been for the moment satisfied, if only they could have deposed Daniel from his just eminence, or if they could have seriously injured his reputation with the king. But since these ends were compassed with insuperable difficulty, they determine to aim higher still, and because *this* end seemed within easier reach, they make a thrust at his life. It is a perilous thing to harbour an evil principle in any corner of the heart. Like a tiny leak in a mill-dam, it will steadily increase: the trickling stream will carve for itself a larger and a larger channel, until every barrier at last gives way, and devastation on a large scale is the result. "Keep thine heart with all diligence, for out of it are the issues of life." Envy, when developed to maturity, becomes red-handed murder.—D.

Vers. 10—13.—*Piety in perilous circumstances.* Daniel was at this time advanced in years. His principles, good at the first, had grown in strength and mutual support. At his age he was not to be surprised by alarm nor driven into rashness. His character had been moulded into heavenly shape under the rough handling of oppression and persecution, and now every fibre of his moral nature had toughness and tenacity. He was manly because he was eminently devout.

I. TRUE PIETY FINDS ITS CHIEF EXPRESSION IN PRAYER. Piety shows itself in many acts, some of which, though useful, are accidental; *one*, however, is essential, viz. *prayer*. If there be no outgoing of desire from the soul Godwards, there is no real piety; if there be prayer, vocal or silent, there is piety. Pious men, when placed in perilous circumstances on account of their faith, may suspend (sometimes *must* suspend) overt acts of public worship; they may never relinquish prayer. A beggar asking alms, a child thanking its parent, a subject honouring his monarch,—these are earthly acts parallel to prayer. When first the gospel found its way into the hearts of the Malagasy, they did not style themselves Christians—they simply styled themselves the praying people. Prayer is the distinctive mark and badge of piety. What colour is to the rainbow, what saltness is to the sea, what roundness is to the circle,—such prayer is to piety. It is its essential element. It is the breath of spiritual life.

II. TRUE PIETY HAS RESPECT TO MINUTE PRECEPTS. For Daniel to pray was the first principle of his religion. To pray three times a day, to pray with his window open, to pray with his face toward Jerusalem,—these things were non-essentials. Nevertheless, there was a fitness and a propriety in these minuter acts. If not positive commands from God, they were indications of God's pleasure. Daniel had found them helpful to his spirit's health. Such habits of piety had been sanctioned by the most eminent saints who had gone before him. David had ascribed his elevation and his prosperity to the favour of God, and David had been accustomed to pray three times a day. The temple in Jerusalem had contained the only visible symbol of the Divine Presence on earth. Thither the longing heart of every pious Jew turned. On what ground should these pious habits be abandoned? It would not conciliate the unreasonable hostility of Daniel's detractors. The king's decree was not directed against these minor forms, but against prayer itself. Amidst so many unfriendly influences, it is wise to secure every vantage-ground for piety.

III. TRUE PIETY IS SELF-CONSISTENT. When the ridiculous decree of the king was promulgated, Daniel wisely resolved not to alter his course by a single point. He will steer his bark straight for the port of heaven, come what may. To a self-willed man, the temptation would be strong to resist the imperious interference of the king, and to pray more frequently and more prominently than before. To a timid man the inducement would be to close his chamber-window, and clandestinely do *that* which the new law disallowed. But Daniel leant neither to temerity nor to timidity. He maintained an upright and straightforward demeanour. Every habit of his life had been formed under the guidance of wisdom and discretion, and terror shall not rob him of advantages which experience has given. His loyalty to God is an obligation earlier, stronger, deeper, than loyalty to an earthly king. As God had been a true and trusty Friend for seventy years and more, it would be base ingratitude to neglect him now.

IV. TRUE PIETY ACTS WITHOUT REGARD TO MAN'S JUDGMENT. In every circumstance of life, God's honour being first secured, the pious man will find a delight in serving his fellow-men. But to attempt to appease malice by abandoning honest principle, would be, in very deed, to "cast pearls before swine." Full well Daniel knew that his enemies were watching his every step, yet would he not submit to the slightest compromise or concealment. These princes and presidents degraded themselves into spies and informers. They watched, as with wolves' eyes, the open lattice of this man of God. Their organs of hearing were made sensitively alive by keen suspicion. As the fowler watches for his prey in the net which he has spread, so these inhuman spies watched for the successful issue of their plot. In breathless haste they press into the council-chamber of the king, and divulge what they have heard and seen. They employ every stratagem that can arouse his anger and enflame his wrath. They meanly point to Daniel's foreign origin. They knavely describe his deed as treason against the king. "This fellow," urged they, "doth not regard *thee*, O king. He tramples on thy authority, and treats as a dead letter thy royal edict." Not a stone was left unturned by which they might injure the innocent man. Nevertheless, Daniel maintained a dignified and peaceful demeanour. To be right was with him a higher honour than to be respected. He was no stoic. He had all the better feelings of a man. He entertained the good opinion of his fellows at its true

value. He would be delighted to enjoy that good opinion if he could have, at the same time, the approbation of his God. But the latter was paramount, transcendent, priceless. And if, as the result of his loyalty to God, men maligned and hated him, much as he lamented the fact, he was content to face the consequence. It is, after all, comparatively a little thing to be approved or reprobated by man's judgment. "He that judgeth us is the Lord."—D.

Vers. 14—18.—"*One thoughtless act brings much sorrow.*" King Darius was free from many bad qualities which have stained the reputation of other monarchs. He had more gentleness and kindness—had more regard for the interests of others—than most Oriental kings. Yet he had grave faults also. He was too fond of ease. He was too ready to allow others to take the responsibility which of right belonged to him. To share the responsibilities of government with competent statesmen is an advantage to all; but his readiness to sign decrees without weighing their significance and design is a grave dereliction. The foibles which in a private person escape an adverse judgment may in a king be ruinous to the nation.

I. A THOUGHTLESS ACT REVEALS THE INTERNAL WEAKNESS OF CHARACTER. King Darius, having discovered the practical outcome of the rash edict, was "sore displeased with himself." This feeling is commendable. He does not blame the cunning, the envy, the malice of others, so much as the easy thoughtlessness of himself. Others may be more blameworthy accomplices than ourselves in an evil transaction; but if any blame attach to ourselves, it is wiser first to discover and remove the mote in our own eye, before we touch the beam in another's eye. An hour's serious reflection, at the right time, would have prevented this Oriental king much anguish and remorse. It was an alleviation of his inward grief that he had not intended to do Daniel harm; yet, in effect, his thoughtlessness had produced as much suffering on others as if he had been instigated by feelings of bitterest malice. He ought to have given the edict mature consideration before he gave to it the authority of his great name. He ought to have inquired into its purpose, its meaning, its probable effects on society. The very haste of the councillors ought to have awakened his vigilance. Too easily his supple will yielded to others' inclination. Too easily he swallowed the bait of human adulation. Truly saith our poet—

"Evil is wrought by want of thought,
As well as want of heart."

II. A THOUGHTLESS ACT GIVES SCOPE TO WICKED MEN TO EXECUTE THEIR PLOTS. Want of vigilance upon our part gives an advantage to our enemies, which they seize upon with avidity. We might often nip iniquity in the bud, if we were only on the alert against the secret machinations of the tempter. We encourage wicked men in their base intrigues, if only inadvertently we smooth the way for their success. We are counselled by a high authority to be "wise as serpents." Intelligence has been given to us for this selfsame purpose, and it is a sin to allow any faculty of mind to be lulled into needless sleep. Darius had both admiration and personal regard for Daniel; but this very esteem and preference of the king brought with it elements of danger to the prophet. Hence the affection of the king ought to have been thoughtful, inventive, watchful. The mean-souled officials had prepared the axe, and unwittingly the king gave them the handle by which the better to use it. For want of wariness, we may lend sheep's clothing to human wolves.

III. A THOUGHTLESS ACT OFTEN LEADS TO SAD AND IRREPARABLE RESULTS. It was a settled principle in the Persian government that a law, having once received the sign-manual of the king, could in no way be altered or repealed. This principle in the main was beneficent and useful. In a period when communication between the palace and the remote provinces was difficult and tardy, it was a great advantage to the people to know that a law, once enacted, was fixed and irreversible. But the knowledge of this first principle ought to have made Darius all the more cautious and wary in affixing the seal of authority to any new decree. He was master of that simple act; but, having performed it, he was no longer master of its consequences. It would have imperilled his reputation, his influence, perhaps his government itself, if he should have ventured to rescind it. Yet no sooner was the effect of his rash

deed discovered than remorse seized his mind. Conscience lashed him for his folly. His appetite departs. The desire for enjoyment ceases. Yea, the very capacity for enjoyment is suspended. Sleep forsakes his bed. His pillow is sown with sharpest thorns. No rest can the king find for body or for mind, because an innocent life, a noble life, is jeopardized through his rash deed. His mind roams over a variety of devices by which, if possible, he can yet protect Daniel from the ferocity of human wolves. But the king himself is powerless—as powerless as the meanest peasant—in this matter. He had, not long since, the power to defend any and every subject, but he has thoughtlessly allowed the power to depart. It is in other hands now, and cannot be recalled. Opportunity has fled. The king is a prisoner in the hands of evil workers, and is compelled by them to do a disgraceful deed—to sign the death-warrant of his best friend. Nothing is left to him but his tears. Oh the bitter fruits of rashness!—D.

Vers. 19—28.—*The tables turned.* If human law and human authority are impotent to save an innocent man from death, the unseen but supreme Monarch will appear upon the scene, and will vindicate the cause of injured innocence. The calculations of human sagacity often prove false. One factor is omitted, which entirely vitiates the result. Just as the ruffian is about to seize his prize, a judicial hand is laid upon him, and completely defeats his project. The victor is vanquished; the bitter bitten.

I. WE HAVE PRESENTED TO US HERE NOBLE ACTIVITY IN THE PLACE OF INDOLENT EASE. The craft of these base politicians was too short-sighted. Within reach of success, they were doomed to ignominious failure. Fortunately for the interests of justice, the king awoke to the deceit that was practised on him. At once he shook off his lethargy, applied such mental energy as he had to the business of the state, and searched in every direction for an expedient to save Daniel. Now that the king has discovered the treacherous design of his princes, all his wits are summoned to meet craft by craft. No effort shall be left untried by which his trusty and noble servant may be saved. He will no longer be a pliant tool in the hands of others, but a master of his own destinies. The hour was critical for Babylon, and Darius rose to the high demands of the occasion. *King* he will be yet.

II. THE GUILTY PUNISHED IN THE PLACE OF THE INNOCENT. Darius perceived that it would be perilous to abrogate, in unseemly haste, an edict so lately made. It would weaken the force of all imperial laws. It would loosen the bands of loyalty. It would arouse the sleepless hostility of his captains and princes. He had heard strange reports of the power of Daniel's God to save in times of danger. He believes that the same God will rescue now. The penalty which Daniel had incurred was that he should be *cast into* the den of lions. The edict did *not* say that he should be left there to die. The king's decree would have been fulfilled if Daniel had spent an hour or less amid the caged beasts. All through that dismal night the king had taken counsel of himself. Desiring, on this occasion at least, to do for Daniel all that justice and good will could devise, we cannot doubt that his mind came under the influence of the Divine Spirit. The selfsame God who, through that long night, was giving Daniel courage to control and subdue the lions' rage was also conveying wisdom to King Darius. At earliest dawn the king goes in person to the den, and finds faith in God honoured, human malice frustrated. The king's edict had been observed to the letter. But there was an authority, appertaining to the king, beyond what was embodied in law. He held in his hand the lives of all his subjects. It is clear as noonday that these envious statesmen had basely deceived the king. Under cover of bringing him honour, they thought only of glutting their own malice, and robbing the state of its best servant. It was nothing less than a murderous conspiracy. They were as guilty of murder as if Daniel had died. Justice plainly demanded that summary retribution should follow; and at once these crafty lords were consigned to the death they had prepared for Daniel. Every man shall receive the due reward of his deeds.

III. GOD MAGNIFIED INSTEAD OF BEING DISCREDITED. Profane men thought to use God only as a tool in order to gain their nefarious end. If God was defrauded of his daily tribute of praise, what cared they? If humble souls were deprived of guidance

and pardon and heaven, what heeded they, so long as they could lay murderous hands on Daniel? But will men rob God with impunity? Be well assured that God can defend his own! The opposition of vain men shall only advance his cause. The attempt to gag the mouth of prayer shall make even kings vocal in God's praise. When pompous statesmen league themselves against him, "he that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh." The proposal was that all prayer should cease for the space of thirty days. The effect was that Jehovah was proclaimed as the True and Mighty all through the Persian empire; and a wider effect has been that God has been more honoured and trusted all the world over. "His Name shall endure for ever;" "To him all flesh shall come."

IV. THE ELEVATION OF THE MAN WHOM MALICE SOUGHT TO DEPRESS. These worldly wise statesmen felt that Daniel was a superior man to themselves. They could not expect promotion so long as they had to compete with him. Hence they resolved that what they could not gain by fair means they would gain by foul means. But they reckoned without their host. It came to pass that they were degraded, and that Daniel was advanced. True merit will, sooner or later, find its fitting level! Now that these grasping placemen are removed from the empire, there is all the more room for Daniel—the more need for an able and trusty councillor. Step by step he rises in favour and in influence. His increasing power brings advantage to the captive tribes of Israel. The sunshine of his prosperity lends brightness to their fallen fortunes. They, too, begin to lift up the head. This event becomes another step in the way of Israel's restoration. And Daniel rises to the enjoyment of a reputation which is world-wide and immortal. "He shines as the brightness of the firmament, and as the stars for ever and ever."—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER VII.

VERS. 1—28.—THE VISION OF THE FOUR BEASTS.

This chapter begins the second section of the book. All before this has been narrative; visions are introduced into the narrative, but they were not given to Daniel himself, but to others; his rôle was the secondary one of interpreter. These visions and the events connected with them are related more as incidents in the biography of Daniel, than as revelations of the future. With this chapter begins a series of revelations to Daniel personally. This chapter is the last chapter of the Aramaic portion of Daniel. Though thus linguistically joined to what has preceded, logically it is related to what follows.

Ver. 1.—In the first year of Belshazzar King of Babylon Daniel had a dream and visions of his head upon his bed: then he wrote the dream, and told the sum of the matters. The language of the Septuagint is suggestive of the actual state of matters, "While Baltasar was reigning—acting as king—for the first year, Daniel saw a vision beside (παρὰ) his head upon his bed. Then

Daniel wrote the vision which he had seen in heads (chapters, κεφάλαια) of narration (λόγων)." While these words do not necessarily imply that Belshazzar was not king, but only acting as king, they yet may mean this. We know now that for five years during the nominal reign of his father Nabunahid, Belshazzar really reigned. Theodotus does not absolutely agree with the Massoretic reading here, "In the first year of Belshazzar King of the Chaldeans, Daniel saw a dream (ἐνὶ ὕπνῳ) and the visions of his head upon his bed, and he wrote the dream." The omission of the final clause will be observed. The Peshitta is closer to the Massoretic; it differs, in fact, only by the insertion of *malcootha*, "the reign of," before "Belshazzar." This is, in all probability, the original heading of the tract in which Daniel first published his prophecy. What were the circumstances, so far as we can attain a knowledge of them, when thus the future was revealed to Daniel? The Scythian forces under Astyages had conquered all the countries intermediate between the steppes whence they had come and Babylonia. Above all, they had overthrown the Median Empire, that was closely associated with that of Babylon. They had pressed in upon Babylonia, and were besieging its cities when Cyrus, the King of Ansan, rebelled against Astyages. We may imagine that, from the extent of their empire, the Manda would have to be

somewhat scattered. Cyrus then might easily gain advantage over the small division of Manda that held the canton of Ansan. As usually, the attacks of Elam and Media on Babylonia and Assyria had been made across the canton of Ansan, the rebellion of Ansan would thus separate the Manda in Elam and Media from those in Babylonia—the latter being the main portion. Cyrus succeeded in rousing the Medes, Elamites, and Persians against this invading horde, and wrested the power from them. Nabunahid, in a pious inscription, regards Cyrus as the instrument in the hand of Marduk to overthrow these oppressive Manda. Shortly after this uprising of Cyrus, Nabunahid is to appearance stricken with illness, and for several years takes no part in the business of the empire. In the seventh year of Nabunahid, we learn from the annals that the king was in Tema, and did not come to Babylon, but that the king's son conducted the affairs of the monarchy. It was probably, then, in this year, when Cyrus had defeated the Scythians, and had driven them out of Elam, Media, and Babylonia, that Daniel had the vision recounted in this chapter. Keen political insight might easily foresee the events in the comparatively immediate future. The rise of a vigorous new power like that of Persia meant menace to the neighbouring powers. Babylonia, filled with treachery and discontent, was in no condition to resist. The fall of Babylon seemed imminent—its place was to be taken by Persia. But Babylon had succeeded Assyria, and before Assyria had been the empires of Egypt and the Hittites. He remembered the dream of his old master Nebuchadnezzar. Now a dream is vouchsafed to himself, which repeats the vision of Nebuchadnezzar with some differences. He is reminded that the changes that come over the affairs of men are not unending. The rise and fall of empires is not the confused whirl of uncontrolled atoms, but all tending towards an end—the establishment of the kingdom of God upon the earth.

Ver. 2.—Daniel spake and said, I saw in my vision by night, and, behold, the four winds of the heaven strove upon the great sea. The Septuagint omits the introductory clause, and renders, "On my couch I saw in my night-sleep, and, behold, the four winds of heaven fell upon the great sea." Theodotion, like the LXX., omits the introductory clause, and renders, "I Daniel beheld, and, lo, the four winds of the heaven rushed upon (πρὸς ἑαυτὸν) the great sea." The Peshitta seems as if transferred from the Massoretic text, the resemblance is so close. The variations in the Greek Version may be due to condensation of a fuller

narrative. The verb translated "strove" in our Authorized Version is better rendered, as in the Revised, "brake forth upon." Luther's version is, "stürmeten wider einander." This, like the Authorized Version, seems to be the result of the Vulgate *pugnabant*. The only objection to this is that it ought to be followed by a preposition (Bevan). The translation suggested by Levy, "stirred up," appears still better. The sea referred to is naturally to be taken as the Mediterranean; it is "the great sea" of the prophets (Ezek. xlvii. 10). Jerusalem is not so far from the sea but that Daniel might have seen it in his boyhood. The symbolic meaning of the sea is the mass of heathen nations (Ps. lxxv. 7). The "four winds of heaven" usually stand for the points of the compass (Jer. xlix. 36). Here, however, the winds are pictured as actual forces dashing down upon the sea, and stirring it up to its depths. It may be objected that this is an impossible picture. It might be replied that Virgil, in the first book of the 'Æneid,' 84-86, and Milton, in 'Paradise Regained,' has the same thing. Daniel has more freedom, for he narrates a vision, and, further, to him the winds (*rucheen*) were under the guidance of angels. Hitzig denies that the winds can be *angelicæ potestates*, as Jerome maintains; and, when Jerome supports his position by a quotation from the Septuagint Version of Deut. xxxii. 8, gives as answer a mark of exclamation. The passage, "He set the nations according to the number of the angels of God," represents a phase of thought in regard to angelology, which Daniel elsewhere obviously has. The double meaning of the word *ruch* made the transition easy. We see the same double meaning in Zech. vi. 5. The sea, then, is to be regarded as the great mass of Gentile nations, and the winds are, therefore, the spiritual agencies by which God carries on the history of the world. As there are four winds, there are also four empires. There are angelic princes of at least two of these empires referred to later. May we not argue that these empires had, according to the thought of Daniel, each an angelic head? It may be doubted whether the most advanced critics know more of angelology than Daniel, or can be certain that his view was a mistaken one. Moreover, the Mediterranean Sea was the centre round which the epic of history, as revealed to Daniel, unfolded itself. Nebuchadnezzar marched along the eastern shores of that midland sea; the Persian monarchs essayed to command it by their fleets; across a branch of that sea came Alexander; and from yet further across its blue waters came the Romans. The Mediterranean saw most of the history

transacted that took place between the time of Daniel and that of our Lord.

Ver. 3.—And four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another. The Septuagint rendering omits "great;" otherwise it is a closely accurate representation of the Massoretic text, save that the translator seems to have had, not כְּדָרִים, but as in the Syriac, כְּדָרִים, as he renders *ἐν παρά τὸ ἐν*. Theodotion has *μεγάλα*, but does not so slavishly follow the Aramaic construction at the end. The Peshitta is very close to the Massoretic, save that in the last clause it agrees with the LXX. The number four is, in apocalyptic writings, significant of the world; "the four winds" mean the whole world. Here it is human history that is summed up in the four beasts. So in Zechariah we have "four horns" that symbolize the oppressors of the people of God (ch. i. 18; ii. 1). We have "four" chariots in the sixth chapter of Zechariah, which seem to be symbols of the same thing. *Beasts*. Animals of one sort or another are used of nations in the prophets; thus Egypt is symbolized in Isa. xxvii. as "leviathan," presumably a crocodile (Isa. li. 7), as "a dragon" in Ezek. xxix. 3. Babylonia is figured as an eagle (Ezek. xvii. 3). Composite beings are used as symbols also, as Tyre is addressed as a "covering cherub." In the Book of Revelation Rome is figured as a beast with seven heads and ten horns (Rev. xiii. 1). In the Book of Enoch (lxxxv.—xc.) we find this figurative use of animals carried much further. Assyria and Babylonia and, following them, Persia made great use of composite, monstrous animal forms as symbols, not so much, however, of political as of spiritual powers. This distinction is the less important, that political events were regarded as the production of spiritual activity.

Ver. 4.—The first was like a lion, and had eagle's wings: I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked, and it was lifted up from the earth, and made stand upon the feet as a man, and a man's heart was given to it. The LXX. and Theodotion render "lioness," but otherwise agree with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta does not differ from the received text. The word *אִרְמַיִם* is epicene. It is, however, to be noted that in later Aramaic the terminal letter was *ן*, not *ם*. The word *gappeen*, "wings," is worthy of note; in this form it appears in the Peshitta, i.e. in Eastern Aramaic; *gnappeen* is the Targumic form. No modern commentator has doubted, with, I think, the single exception of Dr. Bonnar ('Great Interregnum'), that the first beast here is the Babylonian Empire (Hitzig, Zöckler, Kliefoth, etc.). Nebuchadnezzar is compared (Jer. xlix. 19)

to a lion and to an eagle (Jer. iv. 7; also Ezek. xvii. 3), and suitable to this are the winged human-headed figures found in the ruins of Nineveh and Babylon. If we assume that the empire of Babylon is represented by this first beast, then we have to note, in the first place, the avoidance of any reference to numbers. It may be objected that the "eagle's wings," *עֶפְיִן* (*gappeen*), are in the dual. Yet the number two is not mentioned. That the word was in the dual in the pre-Massoretic text does not appear from the versions, so the correctness of the dual pointing may be doubted. Unity was the mark of the Babylonian Empire in the vision of Nebuchadnezzar, and unity still remains its numerical sign. As swiftness and aggressiveness are symbolized by wings, especially "eagle's wings," when we read, "I beheld till the wings thereof were plucked," we learn that before the fall of Babylon a period set in, during which Babylonia ceased to be the aggressive conquering power it had been. *A man's heart was given to it*. J. D. Michaelis thinks the reference here is to the fact that when they first broke from their original seats, the Chaldeans were barbarians, but they became civilized in Babylonia. We know more now of the early history of Babylon and of the Chaldeans, and know that at one time the latter were divided into many cantons, each under its separate king, and that on and after the conquest of Babylon by Merodach-Baladan, they became more able to act in concert. The circumstances connected with the accession of Nabopolassar are wrapped in mystery. However, it is clear this cannot be the reference here. The giving of the man's heart is brought into close relationship with the plucking of the wings. This fact also decides us against the view so generally maintained, that there is here a reference to the madness of Nebuchadnezzar. In his case the heart of a beast was given to a man; in the case before us the heart of a man is given to a beast. To us the contrast seems more obvious than the resemblance. Much superior is Calvin's interpretation. Speaking of the phrases, "set upon his feet," and "the heart of a man was given to him," Calvin says, "By these modes of speech one understands that the Assyrians and Chaldeans were reduced in rank—that now they were not like lions, but like men" (comp. 2 Sam. xvii. 10, "Whose heart is as the heart of a lion"). This is the view of Behrmann. There is no reference, then, to any supposed humanizing influences which manifested themselves in Babylonian methods of government after Nebuchadnezzar was restored to his reason. From being an empire that spread its wings over the earth, it became limited very much

to Babylonia, if not at times to little more than the territory surrounding the city of Babylon. We find that Nabunahid felt himself ready to be overwhelmed by the encroaching Manda. He manifests nothing of lion-like courage or eagle-like swiftness of assault. This was the state of things when Daniel had this vision. Nabunahid was in Tema, while his son did his best to defend the frontier against the threatening encroachments of Cyrus. Hitzig and Hävernick maintain that the attitude suggested by the phrase, "set upon its feet," is what, in heraldic language, is called "rampant;" it is possible, but it rather militates against the natural meaning of the words. Before leaving this, it must be noted that, as in the vision Nebuchadnezzar had of the statue, the symbol of the Babylonian Empire is the noblest metal—the head of gold. Here the noblest animal is the symbol of Babylon—"the lion." The same reason may be assigned here for this, as in the passage in the second chapter for that—that the Babylonian Empire had more in it of the symbol of Divine government. No monarch was more like a god to his subjects; his power was unchecked, unlimited, uncontrolled.

Ver. 5.—And behold another beast, a second, like to a bear, and it raised up itself on one side, and it had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it: and they said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh. The Septuagint rendering here differs but slightly. "A second" is omitted, and instead of "they said," it is "one said" or "he said." Theodotion agrees with the Septuagint in omitting the word "second," but agrees with the Massoretic in having "they said." The Peshitta begins more abruptly than the others, "And the second beast [was] like to a bear," etc. In regard to the Aramaic text, the use of the haphel form must be observed. The presence of the ב instead of the ב is an indication of antiquity in the word בְּעֵזַר (*be'ezar*), which becomes in the Targums בִּשְׂחָר . It has been supposed that the reading should be בִּשְׂחָר (*bishayr*) with ש , which would mean "dominion"—a phrase that would give a sense out of harmony with the context. It is in regard to the meaning of this symbol that interpreters begin to be divided. The most common view is that this refers to the Median Empire. There is nothing to support the assumption that the author of Daniel distinguished between the Median and the Persian empires; everything, indeed, which, fairly interpreted, proves that, while he regarded the races as different, he looked upon the empire as one. It is the laws of "the Medes and the Persians" that are appealed to before Darius the Mede. The united empire is symbolized as a ram with two horns. Dr. Davidson, in his review of

Professor Bovan's Commentary (*Critical Review*) on Daniel, shows the duality indicated by the animal raising one of its two sides. That one race was stronger than the other had to be symbolized, and this was done by making the symbolic animal raise one side. The attitude at first sight may be difficult to comprehend. There is a figure in Rawlinson's 'Five Great Monarchies,' vol. i. p. 332, in which a pair of winged bulls are kneeling with one leg; the side opposite to the kneeling leg is thus the higher. Kliefoth denounces this interpretation as mistaken, without assigning any reason against it. The interpretation by which he would supersede it is that it means "to one side of Babylonia." There is no reference to locality at all. Moreover, as all the animals come out of the sea, their relationship to Babylonia would be remote. *It had three ribs in the mouth of it between the teeth of it.* What is meant by these three ribs has been much debated. In the first place, Hävernick thinks that it is a mistake to translate שָׁלֹשׁ ("three") "ribs;" he maintains the true rendering to be "tusks." He identifies שָׁלֹשׁ with שָׁלֹשׁ (Hebrew); but even if we grant this identification, we do not find any justification for this rendering. The word for "tusks" seems rather to be רִיב , which occurs in the Targum of Joel i. 6 and Job xxix. 17, and the same word occurs in the Peshitta. At the same time, the symmetry of the figure would fit some such view. In none of the other beasts is there any reference to what they are devouring. Still, one cannot lay stress on this. When we come to consider what is meant by the "three ribs," we have great diversity of opinion. On the supposition that the ribs are in the mouth of the bear, and being gnawed by it, it must mean that at the time when by the conquest of Babylon it came into the apocalyptic succession, the bear-empire had laid waste three territories. Ewald agrees that three countries must be meant, but assumes these countries to be Babylonia, Assyria, Syria. There is no evidence, Biblical or other, that the Median Empire ever extended to Syria. If we grant that the author of Daniel lived in the time of Epiphanes, then no authority open to him, so far as we know, brought the Medes into Syria before the day of the Persian rule. We need not assume a blunder for our author, and then build further assumptions on that assumed blunder. Moreover, by the conquest of Babylonia and Assyria, the bear came into the apocalyptic succession, whereas he had already devoured those provinces represented by ribs when he appears. Hitzig, following Ben Ezra, takes the ribs as three cities—Nineveh and two others. There seems nothing to identify "ribs" with "cities;" we can imagine it to

mean "provinces." Thus we are led to Kranichfeld's opinion, that it represents constituent portions of an older confederation broken up. The view of Kliefoth, that the conquests of the Medo-Persian Empire are intended—Babylonia, Lydia, and Egypt—sins against the symbol, which implies that the ribs are already in the bear's teeth when he enters into the sphere of apocalyptic history. Jephth-ibn-Ali maintains the "three ribs" to refer to the three quarters of the world over which the Persian Empire ruled; and this is the view of Keil. It seems better, with Von Lengerke, to regard the number three as not important, but a general term for a few, though, at the same time, we can make approximation to the number when we look not at the Medes, but at Cyrus. Moreover, had we a better knowledge of early apocalyptic, it is at least a possible thing that we might find that "three" was the designating number of Lydia or Armenia, as "two" was of Medo-Persia, "four" of Greece, "five" of Egypt, and "ten" of Rome. It seems to us that the position of Cyrus—at the time we assume the vision to have been given to Daniel—suits admirably with the picture of the bear. Like the bear, he came from the mountains, in contradistinction from the lion of the plains. He united under his rule his hereditary kingdom Anson, Elam, and Media. Thus we might have the three ribs if we might lay aside the notion of these being devoured. He overthrew the Manda and Croesus before he conquered Babylon, and it is probable that Armenia had also to be conquered before he could encounter Croesus. It is singular that writers who are determined to maintain that Daniel drew all his information as to Babylonian history from Jeremiah and other early writers, should also, by implication, maintain that, in defiance of the continual mention by these writers of *kings of the Medes*, as if they were a numerous confederacy (Jer. li. 11), Daniel held that there was a united empire of the Medes separate from the Persian Empire. The second empire is not, as maintained by Ewald, represented by a bear, "because its empire was less extensive than that of Babylon," but because it was a falling off from the theocratic monarch—the monarch who ruled as God. *They said thus unto it, Arise, devour much flesh.* The speakers here may be "the watchers," or it may be used impersonally. On the assumption that the bear is the shadowy Median Empire, what meaning can this command have? The Medes, as distinct from the Persians, by the time that Epiphanes ascended the throne, had become very shadowy. The scriptural account of them does not represent them as pre-eminently cruel. Isaiah (xiii. 17) foretells they will conquer

Babylon, with all the concomitants of a city taken by assault. Jeremiah (xxv. 25) places the Medes with other nations under the dominion of Nebuchadnezzar King of Babylon, and (li. 11, 28) he too asserts that the Medes will assail Babylon. There is nothing here to indicate the expectation that Media should be a pre-eminently destructive power. This applied correctly enough to Persia. Even on the assumption that the author of Daniel was a Jew of the time of Epiphanes, it seems very improbable that he should have placed Media as an empire co-ordinate with Babylonia, Persia, and the Greek Empire of Alexander and his successors. Still more improbable that he should attribute pre-eminent cruelty to it, when all the cruelty ascribed to the Medes by the prophets was exercised against Babylon, and even that was not beyond the ordinary measure exercised by a conqueror in a city taken by assault.

Ver. 6.—After this I beheld, and lo another, like a leopard, which had upon the back of it four wings of a fowl; the beast had also four heads; and dominion was given to it. The LXX. rendering is shorter, "And after these things I saw another beast, like a leopard, and four wings stretched over it (*ἐπέτενον*), and there were four heads to the beast." The grammar of this is difficult to understand. As it stands, it must be translated as above; if, however, we might read *ἐτενον*, we should avoid the solecism of uniting a neuter plural to a plural verb, rendering, "and it stretched," etc. Paulus Tellensis renders as above, and adds a clause, "and a tongue was given to it"—a reading to all appearance due to the transposal of *τ* and *σ*. It is difficult, on the present text, to explain how the LXX. rendered "wings of a fowl," "stretched over it." If, however, the original word were that used in the Peshitta, *ܐܪܝܐ ܕܥܝܪܐ* (*parhatha*), it is explicable that this should have been read *ܐܪܝܐ*. Theodotion and the Peshitta do not differ from the Massoretic text. The majority of critical commentators maintain this to be the Persian Empire. A leopard is a less animal than a bear, and therefore, according to the argument these critics used with regard to the second empire, it ought to mean that it symbolized a still smaller empire. That, however, is impossible. No Jew of the age of the Maccabees could have been under that impression. Moreover, we have the four wings declared to mean that the Persian power extended to all quarters of the world, and attention is directed to the fact that the statement is made concerning it, "dominion was given to it." This assumes, what would be admitted by everybody to be contrary to fact, had the critics

not a further conclusion in view. The traditional interpretation is that the Hellenic Empire—that of Alexander the Great and his successors—is intended here. In defence of this we have the fact that four, as we have just said, is the numerical sign of the Greek power. In the following chapter we have the goat, with its one notable horn, which, on being broken off, is replaced by four. In the eleventh chapter we are told that Alexander's empire is to be divided to the four winds of heaven. But "wings" are not prophetically so much the symbol of extensive dominion, as of rapidity of movement. If Nebuchadnezzar (Ezek. xvii. 3) is a great eagle with long wings, it is because of the rapidity of his conquests. Jeremiah says of his horses, they are "swifter than eagles." Again in Lamentations, "Our persecutors are swifter than eagles." Wings, then, symbolize swiftness of motion. If we turn to the next chapter, the swiftness of Alexander's conquests is the point that most impresses the seer. Swiftness, compared either with the conquests of Nebuchadnezzar or of Alexander, was not the characteristic of the Persian conquests. Cyrus, in the course of thirty years, had subdued Asia Minor, probably Armenia; had relieved Media, Elam, and Persia from the alien yoke of the Manda; and had conquered Babylon. Nebuchadnezzar, after the battle of Carchemish, had advanced to the river of Egypt. We do not know the extent and direction of his many campaigns, but rapidity of movement characterized some of them we do know, and Alexander's conquests were made with extreme rapidity. Altogether the figure seems much more suitable for the empire of Alexander than for that of the Persians.

Ver. 7.—After this I saw in the night visions, and behold a fourth beast, dreadful and terrible, and strong exceedingly; and it had great iron teeth: it devoured and brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with the feet of it: and it was diverse from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns. The version of the LXX. differs considerably, though not essentially, "After these things I beheld in a night vision a fourth terrible beast, and the fear of it excelled in strength; it had great iron teeth, it devoured and pounded down; it trode round about with its feet; it differed from all the beasts that were before it; and it had ten horns, and many counsels were in its horns." The sense of this does not really differ, save in the last clause, which seems to belong to the next verse. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta differs only by having "after these things," following the LXX., instead of "after this." The identification of the

empire intended by this beast has been the *crux* of interpreters. Practically all ancient authorities—Josephus, and the author of the Apocalypse of Baruch being among the number—maintain the Roman Empire to be meant. On the other hand, a very large number of modern critics, not merely of the exclusively critical school, have held that it refers either to the Greek Empire as a whole, or to the Seleucid portion of it. As we shall discuss this subject in a separate excursus, we shall at present look at the principles to be adopted in dealing with such a question. The important point is the numerical note of this "beast." It is "ten"—the same it may be remarked, as in the feet of the image of Nebuchadnezzar's dream. When we turn from the Apocalypse of the Old Testament to the Apocalypse of the New, we find "ten" the note of Rome. Even though we should put this to the one side, as merely the opinion of an apostle, and therefore not to be considered at all in comparison with that of Hitzig or Von Lengerke, yet he was writing little more than a couple of centuries from the time when, according to critics, Daniel was written; moreover, he was in the direct line of apocalyptic tradition. The Apocalypse of Baruch, written in all probability B.C. 60, has the same view, and it is separated by little more than a century from the time of the Maccabees. The Fourth Book of Esdras, written about A.D. 80, has the same view. All three books imply that it is the universally received opinion. This view is really the only one that fairly meets the case. The view which separates the Seleucid Empire from that of Alexander may be laid aside, although the first three empires are correctly interpreted, because it is directly controverted by the statement that this fourth empire is to be diverse from all that had gone before. The empire of the Seleucids was in no sense diverse from that of Alexander. This fourth empire was to be stronger than all that had gone before. The Seleucid Empire was notoriously and obviously less powerful than the empire of Alexander had been, and was merely a match for the empire of the Ptolemies. Further, the next chapter shows that the writer of Daniel regarded the empire of the Diadochi as really a continuation of that of Alexander the Great. The other view rests on a division between the Median and the Persian empires, which is contradicted by any fair interpretation of this book. The next chapter shows clearly that the writer regarded the Medo-Persian power as one, but as having two dominant races. The "great iron teeth" of the beast have a reference to the iron legs of the dream-image which appeared to Nebuchadnezzar. This beast "is

diverse from all the beasts that were before it." In all the previous empires, the constitution was avowedly monarchical. With the Roman, the republican constitution appeared, and even under the emperors the forms of that constitution were preserved. In this sense it was diverse from all the preceding empires. Mr. Bevan thinks "the atrocious massacres at Tyre and elsewhere, by which Alexander endeavoured to strike terror into the conquered races," is symbolized by the monster "devouring, crushing," etc. Mr. Bevan must never have read the accounts of the conquests of Asshur-bani-pal. He seems to have forgotten the treatment meted out to Samos and Miletus by the Persians.

Ver. 8.—I considered the horns, and, behold, there came up among them another little horn, before whom there were three of the first horns plucked up by the roots: and, behold, in this horn were eyes like the eyes of man, and a mouth speaking great things. The Septuagint Version, if we consider it a rendering of the Massoretic, begins really with the words which are made in it the last clause of the preceding verse, "And counsels were many in its horns." This reading is certainly not to be preferred, although it can easily be understood how it has arisen. The version proceeds, "And behold another horn sprang up in the midst of them—little in its horns"—this latter is a doublet—"and three of the former horns were rooted out by it, and, behold, eyes as human eyes were in this horn, and a mouth speaking great things, and it made war against the saints." Theodotion is practically in agreement with the Massoretic text, as is also the Peshitta. As Daniel is gazing, his attention is directed to the horns; he sees their appearance changing. An eleventh horn springs up, much less than any of the former ten; quickly, however, it grows, and before its growth three of the former horns are rooted up. This horn now drew his gaze from all the others: it had human eyes, it had a mouth speaking great things. In the changes of the dream the horn now seems separated from the animal on which it is; it becomes an oppressor, and makes war upon the saints. It is usual to identify this horn with that in ch. viii. 7. When carefully looked at, the alleged resemblance is reduced to the fact that in both cases "a horn" is used as a symbol of an oppressor of the saints. We must remember that, according to the figure, these ten horns are contemporary. If we take the typology of the next chapter as our guide, these horns are kingdoms or dynasties. Unlike the Greek Empire, which split up into four, this fourth empire splits up into ten. Another dynasty rises up and sweeps away three of these earlier dynasties.

Nothing like this occurred in regard to the empire of the Diadochi. Of course, it is true the number ought not to be pressed, save as a designative symbol. There must, however, be more than five or six, as in such a case four would be a more natural general number. It may, however, be twelve or fifteen. Several events in the history of the kingdoms that have followed the Roman Empire might satisfy one part of this picture—the replacing of three kingdoms by one. It is a possible enough view that provinces may be referred to, as Jephthah maintains. As, however, the primary significance of the "horn" is power, the most probable solution seems to us to be to take the "ten" horns as the magistracies of Republican Rome. If we reckon the magistracies, there were fewer, if we take the distinctive individuals occupying the magistracies, more, than ten. The imperial form of government replaced several of these magistracies, which may roughly be reckoned at three. Certainly of the imperial power it might be said that it had a mouth "speaking great things;" for the claim to deification made openly was certainly a new claim. Other monarchs had claimed to be the sons of their god; only the Roman emperors were addressed as *divus* during their lifetime. Certainly the empire made war against the saints—against the people of God. It was Nero, a Roman emperor, who decreed war against the Jews; it was Vespasian, another Roman emperor, that began the conquest of Palestine; it was Titus, a third Roman emperor, that captured Jerusalem. Some support may be found for the Jewish idea that it is Titus personally. If we are permitted to take the ten horns as successive emperors, he was the eleventh emperor, and three emperors were swept away before the Flavian dynasty. We must reserve fuller discussion of this subject to a special excursus.

Vers. 9, 10.—I beheld till the thrones were cast down, and the Ancient of days did sit, whose garment was white as snow, and the hair of his head like the pure wool: his throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire. A fiery stream issued and came forth from before him: thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him: the judgment was set, and the books were opened. The Septuagint Version here does not differ much from the Massoretic save that there are two cases of doublet. Theodotion and the Peshitta are evidently translated from a text identical with that of the Massoretic. There is, however, one point where the versions agree against the Authorized Version—the thrones are not cast down, they are "placed," as

in the Revised. Luther and most German commentators render thus, as does Jerome. Ewald translates "cast," that is, "set." In the third chapter, where we have the same word, it means "cast down," this leads us to prefer the Authorized rendering. The word for "throne" is to be observed. It means not so much the throne-royal as the seat of a judge (Behrmann); but the office of judge was that essentially of the king. *The Ancient of days did sit.* It is not "*the Ancient of days*," but "*one ancient in days*," that is to say, the phrase is not appellative, but descriptive. After the thrones of these earlier kingdoms were cast down, then one appeared like an old man clad in a garment of snowy whiteness, and the hair of his head as wool. That this is a symbolic appearance of God is beyond doubt. Ewald remarks on the grandeur of the description as excelling in boldness even the vision of Ezekiel. The throne, the judgment-seat of the Ancient of days, is a chariot of "fiery flame," with "wheels of burning fire"—a description that suggests the translation of Elijah. His throne is at once the judge's seat and the chariot of the warrior. From beneath this chariot-throne "*a fiery stream issued forth.*" In the Book of Revelation (xxii. 1), from beneath the throne of God there issued the river of the water of life, clear as crystal. Compare with this also Enoch xiv. 9-22. Enoch's description is derived from this, but amplified to a great extent. *Thousand thousands ministered unto him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before him.* The word "thousands" in the Aramaic has the Hebrew plural termination in the K'th'ib, but in the most ancient forms of Aramaic there are many points where the two tongues have not yet diverged. The symbol here is of a royal court, only the numbers are vaster than any earthly court could show. The angels of God are present to carry out the decisions of the judgment. Compare with this Enoch i. 9 (Charles's trans.), "*Lo! he comes with ten thousands of his holy ones, to execute judgment upon them.*" Those that minister unto the Judge are those whose duty it is to carry out the Divine sentence; those who stand before him are those who are spectators of this great assize. *The judgment was set.* This translation is not accurate. The word translated "*was set*" is the same as that rendered in the second clause of the preceding verse "*did sit.*" Again, although *deena*, thus vocalized, means "judgment," it may be differently vocalized, *dayyana*, and mean "Judge." If we take the present pointing, the phrase may be taken as equivalent to "*the assize began.*" And the books were opened. It ought to be noted that the word here used for "books" is derived from a root primarily meaning "engrave." The Baby-

lonian books, as they have come down to us, are clay tablets "engraved" or "impressed" with letters. We have all manner of legal documents in this form. The piles of tiles and cylinders which contain the deeds of those before the judgment-seat stand before the Judge. One by one they are displayed before him. The scene presented is one of unspeakable grandeur, and all put before us with a few masterly strokes. We see the great fiery throne; the Judge, awful with the dignity of unnumbered ages, attended by a million of angels who are ready to do his will; and a hundred million watching and listening spectators. We find that this description of the judgment in the first Apocalypse reappears, modified and made yet more solemn, in the last Apocalypse. We are, however, not to regard this as the final judgment. Daniel is rather admitted into the presence of God in the heavens, and sees his judgment continually being prepared against the wicked.

Ver. 11.—I beheld then because of the voice of the great words which the horn spake: I beheld even till the beast was slain, and his body destroyed, and given to the burning flame. The Septuagint Version has been translated from the same text; but the word translated "because" is rendered τότε, "then," according to the usual meaning of the word. Theodotion has a doublet. The Peshitta is much briefer, "*I saw that this beast was slain, and its body destroyed, and it was cast into the flame of fire.*" *The voice of the great words*; that is, blasphemies. The punishment of blasphemy among the Babylonians was burning. On account of the blasphemies of the little horn, the whole empire to which it belonged was destroyed. If we regard the fourth beast as Rome, and the little horn the imperial dignity, it was on account of its blasphemies that the empire really ceased. The blasphemous claim to divinity wrought madness in the minds of such youths as Caligula, Nero, Commodus, Caracalla, and Heliogabalus. The process might be a slow one. God had his purpose in the history of the race to work out by the Roman Empire; yet it was none the less the madness of the emperors that brought the empire down. The way the provinces were harried by barbarians East and West could well be described as burning the body of it with fire.

Ver. 12.—As concerning the rest of the beasts, they had their dominion taken away: yet their lives were prolonged for a season and time. The version of the LXX. has a different reference, "*And those about him he took away from their dominion, and time of life was given them for a time and a season.*" Here, as in the seventh verse,

we have *sh'ar*. The reference then would be to the horns that still remained after the one blaspheming horn was destroyed. Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic. The Peshitta differs, but only slightly. As the Massoretic text stands, there is difficulty in maintaining that the reference here cannot be to any other than to the other three beasts. They should still occupy a place, but possess no dominion, even after they were removed from supreme authority. After Babylon lost imperial power, it still continued for a time a highly important province in the Persian Empire, and the sensibilities of the inhabitants were considered throughout the whole period of the Persian rule. After the Persian Empire was overturned by Alexander, there was still the province of Persis; and from the remains of the Persian Empire sprang up Parthia, and then the second Persian Empire; and after the rule of the caliphs had been broken, Persia revived as a Mohammedan power. When the Greek Empire fell, Greece still survived, not independent, but still influential. It is difficult to see what meaning this verse could have to one living at the time of the Maccabees, especially if he thought the Greek Empire was the fourth. Parthia certainly might represent Persia, but where was Media? "For a season and a time" does not refer to any definite time. Jephthah-Ali regards the reference till the end of the rule of the fourth beast. This militates against the idea that *'iddan* must always mean "a year."

Ver. 13.—I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. The version of the Septuagint is different in the last two clauses of this verse, "As the Ancient of days he came, and those standing around were present to him." Although the reading here is supported by Paulus Tellenius, we suspect some error of copyists. Theodotion practically agrees with the Massoretic. The Peshitta renders the last clause, "Those standing before him approached him." These earthly kingdoms having been destroyed, the new kingdom of God is ushered in. "A son of man" (not "the Son of man," as in our Authorized Version) appears in the clouds of heaven. It is a question whether this is the King of the Divine kingdom, the personal Messiah, or the kingdom itself personified. It is agreed that, as the previous kingdoms were represented by a beast, a man would be necessary symmetrically to represent at once the fact that it is an empire as those were, but

unlike them in being of a higher class, as man is higher than the beasts. Further, it is brought in line with the image-vision of the second chapter, where the stone cut out of the mountain destroys the image. But we must beware of applying mere logic to apocalyptic. In this vision we see that "a man's heart" really meant weakness as compared with the courage and strength represented by the lion. Further, the point of distinction between this vision and that of Nebuchadnezzar is that this is more dynastic, looking at the monarchs, while the other looks at the powers—the empires as distinct from their personal rulers. Hence, while the Son of man here refers to the Messianic kingdom, it is in the Person of its King. It is to be observed that, while the beasts came up out of the sea, the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven. This indicates the Divine origin of the Messiah. That the writer might not apprehend this is no argument against this being really symbolized. When he comes to the throne of the Ancient of days, he is accompanied to the presence of the Judge by the attendant angels—a scene which might seem to justify the LXX. Version of Deut. xxxii. 43 as applied by the writer of the Hebrews.

Ver. 14.—And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him; his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed. The versions differ only slightly and verbally from this. The personal element is here made prominent. Compare with this Rev. v. 12, "Worthy is the Lamb that was slain to receive power, and riches, and wisdom, and strength, and honour, and glory, and blessing." The Messianic kingdom, and with it the Messiah, was to be everlasting. The resemblance is great, as might be expected, between this statement and that in ch. ii. 44, "A kingdom which shall never be destroyed, and the kingdom shall not be left to other people." It is to be noted that even his dominion is bestowed upon him. The Ancient of days, whose sentence has deprived the other dynasties of their empire, bestows boundless empire on the Messiah (comp. Ps. ii. and lxxii.). Jeremiah's account of the state of matters on the return from the Captivity (ch. xxx. 21) is compared to this by Hitzig; but there it is not a king who is to come near before God, it is simply "governor" (*mashal*). In Jeremiah we have to do with a subject-people living in the fear of the Lord, but under the yoke of a foreign power.

Excursus on "The Son of Man."

The title given here to the Messiah for the first time, appears prominently in the Book of Enoch, and becomes consecrated to us in the lips of our Lord, as the favourite title by which he designated himself as the Messiah.

The phrase, "son of man," *ben-adam*, is used of man as contrasted with God: Numb. xxiii. 19, "God is not a man that he should lie, nor the son of man that he should repent;" of man as weak: Isa. li. 12, "Who art thou, that thou shouldst be afraid of a man that shall die, and of the son of man which shall be made as the grass?" (so Job xxv. 6; Ps. cxliv. 3). Again, it is used simply as equivalent to "man:" Jer. xlix. 18, "No man shall abide there, neither shall son of man dwell in it" (see also Jer. li. 43). The contrast, so far as there is a contrast, is between *אָדָם* and *בֶּן-אָדָם*. In the Psalms we have *ben adam* and *ben ish* contrasted: Ps. lxii. 9, "Surely men of low degree (*ben adam*) are vanity, and men of high degree (*ben ish*) are a lie." This distinction does not apply to Aramaic, in which *enush* is the only generally used word for "man." In the prophecies of Ezekiel the phrase becomes determinative of the prophet. The question is complicated, however, by the fact that in Eastern Aramaic *barnesh*, a contraction for *bar-nasho*, is used very generally for "men," as *col-bar-nesh*, "everybody." It also occurs in this sense in Targumic, though more rarely, as Job v. 7. The title here, then, simply declares that one, having the appearance of a man, was seen coming in the clouds of heaven. The phrase in the Peshitta for "the Son of man" is *bareh d'nosh*. It is implied that this mysterious Being had the form of a man, but further, it is implied that he was other than man. In the Book of Enoch the phrase has ceased to be descriptive merely, and has become an appellation. Thus Enoch xlii.: "(1) And there I saw one who had a head of days, and his head was white like wool, and with him was another being, whose countenance had the appearance of a man, and his face was full of graciousness like one of the holy angels. (2) And I asked the angel who went with me and showed me all the hidden things concerning that Son of man, who he was, and why he went with the Head of days. (3) And he answered and said unto me, This is the Son of man, who hath righteousness, with whom dwelleth righteousness, and who reveals all the treasures of that which is hidden, because the Lord of spirits hath chosen him, and his lot before the Lord of spirits hath surpassed everything in uprightness for

ever." This is clearly borrowed from the chapter before us. Elsewhere¹ we have endeavoured to fix the date of this part of the Book of Enoch, as a.c. 210. Of course, in this view the Maccabean origin of Daniel is definitely set aside. If, however, we take the date assigned to this part by Mr. Charles, then we have a choice between approximately a.c. 90 and a.c. 70. Even then the date seems too near the critical date of Daniel to explain the rapid development the idea has undergone. In Daniel the person "like a son of man" may be a personification of Israel, though not naturally so; here in Enoch we have to do with a super-angelic being.

As to the question of the reference of the title, it has been doubted whether it is to be held as applying to the Messiah, the Messianic kingdom, or to the people of Israel. The last view is that of Hitzig and many other critics of his school. It practically involves a denial of the truth of the idea that the Jews ever had Messianic hopes. In the present case there is nothing to indicate any reference to Israel personified. While there might be some plausibility in arguing from each of the four beasts representing empires that this "Son of man" should represent an empire also; it must be observed that in all the other cases there is a peculiarity which marks off the animal as merely a symbol: the lion has wings; the bear has three ribs in its teeth; the leopard has four heads and four wings; and the last, unnamed, beast has ten heads and iron teeth. Further, this "Son of man" is brought to the Ancient of days, and does not merely appear as do the "beasts." He has thus many of the characteristics of a person. The other view, that the "Son of man" indicates the Messianic kingdom, thus comes into line with the view of Hitzig. The view that it is the Messiah who is meant by the "Son of man" was held practically by all interpreters, Jewish and Christian, until the middle of last century.

If we look at the phenomenon of prophecy, we shall find ourselves open to another view of the matter. From 1 Pet. i. 10 we see that prophets did not necessarily know the meaning of their own prophecies. It might well be, then, that to Daniel the distinction between the Messianic King and the Messianic kingdom was not one clearly apprehended. We see in the prophecies of the second Isaiah that the "servant of the Lord" is first the holy people, then the prophetic order, and latterly a person. There probably was a similar uncertainty here. If we grant this inde-

¹ 'Books which influenced our Lord and his Apostles.'

finiteness, the next question that rises is—What is the special aspect of the Messianic kingdom that is intended to be portrayed when this title is given to its King? If we are guided by what is incomparably the oldest interpretation, that of the second Book of Enoch, this title implies an incalculable dignity. When we come to our Lord's use of it in the Gospels, there is nothing to oppose this. Thus John v. 22, "And hath committed all judgment unto him, because he is the Son of man;" so Matt. ix. 6, "The Son of man hath power on earth to forgive sins." This is not contradicted by Matt. viii. 20, "The foxes have holes, . . . but the Son of man hath not where to lay his head." The emphasis of the statement lies in the contrast between the inexpressible dignity of the Person and the poverty of his earthly circumstances. It is because the ideas of superhuman dignity had been associated with the title that our Lord had, in foretelling his approaching crucifixion, to bring the two facts into close connection, "The Son of man must be lifted up." So after Peter's confession, "The Son of man must suffer many things." We see that the multitude of the Jews understood the title to have this lofty meaning, for they demand (John xii. 34), "How sayest thou, The Son of man must be lifted up? Who is this Son of man?" The attempts to make it imply something humiliating by dwelling on the fact that not *adam* or *ish* is the word for "man," but *'enosh*, are beside the question, for these deductions apply to the Hebrew words, not to the Aramaic. And in Aramaic neither *ish* nor *adam* is in common use as equivalent for "man." It is as much beside the point as if one, knowing the difference between *man* and *mann* in German, should lay stress on the fact that in this phrase in English "man" has only one *n*.

The connection of this surpassing dignity with humanity has probably deep roots in human nature. The late Professor Fuller saw reference here to the function occupied by Silik-mooloo-Khi as mediator between Hea and mankind, and to the further development of this in the Zoroastrian doctrine of a *soaiosh*, or redeemer. The full investigation of this is beside our present purpose.

Vers. 15—18.—I Daniel was grieved in my spirit in the midst of my body, and the visions of my head troubled me. I came near unto one of them that stood by, and asked him the truth of all this. So he told me, and made me know the interpretation of the things. These great beasts, which are four, are four kings, which shall arise out of the earth. But the saints of the

Most High shall take the kingdom, and possess the kingdom for ever, even for ever and ever. The version of the Septuagint differs in some points from the Massoretic. In the fifteenth verse there is no reference to the spirit being in the body; it adds "of the night" after "visions," and changes "my head" into "my thoughts." The sixteenth verse presents no essential points of difference. In the seventeenth verse the differences are more considerable, "These great beasts are four kingdoms, which shall be destroyed from the earth." There seems a good deal to be said for the reading behind this version. The first variation, "kingdoms" instead of "kings," may be due to logic, but it has further "destroyed from" instead of "arising out of," which cannot have resulted from the Massoretic. The verb *qoom*, "to stand up," followed by *min*, "from," is not elsewhere used in the sense which we find in the Massoretic here. When one is prone on the earth, as Saul before the revelation of the witch of Endor, "he stood up from the earth" (1 Sam. xxviii. 23, Targum Jonathan)—word for word as here. When Abraham (Gen. xxiii. 3, Targum Onkelos) arose from before his dead, we have a similar construction. In 2 Sam. xi. 2, "David arose from his couch." This construction involves change of position, either directly or implicitly. It is difficult to understand how the one reading arose from the other. The condensation of the sense as it appears in the Septuagint is not likely to be attained by a *falsarius*. In ver. 18 there is nothing calling for remark, save that the reduplication of "for ever and ever" is omitted. While Theodotion is nearer the Massoretic text, he too differs from it in some points—his rendering of *nidnay* by *ἐξίς*. Schleusner thinks this probably a false reading for *ἐκράδαις*. However, in Judg. xiv. 9 we have *ἐξίς* used for "body." In the seventeenth verse we have "kingdoms" instead of "kings." The last clause agrees with the Massoretic, but there is subjoined *αἱ ἀρῆσονται*, "which shall be taken away"—an addition that suggests that some of the manuscripts before Theodotion had the same reading as that before the Septuagint translator. He renders *q'qoomoon min* by *ἀναστήσονται ἐνί*, showing that at all events he had a different preposition. The reduplication of "for ever and ever" is omitted. The Peshitta ver. 15 has "in the midst of my couch" instead of "in the midst of my body." In the sixteenth verse it resolves the bystanders into "servants." In the seventeenth verse the preposition is not *min*, but *'al*. Jerome, instead of *corpus*, "body," has *in his*, "in these," as if he had read *b'id'na* instead of *nidnay*; he also

in ver. 17 reads *regna*, not *reges*. The Massoretic text has some peculiarities. The first words afford one of the rare instances where we have the 'ithpacl instead of the hithpacl; it may be due to scribal correction. In the seventeenth verse 'inoon (K'thib) affords an instance of the frequent Syriasm in Daniel. The "Most High" is rendered by a plural adjective, מְלִיכִימָּה ('*elyoneen*); it is explained differently. Kranichfeld and Stuart regard it as *pluralis excellentiæ*. Bevan and Behrmann regard it as a case of attraction, the latter giving as parallel instances, *b'nee 'ayleem* (Ps. xxix. 1) and *b'nee n'beem*. The difficulty remains that neither the *pluralis excellentiæ* nor change of number is known in Aramaic. The fact that this strange form has produced no effect on any of the versions makes the reading suspicious. Professor Fuller sees in this word a proof of Babylonian influence, but he does not assign his reason. We now enter a new stage in the development of this vision. After the wonderful assize has ended, Daniel dreams that he is still standing among these innumerable multitudes, and, feeling that all these things are symbols, he is grieved because he cannot comprehend what is meant by them. So from one of those attendants who crowd the canvas of his vision he asks an explanation, or rather "the certainty," of this vision; he wishes to know whether it is a mere vision or of the nature of a revelation. This is a perfectly natural psychological condition in dreaming. In the act of dreaming we question ourselves whether we are dreaming or not; we may even ask one of the characters in our dream the question. The interpretation is interesting, but has been already to some extent forestalled. A difficulty is seen by some commentators—how these four kingdoms could be said to arise, when one of them was nearing its fall. If we take the reading of the Septuagint, this difficulty is obviated. Saadia Gaon makes these four kings the nominative to the verb "receive" (wrongly translated in our Authorized Version, "take"), and maintains each of these empires shall hold the kingdom of Israel until the Messiah shall come. This view would necessitate grammatically that the Messiah should never come, but that the reign of these four world-empires should be prolonged into eternity. "The saints of the Most High," in the thought of Daniel, would be, of necessity, the Jews; for we need not discuss the possibility of the angels being the holy ones implied here—they always have the kingdoms of the world under them—but we may see the Israel of faith in this figure. The believers in Christ are the true Israel, and the king-

dom of heaven which Christ set up is thus promised to fill the earth. The Church is thus the true ultimate state. If we regard the Church as a society formed of those who are mutually attracted to each other, have a mutual love for each other, and have a common love to God, then all the history of the world is tending towards the establishment of such a society, universal as the world. National hatreds are much less acute now than they were. Despite the efforts to rouse class against class, there seems more sympathy between classes than there was. The final break-down of national and class oppositions, not necessarily by the abolition of either class or nation, will prepare the way for the Christ-commanded love which is the tie that unites the members of the true eternal Church of God.

Vers. 19-22.—Then I would know the truth of the fourth beast, which was diverse from all the others, exceeding dreadful, whose teeth were of iron, and his nails of brass; which devoured, brake in pieces, and stamped the residue with his feet; and of the ten horns that were in his head, and of the other which came up, and before whom three fell; even of that horn that had eyes, and a mouth that spake very great things, whose look was more stout than his fellows. I beheld, and the same horn made war with the saints, and prevailed against them; until the Ancient of days came, and judgment was given to the saints of the Most High; and the time came that the saints possessed the kingdom. In regard to the version of the LXX. here, we have the advantage of Justin Martyr's transcription, in which, however, the differences from the Chigi text are not of great importance. The LXX. here is pretty close to the Massoretic text. "Behold" has intruded into the text; it is, however, omitted from Justin Martyr. Another clause, evidently a doublet, is omitted also, and the clause assumes nearly the shape it has in Theodotion. It is difficult to imagine how the reading of the LXX. arose. The differences from the Massoretic text are for the rest not essential. This is the case with Theodotion and the Peschitta. These verses to some extent recapitulate the earlier description of this fourth beast. There are, however, features added—to the "iron teeth" of the seventh verse are added "claws of brass." The main change is in regard to the little horn that came up last. We not only learn here that three other horns were plucked up before it, but the personification is now carried further, and the horn makes war against the saints, and prevails against them. This description does not suit Epiphaneus. He certainly made war against the saints, but as certainly he did not pro-

rail against them. When he came up from Egypt, and entered into the sanctuary and plundered it, he could not be said to make war against Israel. Judæa was one of his own provinces. When a tyrannical government takes possession of the wealth and property of individuals or corporations, it may be called cruel and oppressive, but its conduct is not called war. Even the massacre of the inhabitants of Jerusalem by the collector of taxes was not war. There was no war levied by Epiphanes against the saints till Mattathias and his sons rebelled, and thereafter Epiphanes did not prevail against the Jews. The Romans did make war against Israel, and did prevail. If the saints are a nation, then Epiphanes did not prevail in war against them. If persecution is to be regarded as warfare, then it is not warfare against a nation, but against a community like a Church. If we look upon the Christian Church as succeeding to the position of Israel, then Rome persecuted the Church, and persecution ceased only when Rome became Christian. But a wider view opens itself to us. All modern states are in a sense a continuance of Rome, and so far as they do not submit themselves to the direction of Christ, they are still at war with the saints. It is only when the Son of man comes in his power that the kingdom will belong to the saints. It is to be observed, the figure of an assize is still kept up, and "judgment is given to" or "for the saints," and in virtue of this decision they possess the kingdom.

Vers. 23, 24.—Thus he said, The fourth beast shall be the fourth kingdom upon earth, which shall be diverse from all kingdoms, and shall devour the whole earth, and shall tread it down, and break it in pieces. And the ten horns out of this kingdom are ten kings that shall arise; and another shall rise after them; and he shall be diverse from the first, and he shall subdue three kings. The version of the LXX. differs in some minute points from the Massoretic text. The text as given by Justin Martyr is slightly shorter by omitting some words. Theodotion and the Peshitta also agree. What remarks can be made on this have been made already. It is to be observed that it is the whole earth that is devoured by the fourth beast as presented to us now. In the earlier presentation, although very terrible, his devastation is limited. There is nothing said to indicate that the kings are successive, but the inference rather is that they are contemporaries. The attempts are many that have been made to make out ten kings before Epiphanes, but they have all failed. If the fourth kingdom is the Greek Empire, then ten is a number far too small for the various kings of the different dynasties that

sprang up. There were seven or eight Lagida, as many Seleucida, three or four Attalida, five or six Antigonida, not to speak of such men as Lysimachus and Perdiccas, who were kings, but who did not found dynasties. If the fourth kingdom is tacitly reduced to the Syrian kingdom, then how is it explained that the author of 'Daniel' was ignorant, in the seventh chapter, that the Lagids were also successors of Alexander as well as the Seleucida? How could a man living in the age of the Maccabees imagine the Seleucida rulers of the world, when Epiphanes had been a hostage in Rome? A great power does not give, but receives, hostages. We know from First Maccabees that the Jews were well aware of this, and also of the check the Romans were on Epiphanes. Even if Daniel wrote at the time chosen by the critics, how came he to be so ignorant as to imagine the Seleucid Empire to be so tremendously great? *He shall subdue three kings.* Who are the three kings of the ten who preceded him whom Epiphanes subdued? Selencus Philopator, Heliodorus, and Demetrius Soter are given by Professor Bevan. But Demetrius Soter did not ascend the throne till after the death of Epiphanes. It is extremely doubtful whether Heliodorus ever assumed the crown. Our whole knowledge of him is from Appian. Josephus knows nothing of Heliodorus. The Second Book of Maccabees, though telling a legendary story of Heliodorus, gives no account of his murder of his master and attempt to take the crown. Our sole authority for this whole story is Appian, who wrote three centuries after the event, and manifests considerable confusion at times, e.g. represents Attalus and Eumenes as being two sovereigns independent of each other, whereas the one succeeded the other. If Selencus Philopator is to be reckoned as "subdued" or "humbled" before Epiphanes, as well might all the rest of his predecessors. The Jewish interpretation, that the little horn is the Flavian dynasty, has far more verisimilitude. Certainly Galba Vitellius and Otho had been humbled before the Flavians. If we consider the horn "magistracies," certainly the absorption into the imperial dignity of all the higher magistracies might well be reckoned humbling them.

Vers. 25—27.—And he shall speak great words against the Most High, and shall wear out the saints of the Most High, and think to change times and laws; and they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time. But the judgment shall sit, and they shall take away his dominion, to consume and to destroy it unto the end. And the kingdom

and dominion, and the greatness of the kingdom under the whole heaven, shall be given to the people of the saints of the Most High, whose kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, and all dominions shall serve and obey him. The versions do not present much of note in ver. 25, save that the Greek versions imply that dominion over all is given to the oppressors. Throughout the Septuagint has traces of explanatory expansion. *He shall speak words against the Most High.* The word "against," *'etad*, is really "to the side of." This clause may refer to blasphemy against God, but more naturally refers to self-exaltation to a place alongside of God. *Shall wear out the saints of the Most High.* Persecute them, or maintain war against them; the natural meaning of the word is "afflict." *And shall think to change times and laws.* It ought not to be "laws," in the plural, but "law." It may refer to the marked changes introduced into the calendar by Julius Cæsar. Certainly the law or constitution of the Roman state was changed by him. *And they shall be given into his hand until a time and times and the dividing of time.* Who shall be given into his hands? It is usually assumed that it is the saints; but the LXX. asserts that it is universal dominion that is given into the hands of the oppressors. We have no right to assume that *'iddan*, "a time," means "a year;" it is really any defined time. Certainly it does approximate to the time during which the temple was polluted with heathen offerings; but it also coincides with equal accuracy to the campaigns of Vespasian and Titus against the Jews. Vespasian landed in Galilee in the beginning of A.D. 67, and Jerusalem fell on September 5, A.D. 70. There was thus, approximately, three years and a half occupied by this war. But "centuries" might also be meant. From the birth of our Lord, on whom the oppression was first exercised, till the accession of Constantine, was three centuries and a portion of a century. *The judgment shall sit.* Not necessarily the last judgment, but the evil that is being done comes before God for judgment. The taking away of the kingdom and dominion is immediately at the end of the period indicated by "a time and times and a dividing of time." The dominion was not taken away from Epiphanes then, nor from Vespasian; it did, however, pass from the heathenish empire when Constantine ascended the throne. At the same time, any such purely limited explanation is against the whole symbolic character of this vision. It is a period of time measured by "seven" *halves*. The times may receive their definition, not from the calendar, but from their spiritual import or dynamic content. The

three years of our Lord's ministry is of more moment for the history of the race than all the millennia that preceded it.

Ver. 28.—Hitherto is the end of the matter. As for me Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me, and my countenance changed in me; but I kept the matter in my heart. The first clause here is in the LXX. joined to the preceding verse, and rendered, "And all power shall be given to him, and they shall obey him to the end of the matter"—a connection that in many ways is suitable. The difficulty is thrown further back. To whom is this power to be given, and whom are all to obey? The Septuagint clearly takes the reference to be to the little horn, as "end" is rendered by *καταστροφή*. The more common view is that of Kliefoth, Keil, and others, and is that the reference here is to the Son of man as the Head or the embodiment of the Messianic kingdom. The remaining portion of the verse is rendered, "I Daniel was exceedingly overcome with astonishment, and my habit (*ἔξυς*) was changed to me, and the word I confirmed in my heart"—a translation that does not seriously differ from the Massoretic. Theodotion and the Peshitta render from a text practically identical with the Massoretic. *As for me Daniel, my cogitations much troubled me.* The prophet himself did not understand the revelation that had been made to him, even after he had received the explanation. Further, there was the thought of the distress that would befall his own people. *And my countenance changed in me.* "My splendour," "brightness." Daniel was now an old man; but yet there might be a certain brightness, the remains of his former personal beauty. He becomes pale and emaciated as he meditates on what he has seen. *But I kept the matter in my heart.* Thus Mary retained in her heart all the wonders she had seen regarding her Son. This statement is introduced as a guarantee that the vision is correctly recorded. Daniel retained the vision in his mind, and so was ready to recognize the fulfilment of a portion.

Excursus on the Four Monarchies of Daniel.

Among the visions in Daniel, two are conspicuous as being all but universally acknowledged to be parallel to each other—to be twofold symbols of the same great truth. They have this peculiarity, that they are parts of the Aramaic portion of Daniel, which is otherwise mainly historical. The first of these visions is given to Nebuchadnezzar, and is intensified to him by the fact that after he had forgotten it, or had bound himself not to tell it, it is recalled

to him by the grace of God, who had given it in a new vision to Daniel. The king dreams of a colossal image, with head of gold, arms and chest of silver, belly and thighs of brass, legs of iron, and feet partly of iron and partly of clay. Then suddenly a stone, cut out of the mountains without hands, smites the image on the feet, and it falls and becomes as the small dust of the threshing-floor, and is carried away of the wind, while the stone becomes a great mountain and fills the earth. This is interpreted of four successive monarchies, the first of these being the Babylonian. This vision is narrated in the second chapter, which forms the beginning of the Aramaic portion of Daniel.

The second vision is given to Daniel himself, and is related in the seventh chapter, which forms the conclusion of the Aramaic portion of Daniel. This is a vision of four beasts that successively rise out of the great sea, presumably the Mediterranean. The first beast was like a lion, and had wings like an eagle; its wings were plucked, and a man's heart was given to it. The second beast was like a bear, that raised itself up on one side, and had in its jaws three ribs. The third beast was like a leopard which had four wings. The fourth beast was great and terrible, unlike any of the former beasts, breaking in pieces and trampling under foot. It had ten horns. In the midst of its horns another, an eleventh horn, sprang up, and there were rooted out before it three of the former horns. At this point the end of the solemn drama is placed—God, the Ancient of Days, appears to judgment. Then comes a Son of man in the heavens, and the dominion is given to him. Thus the judgment here described is not the final judgment. The fourth beast is burnt up with fire; the other beasts have their dominion taken away. The interpretation follows, which makes the four beasts four kings, or four monarchies. The fourth is to be diverse from all its predecessors, and to make war against the people of God.

Such, then, are the visions, the interpretation of which we would now essay. It has generally been assumed that these two visions are really two aspects of one and the same great scheme of history. Two different interpreters, proceeding on totally distinct lines, deny the identity of the meaning of these two visions. The first is Hitzig, who, while he makes the two series terminate at the same point, makes a difference between them in regard to the earlier members. According to his scheme, in Nebuchadnezzar's dream the first two portions—the golden head and the silver shoulders—are the two monarchs Nebu-

chadnezzar and Belshazzar, whereas the latter two are empires; the third, the Medo-Persian; and the fourth, the Greek. He, however, takes the second series of symbols, that of the beasts in the seventh chapter, as all monarchies. Hitzig assigns no very clear reason for his change in view—for taking the four beasts as four distinct monarchies, and splitting the Medo-Persian into the Median and Persian. The other interpreter, who divides the two visions, is Dr. Bonnar, of East Kilbride, in his book 'The Great Interregnum.' He maintains that the vision of the seventh chapter represents history posterior to that symbolized by the vision of Nebuchadnezzar. His main argument for this is that the same truth would not be present in two different sets of symbols. That difficulty would not be urged by any one who had studied the non-canonical apocalypses; there repeatedly are there double sets of symbols.¹ The number of the kingdoms, being four, points to an identity, as also the fact that both assert that the Messianic kingdom—the *terminus ad quem* of all apocalypse—will be revealed after the setting up of the fourth kingdom without any intercalated power. We shall, then, assume these two visions to present the same scheme of universal history under different aspects.

When we look at this double vision, the first thing that strikes us is the unique breadth of view exhibited. If we may for the nonce accept the traditional interpretation, we see the whole course of history, from the days of Nimrod down to the present time, portrayed; nay, beyond the present, on to the millennium and the last judgment. It seems difficult to imagine that a nameless Jew, living in the days of Epiphanes, could devise such a scheme of universal history. It may be answered that, according to the critical hypothesis, he brought down his scheme only to the days of Epiphanes, and that he expected the advent of the Messiah during the persecution of those days. This does not lessen the marvel, but really increases it, that a man, intending to portray in symbol history up only to his own day, has given a pictorial representation which has been interpreted by the great majority of those following him—some as near as the very century following that in which he lived—as referring to events that were not in the faintest degree showing above the horizon in his day. On the hypothesis that he was an inspired prophet, and spoke words full of a significance which he did not grasp

¹ A similar instance of duplication of symbols—which, though not apocalyptic, is very pertinent—is the twofold dream of Pharaoh.

himself, this is easily explicable. Only, if this explanation be granted, there is no need for placing Daniel so late as the days of the Maccabees. If the scheme of history he unfolds applies to centuries beyond the days of the Maccabees, these events so portrayed beforehand would be as invisible to the critical pseudo-Daniel living *B.C.* 160 as to the real Daniel living *B.C.* 560.

We ought not scientifically to assume, without proof, that prophecy that foretells is impossible. Yet this is the assumption of the critical school. If the critics do venture to take up that position, they have to explain the universal belief in something akin to this foretelling prophecy. Herbert Spencer explains instinctive beliefs of this kind as the inherited result of experience. If we apply this to the belief in prophecy, then we must maintain that some earlier generations have had experience of foretelling prophecy. If, then, prophecy did exist at one time, we may not assume its non-existence at any given time. We find from Deut. xviii. 22 that the Jews believed in foretelling prophecy. "When a prophet speaketh in the name of the Lord, if the thing follow not, nor come to pass, that is the thing which the Lord hath not spoken, but the prophet hath spoken it presumptuously." The early Christians believed in prophecy that foretold; their whole argument against the Jews was the recital of what the prophets had spoken. To deny that prophecy foretells is to assert that Christianity is founded on a gigantic blunder. Closely connected with this is the belief that the prophets did not necessarily comprehend the meaning of their own words, as in 1 Pet. i. 11 we are told that they had to "search what, and what manner of time the Spirit which was in them did signify." This is involved in the primitive idea of prophecy, and inspiration, as may be seen by the oracles. The priestesses that gave the enigmatic answer at Delphi was not supposed to know what was the meaning of her own words. The whole critical assumption that the words of a prophet were *absolutely* conditioned by his environment, is utterly unscientific, as all unproved assumptions are. On the ground of that gratuitous assumption, critics have no right to assert that no more can be in a prophecy than the prophet who uttered it could have fully understood.

We would make another preliminary observation. Apocalypse was a mode of composition of which we have many examples—one other besides Daniel being canonical. To understand Daniel, then, we ought to apply the canons of interpretation which may be deduced from other apocalypses, especially from the Book of Revelation. One of these that is of special

importance is the way numbers are used as marks by which identities are indicated. Thus in Revelation the dragon, the beast that came out of the waters, and the scarlet beast on which the woman sat, are recognized to be all symbols of one and the same antichristian power—Rome, by the fact that always we have the seven heads and ten horns prominent. Towards God it is diabolism, towards the saints it is a devouring beast, and to the world at large the "harlot." On the other hand, the beast that came out of the earth, that had two horns, is different.

If we apply this principle to Daniel, we can maintain the identity of the two visions—before us: first, because each had *four* members; next, we can identify the fourth kingdom in each series by the facts that there are *ten* toes to the feet of the image, and *ten* horns upon the fourth beast—the prominence of the number *ten* proves the identity of the two. The second empire in the image has duality as its ruling mark—there are the two shoulders; and the bear raises itself up on *one* side, implying the other. This twofoldness is intensified in the vision of the "ram" and "he-goat;" the ram has *two* horns. The third monarchy has no number prominent in the image-vision, but has *four* wings as the third beast. When we pass to the next vision, we find that, when the "he-goat" loses his notable horn, *four* others spring up. And in the eleventh chapter the empire of Alexander was divided to the *four* winds of heaven.

While this is an affirmative principle, it is also a negative one. On the ground of the identity of prominent numbers, we may assume the identity of the thing symbolized, though symbolized by diverse symbols; on the other hand, where prominent numbers are diverse, notwithstanding a general resemblance, we can assume a diversity in the thing symbolized. Thus the little horn of the eighth chapter is very like, superficially, to the eleventh horn of the seventh chapter; but the difference of numerical relations compels us to regard them as symbols of different things. It was the identity here assumed that led Delitzsch to abandon the traditional view of the fourth monarchy, and give in his adhesion to the critical view. When, however, we look at the numerical relations of the two, we find they are wholly different. In the seventh chapter the eleventh horn does not belong to any of the previous horns, and dispossesses three of them; on the other hand, the little horn of the eighth chapter springs out from one of the *four* horns—it is not an independent horn, but a sprout from one of the extant horns. Further, there are no horns dispossessed or uprooted before it. These

prominent differences override the resemblance of the one having a mouth speaking great things and making war with the saints, and the other being a king that understood dark sentences, and made war against Messiah the Prince. Notwithstanding this superficial resemblance, we are compelled to maintain the real difference. Surely more than one tyrant made war against the saints and persecuted them. At all events, this must be said—that the numerical difference renders it illegitimate to draw any argument from the purely superficial resemblance above referred to.

Having considered these preliminaries, let us look now at the various interpretations that have been put forward of these visions. First, there is the common, as it may be called, the traditional view, which, as we all know, makes the first empire the Babylonian, the second the Medo-Persian, the third the Greek, and the fourth the Roman. This view is repudiated with one consent by all critics; to admit that the Roman was intended would be to admit that prophecy foretold, and that, Scripture notwithstanding, is tacitly assumed to be impossible. Mere negation is not enough; it is necessary to replace the ancient view by some other that will enable the interpreter to say that not the Roman, but the Greek, is the fourth empire.

The problem before critical interpreters, then, is to show how there can be four monarchies beginning with Nebuchadnezzar and ending with the Greek, or at all events the Seleucid Empire. We may neglect a scheme referred to Ewald by Pusey, but which in his Commentary on Daniel Ewald does not adopt, namely, that the Ninevite monarchy is the first, and the Babylonian the second. This interpretation contradicts the words of Daniel when he interprets the dream to Nebuchadnezzar. He says to Nebuchadnezzar, "Thou art this head of gold." This hypothesis belongs to the theory that Daniel was taken captive from the northern kingdom, and dwelt in Nineveh, not in Babylon. It is utterly without evidence. Neglecting this fanciful view, there are other three schemes. It is obvious that, if three of the four monarchies of the traditional view are to be made out to be four, this can only be done by splitting one of these monarchies into two. We shall classify these views in accordance with this, and take them up in the order of the monarchies they divide.

The first is Hitzig's theory with regard to the interpretation of the image-dream. He splits up the Babylonian kingdom, and makes "the head of gold" apply only to Nebuchadnezzar personally, and says that the shoulders of silver are the symbol of

the reign of Belshazzar. The Medo-Persian is the third monarchy, and the fourth monarchy is the Greek. As we have already said, Hitzig does not apply this to the later vision of the four beasts coming out of the sea: this itself would go far to condemn his view. But when we examine the vision, we find many things in it that do not suit with this interpretation. There is, in the first place, a decided want of symmetry in it. The "head of gold" is Nebuchadnezzar personally; the arms and breast of silver symbolize Belshazzar as a person; but the belly and thighs of brass are the symbol of the Medo-Persian Empire, and the legs of iron the Greek Empire. Here are two individuals and two monarchies made co-ordinate. Usually historians become more diffuse and particular the nearer they come to their own date; but if the author of Daniel lived in the days of the Maccabees, then on this hypothesis he was more diffuse and particular in an age removed from him by three centuries. Further, the twofoldness implied in the two arms which form the symbol of the second kingdom has no meaning in regard to Belshazzar, unless Hitzig were prepared to admit the reference to the fact that Belshazzar reigned along with Nabunahid his father—a view which contradicts his assumption that Belshazzar is the literal son of Nebuchadnezzar. We may dismiss Hitzig's view of the interpretation of the image-vision as unsatisfactory. Further, we may assume that the first monarchy is the Babylonian.

The great mass of critical commentators divide the second empire of the traditional interpretation into two, and maintain that the author of the Book of Daniel believed that there was a Median Empire between the Babylonian and the Persian. Of this Mr. Bevan declares, with the modesty peculiar to the critical school, that "there can be no doubt it is correct." This is the view maintained by Porphyry and Ephrem Syrus. It is deduced from the fact that Ephrem Syrus holds it, that it must have been known to the Jews of the fourth century. With these exceptions, all ancient authorities support what we have called the traditional view. We will not plead against this critical view the fact that no such empire did actually come between Cyrus's conquest and the fall of the Babylonian Empire. All that we will endeavour to do is to see whether the Book of Daniel assumes such an interpolated empire or not—whether it does not persistently assume a dual empire of Medes and Persians.

The first thing we would note is that invariably the symbol of this second empire implies duality. The two arms of the

image show it clearly. Dr. Davidson, in his short article on Bevan's 'Daniel' in the *Critical Review*, remarks that the second beast which lifted itself up on one side implied that same duality. When we turn to the eighth chapter, we find a ram with two horns, the one of which that came up last outgrew the one that sprang up earlier. There we find the same duality in unity as symbolized in the other symbols. That one of the two elements should be the more powerful is implied in the bear that raised itself up on one side. Mr. Bevan thinks the two horns indicate two successive empires. To apply Mr. Bevan's own words to himself, "No one who had not a hopeless cause to defend" would use such an argument. In the he-goat there are horns too. Mr. Bevan does not think that there are two different kinds of empire symbolized by the one horn and the four. If it had been said, in regard to the ram, that the earlier horn had been rooted up before that which came up later, Mr. Bevan might have had some greater show of argument for his position, though even then the fourth beast has three horns rooted out, and he does not maintain that a new race enters into a position of prominence. Like other critics, Mr. Bevan is apt to forget a canon when it does not suit him to apply it. Let Mr. Bevan endeavour to frame a symbolic animal figure which shall represent one empire in which there are two ruling races, kindred yet distinct, one of which had from a position of inferiority gained the superiority. He would be compelled to devise something that would be very like the two-horned ram, and liable to the same misinterpretations as those he has made in regard to it. No one can deny that the Persian Empire presented a dual aspect to those outside. In Herodotus and Thucydides *Μηδική* is to side with the Persians. While Herodotus calls the great Persian war *τὰ Περσικά*, Thucydides always speaks of it as *τὰ Μηδικά*; he calls the battle of Marathon, *ἡ ἐν Μαραθῶνι μάχη Μήδων πρὸς Ἀθηναίους*. At the same time, Herodotus knows the distinction of the races. Æschylus, who encountered the Persians at Salamis, in 'The Persæ' begins the Persian Empire with a Mede, Astyages or Cyaxares—

Μήδων γὰρ ἦν ὁ πρῶτος ἡγεμὼν στρατοῦ.

As late as the days of Horace, this freedom of use of the words "Mede" and "Persian" was common. Such being the case, the natural thing for a Jew living in the days of the Maccabees, whose sources of information in regard to ancient foreign history were mainly, if not exclusively, Greek, would be to identify the Median and Persian monarchies. Certainly the

existence of an independent empire of Medes succeeding that of Babylon, and overthrown by Cyrus, is not hinted at in other Scriptures. The critical hypothesis is that the author of the Book of Daniel was well acquainted with Jeremiah and Kings, and made up the book before us in accord with them. What led him to make this division, if he made it? We should need very conclusive evidence that the author, whoever he was, did make the distinction. To bring forward as evidence the statement that "Darius the Mede received the kingdom," "*was made king*," appears to prove the writer incapable of apprehending the nature of evidence. When a man *receives* a kingdom, or is *made king*, this implies a higher power, as in Luke xix. 12. As to the fact that *כִּלְכַּל* in the pael means "receive," not "take," we may appeal to Ewald, who translates it by *empfang*; to Levy, in whose Aramaic dictionary all the references to the Targumic use of the word show that it means "receive," not "take," as Numb. xxiv. 3, *לֹא יִקְבָּלְךָ מִן אֵשׁ יְהוָה*. Mr. Bevan does not dispute this, but attempts to get round it by asserting that the phrases in question mean that he, Darius, was made king by God. That, however, is without justification: in such case the real agent would be mentioned in the immediate context, as in the example Mr. Bevan takes from ch. v. 28, "Thy kingdom is divided, and given to the Medes and the Persians;" in ver. 26 it is said, "God hath numbered thy kingdom." Professor Bevan (p. 20) says there is an instance in a Syriac historian, whom he does not name, where the same words are used of the accession of Julian the Apostate. That a Christian writer should use *כִּלְכַּל* of Julian the Apostate's accession is nothing to the point. Christianity has emphasized the supremacy of Providence. Further, Julian, expecting to have to conquer the throne, by the unexpected death of Constantius received it as an inheritance.

But the proofs of the unity of the empire of the Medes and the Persians are numerous in Daniel. When Daniel interpreted the inscription on the wall, he had before him *Upharsin*, "and fragments;" he sees in this that the Babylonian kingdom would be broken by the Persians—an interpretation that involves a play on the words *סַבְרָא*, "to divide," and *סַבְרָא*, "a Persian;" there is nothing about *Medes* in the inscription. Yet Daniel says the kingdom is given to the *Medes and the Persians*. Further, the prophecy which declared that the Babylonian Empire would be overthrown by the Persians is regarded as fulfilled when Darius the Mede receives the kingdom.

Again, when Darius publishes the decree that condemns Daniel to the lions' den, he is moved to establish the decree "according to the law of the Medes and Persians, which altereth not." When Darius would rescind the decree, he is met by this immutability of the laws of the *Medes* and the *Persians*. If the empire was *Median*, why was the name *Persian* appended thus? If it be objected that *Medes* is placed before *Persians*, Dr. Pusey rightly remarks that this is in all likelihood due to the court politeness of those about a Median satrap, or king. Boys in Scotland often play at a game which they invariably call "Scotch and English," never "English and Scotch," yet the disparity in population, extent, and influence is greater between England and Scotland than that between Persia and Media. If one had no end to serve by denying it, it would seem impossible to deny that the Persian Empire was regarded as a dual empire by the author of the Book of Daniel; and that, in his view, in this empire the Mede had almost an equal place with the Persian; that, in short, in the Persian Empire the Medes occupied much the same position as the Scotch do in the English.

A subsidiary argument for making the second empire the Median as distinct from the Persian, is the fact that the second empire is declared to be *inferior* to the first. It is gratuitously assumed that this means inferiority in extent of dominion, and thus it is alleged that this independent Median Empire which succeeded the Babylonian was inferior in extent to it. One can assert anything of an empire that never existed. Mr. Bevan seems to lay stress on the fact that the word *אֲחֵרָה*, "inferior," is only used of the silver kingdom, and holds that the idea of inferiority is not carried forward. Had Mr. Bevan not determined beforehand to make the division in question between Medes and Persians, and seen that, to maintain this, he had to assume the inferiority as only applicable to the first, he would have recognized that the word in question is merely explanatory of the relative inferiority of the metal used to symbolize the second kingdom, and its lower position in the figure. That being so, he would not have failed to see that if silver is inferior to gold, then brass is inferior to silver, and iron to brass, and clay to iron. In fact, there is a progressive degradation in the metals, which harmonizes with the lower and lower position in the figure assigned to each. No one could regard the Persian Empire as inferior in extent to the Babylonian. Still less could any one regard the Greek as inferior in extent to the Persian. As the inferiority of the successive empires is not

in extent of territory, this affords no shadow of proof that there was a Median Empire between the Babylonian and the Persian. We may, then, assume this theory as disproved.

A third set of critics divide the Greek monarchy. They assume that the third monarchy is that of Alexander the Great, and that the fourth is that of the Diadochi. It is perfectly true that the four wings on the back of the leopard signify rapidity of movement, and this was the pre-eminent characteristic of Alexander's conquest. Certainly, also, there was great division among the successors of Alexander which *might* be symbolized by the ten horns, though the separate kingdoms never approached that number. But no one could say of the empire of the Diadochi that it was utterly diverse from what had preceded. The various dynasties that succeeded Alexander really continued his influence. No one could say that as iron breaketh in pieces, and subdueth all things, so the feeble kingdom of the Diadochi subdued all kingdoms. If it is restricted to the Selencids in Syria, it is still less true. Parthia broke away from them, and Bactria formed a separate kingdom. If, latterly, they secured Cœle-Syria from the Lagids, it was only towards the end of the reign of Antiochus the Great. Before that they had been beaten back again and again. Further, this scheme lacks symmetry; the first and second as also the fourth beasts, symbolize empires; the third, only the reign of one individual monarch. We must, then, declare this third hypothesis as untenable.

We may neglect the interpretation quoted by Mr. Bevan, which made the fourth monarchy Islam, and reduced the monarchies to four, either by combining the Babylonian and Persian monarchies, or the Greek and the Roman. Islam did not dispossess the empire of Rome. Roman imperialism exists yet. The Emperors of Austria and Germany claim to be successors of the Emperors of the West, and the Czar of Russia asserts himself the successor of the Emperors of the East. We may also neglect Dr. Bonnar's hypothesis, that makes the four beasts symbolize—the first, the Holy Roman Empire; the second, Napoleon the Great; the third, the hegemony of the Anglo-Saxon race in Britain and America; the fourth, the anarchists.

Let us look at the despised traditional view. It starts, like all the others, with the Babylonian. We are told that Daniel informed Nebuchadnezzar that he was the head of gold. The winged lion with human heart was a meet symbol of that Assyrian power which, alike in Nineveh and Babylon, rejoiced in winged, human-headed

animal figures. The second empire has duality for its numerical note—two arms, two sides, and, in the case of the ram, *two* horns. This is a natural symbol for the Medo-Persian power. The animal that symbolizes it—the bear, with its relatively slow movements—represents well the comparatively slow progress of Persian conquests, compared with those either of Nebuchadnezzar or of Alexander. What seems to us to demonstrate the correctness of this view is the fact that the ram, which symbolizes the Medo-Persian Empire in the eighth chapter, has, as we have said, the numerical note *two*.

The third empire is the Greek. It has *four* as its numerical note. The leopard has *four* wings. The goat that symbolizes Greece in the eighth chapter has *four* horns. These wings are the symbol of rapidity of movement. As a matter of history, the conquests of Alexander were made with extreme rapidity. He ascended the throne of Macedonia, a youth of twenty, in B.C. 336. In two years he had subdued the whole Balkan peninsula. In B.C. 334 he crossed the Hellespont, and in ten years he had conquered Asia to the Oxus and the Indus, and Egypt to the cataracts of the Nile. Cyrus, after a reign of more than twice the length, had not made nearly as extensive conquests. On the ground of the suitability of the symbol to the facts of the Greek conquest, we would say that the third empire is that of Alexander and his successors. The symbol in the image-vision is not so clear, but the metal, bronze, was one that was much used by the Greeks for armour, and, moreover, was eminently suitable for artistic purposes; hence it was a suitable symbol for the Greek power.

On this traditional theory the fourth empire is the Roman. Mr. Bevan tells us, as we have said, that Ephrem Syrus, in the fourth century, held that the Greek Empire was the fourth. He "doubtless," says Mr. Bevan, "derived it"—this view—"from Jewish tradition." We have evidence that the common Jewish belief, much earlier than the fourth century, the time of Ephrem Syrus, was that the fourth empire was the Roman. The Fourth Book of Esdras, which is dated by most critics A.D. 90, though by some put more than a century earlier, describes the Roman power as an eagle, and tells of the various emperors, and expressly identifies this with the fourth beast of Daniel.

We have spoken of the New Testament Apocalypse. There are three beasts introduced with ten horns; two of these are certainly Rome, and the fourth beast in Daniel has ten horns. Evidently, then, the Apostle John has no doubt as to the refer-

ence of Daniel's beast with ten horns. The Apocalypse of Baruch was probably written in B.C. 60, and there the Roman power is expressly designated as the fourth kingdom. Here is direct evidence, coming down to little more than a century after the critical date of Daniel, that in Jewish opinion the fourth empire in Daniel was the Roman.

We admit there are difficulties in interpreting the features of this fourth monarchy. In approaching this part of our subject, we would lay it down as a principle that, in interpreting apocalyptic writings, we are to be guided by notes of interpretation to be found in them. One of these notes of interpretation we find in Rev. xvii. 9, "The seven heads are seven mountains, and they are seven kings." Here we find the numerical note which points out the city of Rome. The number *seven* has two meanings: "mountains," the seven hills of Rome; and "seven kings," presumably the seven rulers of Rome, Nero being the seventh and Pompey the first. There may be a reference to the seven kings of Rome. Whatever the interpretation here, at all events this much is clear—the symbols carry double. This is directly in the teeth of the assumption of the critical school, that if a symbol means one thing, it cannot at the same time mean another. With this principle, let us approach this symbol of the ten horns. The magistracies of Rome were, roughly speaking, ten—two consuls, originally two prætors, two censors, and four tribunes. The imperial power was utterly unknown to the Roman constitution; but it, coming up after the others, absorbed the power of three of these magistracies—the tribunitian, the prætorian, and censorial. Certainly the imperial dignity had a mouth speaking great things. Not only was the emperor regularly deified on his decease, but even during his life he was saluted as a present deity. Temples were erected to Augustus during his lifetime, and Caius Caligula could hardly be restrained from compelling the Jews to worship his statue. But these horns may not only be co-ordinate and contemporary, but also successive. From the standpoint of Judaism, what was the greatest injury inflicted on the holy people by Rome? Was it not indubitably the capture of Jerusalem by Titus under the auspices of his father Vespasian? Now, if we include in the rank of rulers Pompey, who certainly had *burned* in his personality upon the Jews by his profanation of the temple, and certainly bulked more largely in the eye of every one, Romans or foreigners, than any preceding Roman, as we may see by reading Cicero, 'Pro Lege Maniliâ,' then Vespasian was the eleventh ruler, and before him

three emperors, Galba, Vitellius, Otho, had been removed.

The interpretation is not yet exhausted. It has been recognized that the two legs represent the twofold division of the empire into eastern and western. Although this was only made actual by Diocletian, the division existed in reality from the first between the subjects speaking Latin and those speaking Greek. Taking this as our starting-point, there could easily be enumerated ten powers, Eastern and Western, that may form the ten toes of the image. The number ten is not to be taken with arithmetical exactness. The imperial power of Russia may be symbolized as that which, arising beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire and of the kingdoms formed from it, seems likely to overstep her present limits, and, it may well be, shall swallow up three other powers. This latter interpretation we merely throw out as suggestive.

The critical school have some difficulty in making out their ten rulers, who are symbolized by the ten horns. Porphyry drew on the Egyptian Ptolemies to fill out the deficiencies of the Seleucids. That is evidently an illicit process. The more general scheme now is to start with Alexander the Great, then take the successive Seleucids; as they are not enough, Heliodorus, who never was king, is inserted. If, however, the fourth beast is the Greek power, and Alexander is to be taken as the first monarch, then all his successors, Lagids, Antigonids, and Attalids, as well as Seleucids, have to be reckoned—a number to be counted by scores rather than tens. Were it not for the necessity they are under to make the fourth monarchy the Greek, this attempt would have been acknowledged to be a failure.

Before we leave this, we must consider this point—the growing degradation of the powers that succeed the Babylonian. In what sense could Babylon be the head of gold, while Persia was silver, Greece bronze, and Rome iron? It is evident that this inferiority is not one of extent of territory; for the successive monarchies were each more extensive geographically than its predecessor. In what, then, consists the inferiority? The only suggestion that seems to me at all to meet the case, is one made by Dr. Bonnar of East Kilbride, in his ingenious book, 'The Great Interregnum.' In looking at this question, we must begin by divesting ourselves of all our preconceived notions of representative government and freedom of the people, in fact, all our Western ideas, and look at monarchy with the eyes of an Oriental. To an Oriental that monarchy is highest that is likest

Divine sovereignty. Only the most absolute monarch can at all, in idea, represent Divine sovereignty. The Babylonian government had this absoluteness—the king's will was law, without check or limitation. This, as the likeliest to the Divine government, was the head of gold. The Persian monarch had the seven nobles—so to say, peers of the crown—that limited his authority. The hereditary satraps formed a further limitation. This was silver, not gold. This monarchy had still much of the Divine absoluteness in it, but not so much as the Babylonian. The Greek Empire still retained many of the features of Oriental absoluteness, as many of the features of Oriental magnificence, but they limited their own authority by the introduction of autonomous cities all over their dominions. Along with the Greek city life there was a certain independence and freedom assigned to the individual, that limited the action of the monarch. He was no longer removed from all men by an immense distance; with all his absoluteness, he was a Greek among Greeks. Still, the idea of the monarchy was kept up. There is thus a further degradation—the age of bronze is reached; the age of gold is past, and even that of silver. With Rome, the empire that was diverse from all others, the monarchical idea disappeared. The emperor was simply *Imperator* of a republic. He might be deified in his lifetime, might wield absolute power in actuality, but in idea he was but the servant of the Roman Republic. The bronze had given place to iron. If we carry our eyes down the ages to the kingdoms that have succeeded the Roman Empire, monarchy has ceased to have much power at all. The iron now is mingled with the miry clay. The progress of constitutional history all over the world has been the lessening of government authority, and setting the individual free. The stone cut out of the mountain, so far as material goes, is at a still lower level in regard to value than the iron mingled with the miry clay. Individualism becomes absolute in Christianity when the believer, in exercise of his absolute personal right over himself, surrenders himself absolutely into the hands of Christ.

The Messianic kingdom, foreseen by the prophet, and foretold in the stone in the vision of the image, and in the Son of man in that of the four beasts, looks forward to a time beyond the present, when all civil governments will have ceased, when the Church shall be manifest as the true state, when Christ, the Anointed of the Lord, alone shall reign. This prophecy is not fulfilled in Christ's coming in weakness as the Babe at Bethlehem, nor in his life of

sorrow and death, of shame and suffering. No; it is in his coming the second time unto salvation. It is failure to realize this that leads Bishop Westcott to maintain the fourth monarchy to be the Greek. He somehow thinks that the fourth kingdom must have passed away before the Messiah comes. But in the image-vision the stone was cut out of the mountain before the image had disappeared. When a person approaches this subject with a set of pre-suppositions, he is all the less likely to

reach a true conclusion. Looked at in the way it presents itself to us, this sublime scheme of universal history terminates only when the kingdoms of this world are become the kingdoms of our God and of his Christ; when the promise made to the Son by the Father, that he should have the heathen for his inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for his possession, shall be fulfilled. Only some such time of universal peace can adequately conclude history and fulfil prophecy.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—12.—*Godless kingdoms.* Daniel's vision brings before us the origin, the character, and the destiny of godless kingdoms.

I. ORIGIN. 1. *Earthly.* The Divine kingdom comes from *above*—"with the clouds of heaven" (ver. 13). These kingdoms come from *below*—from the dark depths of the sea. Earthly passions, not the will of God, shape their origin. 2. *Tumultuous.* "The four winds of heaven strove upon the great sea;" the kingdoms issued from the throes of the storm. The great monarchies of antiquity did not grow up by the development of peaceful arts and commerce. They were formed by wars of conquest, and wild, wicked strifes of ambition. The glory of political success often leads men to disregard the crimes by which it is achieved. But these cannot be ignored by God. 3. *Successive.* One after another the great beasts rise from the sea. God's kingdom is one and lasting, but as these earthly kingdoms are transient, new kingdoms take the place of the old. Thus the same drama is reacted in many ages. Till the reign of Christ is complete, we must expect to see the rise and fall of earthly ambition.

II. CHARACTER. 1. *Points of agreement.* (1) They are all more or less *brutal*. To Nebuchadnezzar the kingdoms appeared bright and glorious (ch. ii. 31). To Daniel, the prophet of God, they appeared savage and brutal. The passions of godless politics are low and unspiritual. (2) They are *destructive*. The true end of government is the peace and welfare of the world. But it has always been the work of wicked ambitious monarchies to spread devastation and misery. 2. *Points of difference.* The great beasts are "diverse one from another." Nationalities are of various types. The faults of governments are not all alike. Evil assumes various forms. All godless kingdoms are not equally bad. In the vision, the first kingdom shows signs of improvement in its later days (ver. 4). The second is far more destructive (ver. 5). The last power is least in apparent size, yet most fatal to its neighbours (ver. 8). Thus human history is full of variety, change, and surprise. It is only in the Divine order that we meet with assured and peaceful stability.

III. THEIR DESTINY. 1. They are all only *temporary*. One succeeds another. 2. They all come up for *judgment* (ver. 10). There is a judgment on nations as well as on individuals. The proudest earthly power must bow before the judgment-seat of God. They who ignore God will not escape his notice. 3. As there are degrees and varieties of crime, so there will be *degrees and varieties of punishment*. The worst of the great beasts is entirely destroyed (ver. 11). The others are dealt with more leniently. Thus at the great judgment the sentence will be proportionate to the sin (Luke xii. 47, 48). 4. The godless kingdoms will all be *superseded* by the universal and eternal *kingdom of heaven*. God's righteous rule will ultimately take the place of the most violent and destructive earthly powers. Evil will finally succumb to good.

Ver. 10.—*God's books.* "The books were opened."

I. GOD HAS BOOKS. 1. *The book of remembrance.* (1) God keeps a record of his people's troubles (Ps. lvi. 8). He is not ignorant of them, nor indifferent to them. He takes notice and gives sympathy. He will take account of them in the future, turning them to good, or compensating for the endurance of them. (2) God keeps an account of his people's faithfulness (Mal. iii. 16). Though they appear to be forgotten,

their humble service is all noted. (3) God preserves a remembrance of men's sins. God forgets sin when he forgives it, but till then our forgetting it does not remove it from his book of remembrance, any more than our forgetting a bond releases us from the obligation of it when it is presented. 2. *The book of life.* St. Paul refers to those "whose names are written in the book of life" (Phil. iv. 3; see also Exod. xxxii. 33; Rev. iii. 5). God preserves a record of the heirs of eternal life. He knows them, if men do not. He takes note of them individually; their names are written. The world is redeemed, not in the mass, but individually. Each one of us either has or has not his name written down in the "book of life." The most important question for each to ask is whether his name is there. 3. *The book of the future.* The future is known to God, and the course of providence and redemption by which he will work out his purposes of righteousness and mercy is determined (Rev. v. 1). Sudden changes surprise us, but they were anticipated by God. There is no chance, but an overruling wisdom fixes the great landmarks of the future.

II. GOD'S BOOKS ARE SEALED. 1. *The book of remembrance is sealed.* We have no present visible proof that God notes our trouble, our fidelity, or our sin. We may forget our past, and it will lie hidden and silent. 2. *The book of life is sealed.* (1) We may have sure evidences of our redemption, but we cannot directly read our names in the book of life. Perhaps the reason for this is that we may walk by faith and experience its discipline. (2) We cannot read the names of others. Therefore we cannot pronounce judgment on them, nor say how many or who will be saved. 3. *The book of the future is sealed.* Prophecy has extracted a few pages. But the great volume will only be unrolled as it is accomplished. It is best that we should not know the future, as we only have sufficient strength to bear the burden of the present (Matt. vi. 34). It is best also because we can learn to walk humbly and trustfully, while we resign the future to the care of our Father in heaven (Matt. vi. 32).

III. GOD'S BOOKS WILL BE OPENED. The judgment-day will be first of all a day of revelation. The decrees of reward and punishment will follow the opening of God's books. 1. The record of our conduct will be brought to light. Forgotten deeds will be remembered, and the truth of character made clear (1 Cor. xiv. 25). Hidden sin will be revealed. Unrecognized merit will be honoured. 2. The roll of the redeemed will be read. Not one of God's people will be forgotten. Christ will own the humblest of his followers. 3. The purposes of God concerning the future will declare themselves. The book of the future is unrolled by degrees as time passes. But its most momentous contents will be those which will be made clear when the great facts of the unseen world are first brought to light. Then God's purposes with mankind will be understood as we on earth can never comprehend them.

Vers. 13, 14.—*The kingdom of the Son of man.* In contrast with the brutal godless kingdoms, we have here a description of the higher final kingdom—its origin, character, and destiny.

I. ORIGIN. 1. It comes from above. Divine providence inaugurates it, and heavenly principles inspire it. Christ and his kingdom are from above (John viii. 23). 2. It is in intimate relations with God. The Son of man "came to the Ancient of days," and was brought "near before him." The source of the power of Christ is his oneness with the Father (John x. 30), his dependence on the Father (John v. 19), and his obedience to the Father (Ps. xl. 7; Heb. x. 7). 3. It is a gift of God. The other kings seized their power. To the Son of man a dominion is "given." Christ does not conquer the world by force. He receives his kingdom through the influence of God's grace and providence on men (John xviii. 36).

II. CHARACTER. 1. It is a true dominion. Christ came to save the world by ruling over it. He is King as well as Redeemer. He claims obedience and more thorough submission than the greatest earthly despot can exact, viz. the submission of the heart (Col. iii. 23). 2. It is typified by "the Son of man," and therefore: (1) more spiritual and higher in character than the godless kingdoms which are represented by ravenous beasts; (2) more humane,—gentleness and mercy are great characteristics of Christ's kingdom (Isa. xxxii. 2; xlii. 1—3; Matt. xi. 28—30); and (3) characterized by oneness and sympathy with its subjects,—the old monarchs were destructive tyrants, Christ is one with his people, a son of man (Heb. ii. 14—18; iv. 15). 3. It is glorious. Christ

was of humble earthly origin, and his kingdom came in obscurity (Luke xvii. 20). Thus it was apparently inglorious when compared with the pomp of worldly monarchies. But it has God's glory, the beauty of holiness. This glory is seen in its principles and in its achievements, triumphing over sin and securing the peace and blessedness of obedience to God's will (Col. i. 27).

III. DESTINY. 1. It is to be *universal*. The greatest human monarchies were limited in extent. Christ's is to be world-wide. (1) Christ *claims* all, and will not be satisfied till he has recovered the lost (Isa. liii. 11). (2) Christ *suits* all. He is the true "Son of man." Therefore all races can find their Saviour and Lord in him. (3) Christ will *attract* all. His appeal is to the common human heart of the world (John xii. 32). 2. It is to be *everlasting*. Other kingdoms are temporary, and subject to final destruction. The kingdom of the Son of man is indestructible and everlasting. (1) It is *Divine*, and the Divine is eternal (Ps. cxlv. 13). (2) It is *righteous* in principle. There is no evil in it to be a seed of corruption (Ps. lxxii. 7). (3) It is founded upon *eternal* principles, not on maxims of temporary expediency. (4) It brings blessings which will be *always* of value (Matt. v. 3—12).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—12.—*Brute rule*. "Four great beasts came up from the sea, diverse one from another" (ver. 3). We remark the *transition* here from history to prophecy; the *date*, the first year of Belshazzar, that is, before the fall of the first of the world-powers about to be described; the *form*, a dream,—before this Daniel had interpreted others' dreams, he now dreams himself; the fact that it was *at once committed to writing*, i.e. not set down after fulfilment; and that the prophecy is only *an outline*, so that we must not expect too much detail. All this in ver. 1. The nature of the prophecy rebukes dogmatism. It may be well to call attention here to the fact that all these expositions and homilies are written independently of each other; there may be, then, possibly some diversity of critical judgment; this, however, will be no disadvantage to the student. For our own homiletic purpose we treat this chapter under three sections—in the first, we have a vision of brute rule; in the second, of Divine sovereignty; in the third, of a great rebellion.

I. ITS CONDITION. "The great sea" is distinguished from all inland seas. The ocean. The image of our troubled world (Isa. xvii. 12—14; Rev. xxi. 1). Out of the commotion and confusion of troubled peoples the four forms of brute rule arose.

II. ITS CAUSE. "The four winds of heaven strove upon the great sea." As the wind plays on ocean, so do supernatural powers (in this case *evil*) lash into fury the passions of a troubled world; and out of revolutionary confusion emerges oft brute despotism.

III. ITS GENERIC NATURE. "Four beasts." Four great empires. Same as described in ch. ii. Why the different form? That vision gave the external glory; this *the inmost nature*. They had life in them, but it was a life less than human. Man sinks below the human when the *πνεῦμα* is no longer animated by the Spirit of God. As with man individually, so collectively, so with nations, governments. Government is of God, but may lose the Divine in it, and so become brutal. A beast may inspire terror; but its look is not heavenward, but earthward; hears no Divine voice; has no consensuous relations with God. "Four beasts," but "diverse." All brutal.

IV. SPECIFIC FORMS. 1. *The lion-form*. The Babylonian empire. Dominant, like the king of the forest; swift and reaching far, like the eagle. Then came deteriorations. The deteriorations developed slowly. "I *continued* looking" is the sense. Swift energy was crippled. Not even with the speed of a lion walking did the empire advance; but painfully, slowly, as a beast marching on hind legs alone. Then instead of the lion-heart at the centre of government, the timid heart of a man. Here we have the glory of Nebuchadnezzar's Babylon, its gradual decay under his successors, until it fell before one mightier than itself. So do governments without God go down. 2. *The bear-form*. The Persian empire. Less noble than the lion; fierce, heavy, slow. Of these characteristics, the most striking illustration would

be the cumbrousness and slow advance of the Persian armies; e.g. the invasion of Greece by Xerxes (see the histories). Note the accessories of the symbol. Raising itself on one side, and perhaps striking out with its right forearm. This indicates the combination of Mede with Persian—the latter the stronger and more aggressive. The three ribs devoured stand for Lydia, Babylon, Egypt, subdued. "Devour much flesh" suggests the awful waste of life incident to Persian progress. How many of the two millions returned from Greece? 3. *The leopard-form.* The Greek empire, specially under Alexander. Characteristics: insatiable appetite for blood, swiftness, subtlety. "Four wings." "Four heads." The Greek dominion essentially one, but with four centres. Trace the analogy. Alexander's determination to conquer the world. Swift movement, equalled only by Napoleon I. The subtlety of his genius. The division of his empire into four. 4. *The nameless form.* The Roman empire. So terrible is this power, that no one creature can represent it, nor the combined attributes of many. The eminence and importance of this empire are apparent from: (a) Its prominence in this chapter. (b) Daniel's anxiety to "know the truth of the fourth beast." (c) Its collision with the Divine kingdom. (d) Its successive historical aspects. (1) *Its first aspect.* (See ver. 7.) All this exhibits the utterly destructive energy of Rome. What it did not devour, it destroyed for destruction's sake. A contrast with the other powers. They ravaged, subdued, extorted tribute; "but their connection with the states which they subdued was loose and disjointed." Rome conquered all, kept all, assimilated all. (2) *Two developments.* (a) "*Ten horns.*" Horn is the symbol of power. The ten were on the head from the beginning, to manifest the unity of the Roman empire plus the European nations. Their development, however, was not at once. (b) *The one.* Small at the beginning. Displaces a third (nearly) of existing powers. A development of the Roman domination. "Eyes" for a certain intelligence. Pride and blasphemy out of its "mouth"? What can this be but the papacy?

V. ITS JUDGMENT AND OVERTHROW. Not for ever and for ever shall the brutal reign. How sublime the contrast ushered in by ver. 9! Below, the ocean, lashed by powers of evil; out of it the brutal, its last developments the worst. *Now heaven opens.* Thrones were set (not "cast down"). A central throne. On it the Eternal. The throne the source of all splendour, the fount of energy (Rev. iv. 5). Judgment proceeding. Not the last judgment. But the continuous judgment of men and nations. The Roman empire, and all that came of it doomed—annihilated. The other empires long gone, though for a while they lingered.

Learn: 1. *The eternal supremacy of God.* 2. *The righteousness of his judgments.* 3. *The certain doom of all that is alienated from his own Divine life.* Individuals and nations are human and humane only as they live in him. The reign of the brutal in any form cannot be eternal. Animalism in all its ugly, cruel, sensual forms, must go down; for God in Christ "must reign, till he hath put all enemies under his feet."—R.

Vers. 13, 14.—*The enthronement of Christ.* "I saw in the night visions, and, behold, one like the Son of man" (ver. 13). Either after, or more probably in connection with, the destruction of the fourth world-power, universal empire was given to Christ—the Messiah of Hebrew expectation. We assume, for the present, that it is he who is described in the next paragraph. That the assumption is well-founded will immediately appear.

I. THE KING. We read ver. 13 thus: "I continued looking in the visions of the night, and behold! with the clouds of heaven like unto a Son of man was advancing, and to the Ancient of days to come, and before him they caused him to approach."

1. *The Personage was Divine.* Advancing, girt with clouds, marks the Divine. Clouds hide the glory behind and beyond. They symbolize the veil that dims the glory of God. Many are the scriptural passages to illustrate. Select a few, and we shall see how the same idea starts up in successive ages of the Church (Exod. xiii. 21; xiv. 24). If these describe the action of the Angel-God, they are all the more pertinent as illustrations of this passage in Daniel (Exod. xvi. 10; xl. 34; Lev. xvi. 2; 2 Chron. v. 13, 14; Ps. xcvi. 2). Christ takes up these representations, and applies them to himself (Matt. xxvi. 64). (In this last passage, note "the Son of man;" so again in Matt.

xxv. 31.) Similar, though not identical, is the imagery of 2 Thess. ii. 8; Rev. i. 7. Holy Scripture is consistent in applying such descriptions only to God, and to God in Christ. See the charge against one enemy of the Church in olden time (Isa. xiv. 13, 14). These intimations of the Divine in Christ of the Old Testament are like the grey that precedes the dawn. If Daniel anticipated that the Messianic Deliverer would be one of the race, it is clear, and will be clearer, that he had a glimpse of the truth that he would be Divine. 2. *The personage was also human.* "A Son of man." The phrase is used in the Old Testament: (1) For man simply (Numb. xxiii. 19). (2) To remind the gifted and inspired of *their oneness with the race*. So eighty times in Ezekiel (iii. 10, 11, 17, *et passim*). So here the advancing one was partaker of the infirmity (innocent) of the race. With "clouds," the engirdlement of the Divine, he might come; so also like "a Son of man." Of none other can this double affirmation be made—of none save the Lord Jesus. That the phrase here denotes the Messiah is clear: (1) From a *general consensus of rabbinical opinion*. (2) From the *Lord's own assumption* of the name. Christ calls himself "the Son of man," though others call him "the Son of God." What is its significance? Answering, we do not limit ourselves to Daniel's standpoint. (1) The Christ was to be of the *human race*. The humanity is Christologically as important as the Divinity, and each is indispensable to the mediatorial office. See the Athanasian Creed, "For the right faith . . . rose again the third day from the dead." (2) In the name is an intimation of *the universality of the Saviour's mission*. An implied protest against Jewish exclusiveness. "Son of David" points to the throne of Israel. Christ's right to it, albeit the sway spiritual. "Son of man" to his relation to the race; "Son of God" to his relation to the Eternal. (3) Of *world-wide dominion*. "The Son of man" was to be no ordinary mortal, but King of the race, and King for the race (comp. Ps. viii. 4—8 with Heb. ii. 5—9). (A most impressive missionary sermon might be preached from the words, "Now we see not yet all things put under him [man]; but we see *Jesus!*" i.e. on the way surely to universal empire.) Note in this connection the wide horizon of Daniel's prophetic vision. It is no longer merely Israel, but the whole world, that is in view. In keeping with the prophet's historical position. His watch-tower is no longer Jerusalem, but Babylon. His look is across the Assyrian plain, at the great world-powers, their developments in relation to the everlasting rule.

II. THE ENTHRONEMENT. 1. *The King came from the heavenly world.* Out of it, and down from it. He "came with the clouds of heaven." This empire is not like those that arose out of "the sea," from the turbulences of men. 2. *He received the kingdom from the Eternal.* Abundant illustration will be found in Matt. xxviii. 18; John iii. 35; xiii. 3; v. 22; xvii. 2; 1 Cor. xv. 27. 3. *The enthronement has no relation to the categories of time or space.* We are not to suppose that at some place, at some moment, there was to be some literal fulfilment; that the Eternal under venerable form, would sit on a throne; that the Christ would come to sue for empire, etc. This is the rock on which many interpreters are wrecked. Nor is there reference to the last judgment, for then Christ himself is on the throne. Broad views, free from mere literalism, on such matters are best. 4. And yet there are the pomp and circumstance of an *indefinite and multitudinous accompanying* of the King. "They caused him to approach." A sort of grand indefiniteness in the expression. Not alone does Jesus come to reign.

III. THE KINGDOM. 1. *Supernatural in origin.* "There was given him." 2. *Spiritual in character.* Invisible rule over souls. We speak of the empire of mind; we see in vision matter at the footstool of intellect. But what shall we say of the empire of religion, of Christianity, of Christ? Mind at the feet of Jesus, and, as a consequence, all below mind! Imaginations cast down, etc. (2 Cor. x. 5). 3. *Universal in extent.* "All people," etc. 4. *Everlasting.* "Shall not pass away," etc.—R.

Vers. 15—28.—*The great antagonist.* "I behold, and the same horn," etc. (vers. 21, 22). In introducing this subject, let the following interesting facts be noted. The dream occasioned Daniel great anxiety. "Even I Daniel grieved was my spirit, in the midst of [its] sheath." The soul a sword in its scabbard. He solicited information from one of the myriads in attendance on the Eternal. In answer, two or three suggestions were made, leading Daniel to inquire further, which he did, especially

respecting the fourth brute power. The angelic interpreter explained, and also gave additional touches to the picture, of which we shall make use in the homily. *All this is the dream, mark!* We shall assume that the single horn does not stand for the antichrist of the Old Testament, viz. Antiochus Epiphanes; and that the schemes of interpretation which involve that it does so break down. The reasons for that assumption we could give, but would be more proper to the body of a critical commentary than to a homily. We must assume all this in homiletical treatment. This prophetic Scripture throws forward lights, then, on—

I. ROME IMPERIAL. 1. *It was the fourth brute world-power.* (Ver. 17.) 2. *Its genius differed* from those that had gone before. "Diverse," etc. (ver. 23). 3. *It appropriated to itself the good of every land.* "Shall devour," etc. (ver. 23). 4. *Its tyranny was oppressive.* "Shall tread," etc. (ver. 23). 5. *It survives until the final overthrow of all brute-power* by the establishment of the eternal kingdom. Rome imperial, Rome dismembered, Rome papal, are still Rome. "One!—one mighty and formidable power, trampling down the liberties of the world; oppressing and persecuting the people of God, the true Church; and maintaining an absolute and arbitrary dominion over the souls of men; as a mighty domination standing in the way of the progress of truth, and keeping back the reign of the saints on earth."

II. ROME DIVIDED. 1. The "ten horns" were *sovereignities*. 2. *Developments* of the Roman empire. 3. *Contemporaneous*. 4. The *exact designation of them is not necessary*. The "ten" have been designated. But differences of opinion have arisen. This not wonderful, seeing that the new powers arose in a time of great confusion, and the boundaries were frequently changing. Perhaps strict literal and numerical exactness is not to be expected. The vague character of prophecy generally would warrant a contrary conclusion.

III. ROME PAPAL. The rise and progress of the papacy constitute a truly wonderful fulfilment of Daniel's dream. But it is necessary in all contemplation of the Romish religious system to distinguish carefully and ever in our minds between the Christian element in it, and the corruption of that Christian element. (As illustration of this distinction, Collette's 'Novelties of Romanism,' R.T.S., is invaluable.) 1. The "other" horn *was another sovereignty*. 2. *It sprang from the Roman domination*. Papal Rome in many ways represents Rome imperial, in the world-wideness of its sway, in possessing the same capital, etc. 3. *It came into being after the dismemberment*. After the ten. 4. *Small at the beginning*. From the apostolic age there had been a bishop at Rome; but the rise of the papacy is to be dated from the assumption of civil power. *When?* This one of the most difficult questions in history. Different theories of interpretation depend on the answers. Enough that so small was the beginning, that none can answer *with certainty*—when? 5. *The sovereignty differed from all other.* (Ver. 24.) Combination of spiritual with secular power. This involves a mighty difference. 6. *It displaced other sovereignties.* (Ver. 25.) "He shall subdue three kings." Either three kingdoms went down before it, or a third, about a third of the power and influence of existing monarchies disappeared. Distinct governments vanished before the rising papacy; and the papacy itself assumed civil functions. Here again it is not necessary to involve the broad incontrovertible facts with questionable historic detail (see end of ver. 20). "More stout" refers to the magnitude finally attained. 7. *Has been distinguished by a far-seeing sagacity.* "Eyes like the eyes of a man." A sagacity of human sort, not Divine. The diplomacy of Rome, the subtlety of the Jesuit, are notorious. The historical illustrations, mediæval and modern, are infinitely varied and innumerable. 8. *By blasphemy.* (Ver. 25.) "He shall speak great words against the Most High." Blasphemy (1) either denies to God something of his essential glory; (2) or assumes the names, attributes, and works of God for the creature. In both senses the papacy has been guilty. The illustrations are numberless which are to be found in the doctrine, ritual, practice, and history of the Roman Church. Some of them terrible. Many of them are now open before us, but we cannot present them here in our limited space. 9. *By persecution*. 10. The new sovereignty has "*changed times and law*." Not "laws," but the fundamental and eternal law of right. Of this, too, the illustrations are without number.

IV. ROME JUDGED. (Vera 11, 26.) 1. *The dream even now waits fulfilment*. Much has been fulfilled, but much remains to be. Imperial Rome has gone. The many other

kingdoms have arisen; and a part of their power has disappeared before the growing supremacy of papal Rome. But even that has within the last half-century been shorn of its strength. Still much remains for the future to disclose. 2. *Rome papal will stand for a definite time.* "Until a time," etc. (ver. 25). The time is *definite*, though to us, as we believe, *unknown*. (On the seeming impossibility of at present interpreting a measure of time like this, see Alford on Rev. xi. 2, p. 655.) 3. *But will certainly fall.* (Vers. 11, 26.) Note the reason in ver. 11. 4. *Then to rise no more.* (Vers. 11, 26.) Are explicit and strong.

V. HER POWER TRANSFERRED. Given to the saints; once theirs, theirs *everywhere*, theirs for ever. War was indeed made against the saints, achieved, too, a certain success. But *principle never dies*. The final victory lay with the persecuted. Dominion passed over to them. In what sense? We might say that good men made the laws, but this would be a poor thing to say. Rather is this the truth—that *the need of government almost passed away*. THE INFLUENCE OF CHARACTER WAS ENOUGH. Some judicial administration might be necessary to arrange debatable points. But deliberate crime had now become non-existent. To illustrate: Mr. Goldwin Smith, after saying that, in a particular instance, "not the special form of the government, but the comparative absence of necessity for government, is the thing to be noted and admired," goes on to say, "The proper sphere of government is compulsion. The necessity for it in any given community is *in inverse proportion to the social virtue and the intelligence of the people*. The policeman, the executioner, the tax-gatherer,—these are its proper ministers, and the representatives of what we call its majesty. It is destined to decrease as Christianity increases, and as force is superseded by social affection, and spontaneous combination for the public good. The more a community can afford to dispense with government, the more Christian it must be" ('The Civil War in America,' p. 27). The Ancient of days gives over empire to the Son of man; his sovereignty is exercised through his saints. They have something of his own sway. What is that? The sway of spiritual supremacy. The rule of righteousness. The law of love. The empire of Calvary.—R.

Vers. 1—8.—*A vision of human violence.* Dreams have a foundation in external fact. The mind of man has a creative faculty—a faint reflection of the Divine—and, when released from the domination of visible things, it asserts its original power. Daniel was advanced in years, had seen many changes in the government of Babylon, and probably had been brooding seriously over the fortunes and prospects of the Hebrews. The past and the future were inextricably interlaced.

I. NIGHT HAS ITS USES, AS WELL AS DAY. Night is not an entire blank in a man's history. God is as much with us by night as by day. "He giveth his beloved sleep." But, at the same time, he supports the imagination and memory in strange activity. Here we have a hint of the separate life of mind and body. If this occurs now, may not the mind be amply active, while the body is fast asleep in the grave? Night reveals to us pictures, which the garish day dissipates. Darkness is freighted with celestial light. What is darkness to the body need not be darkness to the mind. Trial may have a rough exterior, but there is latent good within. Sorrow is endowed with a Divine power of benediction. Death itself to the saint is but a veil that hides the dawning light. *Reality* is often the antipodes of *phenomenon*.

II. MATERIAL THINGS ARE MIRRORS IN WHICH MEN MAY SEE THEIR TRUE CHARACTERS. The mind, in its infantile state, is most impressed with visible and tangible things. "The great sea" is a significant picture of the mobility and restlessness of the multitude. The masses of men, having no settled beliefs, no fixed principles of action, are as fickle, and as easily wrought upon, as the unstable sea. As the briny waters are promptly driven hither and thither by every wind that blows, so the multitudes are moved and tossed by every passing passion—by the faintest prospect of self-advantage—or by the fevered ambition of a stronger will than their own. The Jews, having relinquished their safe anchorago, viz. faith in God, were driven helplessly north and south, east and west, by the wild passions of unscrupulous conquerors. It seemed as if the four winds of heaven strive at one and the same time upon this Hebrew sea. "The wicked are like the troubled sea."

III. UNTAMED BEASTS ARE THE APTEST SYMBOLS OF MILITARY CONQUERORS. One

is like a lion, though, as years roll on, he at length acquires a man's heart—the sensibility of human tenderness. A second is like a leopard; yet so swift is he for destruction, that the fleetness of the leopard fails to convey all the truth; therefore four wings of a fowl are added to the symbol. A third is like a bear, intent only on tearing and consuming much flesh. A fourth destroyer of men is so fierce and death-breathing that not one of the savage beasts in nature can represent him. He is a “beast dreadful and terrible,” having teeth of iron. It is rare that beasts of prey make war upon their own species, much less upon their own kindred. God has provided the wildest beast with but two horns, to serve as weapons of defence; but this human monster was furnished with ten horns. One cannot but be struck with the singular incongruities we meet with in this prophetic dream; yet even this fact is instructive. The wildest vagaries of the imagination are outstripped by the moral incongruities of human character and human conduct. Where shall we find an incongruity so strange as this—the wilful degradation of the man to a level lower than the untrained beasts?

IV. GOD'S PRESENT REVELATIONS TO MEN ARE PARTLY OBSCURE, PARTLY CLEAR. “We know only in part; hence we prophesy only in part.” We may be sure that this arrangement is best. It is an act of kindness and of wisdom on the part of God. It serves to stimulate inquiry on our part. We may learn from it to cherish humility, inasmuch as we are not at present competent to receive larger communications of God's will. Thankful ought we to be that we have enough knowledge of God's will for our practical guidance; and when we have worked up all this raw material into personal service, we shall obtain more. God “made known his ways unto Moses,” but his acts only unto “the children of Israel.” “Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord.” It is one of the attractions of the heavenly state, that fresh light will continually be shed upon the past history of our race, as well as upon the wisdom of the Divine government.—D.

Vers. 9—14.—*The real King-maker.* The panorama which passed before Daniel's mind in the night-season did not terminate in a scene of confusion and misery. This scene of brutal ferocity occurs in the middle of a great tragedy, and leads on to a peaceful triumph of truth and righteousness. These inhuman kings were not masters of the situation. One higher than they watched the moral chaos from his supernal throne, and, out of the tangled mass of conflicting ambitions and passions, brought a condition of permanent prosperity and peace.

I. OBSERVE THE DESCRIPTION OF HIS PERSON. He has the appearance of venerable age—“the Ancient of days.” These inhuman monsters were “but of yesterday;” and, knowing that their time was short, were eager to make for themselves a name, by the methods what they may. But the Ruler of the nations is “from everlasting.” His years outnumber all the generations of men. Human tribes come and go; dynasties rise and fall; to him they are like the meteorological changes on an April day. He sits unmoved, the calm Monarch of the universe. His clothing, “white as snow,” betokens the immaculate righteousness of his administration. No intelligent being has ever detected the slightest blemish in his just and impartial sway. It is not consistent with his supreme dignity to give an account of his doings to human creatures, but to the extent that our moral judgments can comprehend his acts, we can join with the seraphim in the acclamation, “Holy, holy, holy, is the Lord God Almighty;” “Just and true are thy ways, thou King of saints.” He is not an indifferent spectator of human affairs. He may be slow to anger, yet is he the more sure to punish. “His throne was like the fiery flame, and his wheels as burning fire.” Sin, lust, crime, of every sort, shall be swept from his domains with a fiery beson; yea, all creatures who identify themselves with wickedness. Every force and element in nature is his servant, and a stream of fire issues from his feet. The earth, long stained with shameful crime, shall be purified, and the saints shall emerge from the trial “as gold that has been purified.” Though long delayed, complete retribution shall in due time come, and the oppressed among the sons of men shall be publicly vindicated and honoured.

II. HIS SPLENDID RETINUE. His army is not reckoned by thousands, but by myriads. The largest number known to the ancients is put for an indefinite number. Everything that lives and breathes minister unto him. The orders and ranks of unfallen

angels are his lieutenants. At a single glance of his eye they fly on fleetest wing to fulfil his Divine behests. One angel, with his invisible sword, scattered and decimated the proud army of Sennacherib. An east wind discomfited Pharaoh's host. A few flakes of snow annihilated the regiments of Napoleon. More than once a thunderstorm has defeated the most valiant troops of warriors. The locust, one feeble branch of God's military retinue, has chased a whole nation from the field. "To whom, then, shall we liken God?" And is not he a prodigious fool who challenges God to a contest? "Let the potsherd strive with the potsherd of the earth; but woe to the man who strives with his Maker!" Filled with Divine courage, "one man shall chase a thousand, and two put ten thousand to flight."

III. HIS JUDICIAL OCCUPATION. "The judgment was set." This language does not refer *exclusively* to the final and general judgment of mankind. It refers especially to a present judgment, and a special adjudication touching the ambitious kings. The activity of God's mental judgment is never in suspense. Judicial acts are always proceeding. "For judgment," said Christ, "I am come into the world." Still, it is permitted us to think of state occasions, when public investigations are made, clear proofs of human guilt are adduced, and world-wide approval is given of Divine verdicts. "The books were opened," viz. the volume of Divine Law, clearly read by men; the book of history; the book of memory; the book of conscience. The decision shall not be reached with unseemly haste. The investigation shall proceed under the superintendence of Wisdom herself, and her calm decisions can never be called in question.

IV. HIS ROYAL AWARDS. The act of Divine judgment, which was present to the view of Daniel, was an act concerning the "great beast." He had been seized by God's detectives, and arraigned before the bar of heavenly justice. His last daring act of rebellion was that of speaking proud and defiant words against God. Thus the haughty oppressors of nations boast, "Our wills are our own: who is Lord over us?" But their discomfiture will be complete and overwhelming. The beast was slain. Life was withdrawn. Nor this only. His body was destroyed. As he had consumed others, so, by a righteous retribution, he shall be consumed in the burning flame. Lesser penalties are imposed on the other beasts. Further opportunity of amendment is given to some. Dominion is forfeited, but life for a brief season is prolonged. Yet, in this heavenly assize, there are not only wrongs punished; rights are vindicated. Obedience, excellence, merit, are commended, are exalted to the highest place. The human monarchs, who abused their sovereign trust, shall be dethroned—yea, destroyed; but in their place another shall arise—a King of righteousness, a pattern Prince. Instead of savage beasts, there shall be, as King of nations, a Son of man—a man fresh from the hands of God. His innate glory shall be partly veiled, "He came in the clouds of heaven." His is no usurped authority. He does not take this honour of himself. He professes allegiance to the world's Ruler and Judge, and receives the kingdom at the hands of God. "Angels and principalities and powers" delight to do him honour; "they brought him near" the everlasting Father. The Son of man does not disdain to receive the kingdom from the Creator and Originator of all things. Because of his meekness and righteousness (not because of muscular power and violence) the Son of man receives investiture of universal sovereignty. Others, like Alexander and Timour, had aspired to this, but they were not worthy. Real merit shall at length rise to the surface, and reach the topmost place. Before him "every knee shall bow," either attracted by his grace or awed by his power. To him shall appertain, not a kingdom only, but transcendent glory, and dominion born of love. All nations and languages shall ultimately serve him, and his kingdom shall be durable as eternity. Universality and permanency are the indelible marks of Messiah's empire.—D.

Vers. 15—28.—*Godly obedience the basis of permanent dominion.* Wisdom and righteousness are the qualities of a real king. Daniel, though not ambitious of a material sceptre, yet, by virtue of his weighty influence, swayed the destinies of the Babylonian empire. He ruled by an unpretentious grace.

I. GOOD MEN ARE MORE CONCERNED FOR GOD'S CAUSE THAN FOR ANY SELF-EXALTATION. Daniel was grieved in spirit, not because of personal ill, nor from fear

of the lions' den, but because of the obscurity of the vision; in other words, because of the uncertain fortune of God's kingdom. The symbol of the fourth beast seemed to betoken disaster, suffering, yea, even destruction, for the people of God. That under the violence of this unnatural monster the saints of the Most High should be worn out with oppression, and that rude wickedness should prevail; *this* distressed and overwhelmed the heart of Daniel. He lived for one object. His life, from the early days of youth, had been directed towards one end—viz. the reversal of Israel's overthrow—the restoration of the Hebrews to Canaan. If this end seemed nearer, he was content; if this event was shrouded in doubt, he grieved. In his case self was repressed—kept down. He was consumed with pious zeal for others' good—for God's honour. Never once do we find him plotting for his own elevation or for his own interests. He did not live for fame. Yet he had it. He thought mainly of God, and God set his thought and care upon him. He had so completely identified himself with God's cause on earth, that all his interest and happiness were indissolubly bound up with it. Herein God observed his promise, "Them that honour me I will honour." To him heaven was open. He moved in the society of angels. And, when his mind was enveloped with difficulty, he gladly sought counsel and instruction from one of the heavenly host. A wise man will ever seek to increase his wisdom. He welcomes light from every quarter.

II. SELF-EXALTATION IS EVENTUALLY DOOMED TO DESTRUCTION. The nature of man has great possibilities both of elevation and descent. He who *will* be a monarch, be the methods what they may, shall be degraded to the level of a beast. These four human sovereigns are represented by the Spirit of truth as four beasts. They were so rapacious after rule, that, on the road, they did not hesitate to devour much flesh. A thousand, or a myriad, human lives were, in their estimation, *nothing*, so long as they could climb to a throne, and see their proud wills obeyed. Yet they were only beasts in the guise of men. They had the tastes, inclinations, ferocity, of brutes. The fourth in the contemptible series was so wanton and lustful in his rage, that not one of the wild beasts on earth could fitly represent him. He was a very prodigy of brutality. But empire so gained could not continue. The seeds of decay were sown in it from the beginning. "They that use the sword shall perish by the sword." Their success is but for a moment—a vapour, which barely appeareth, and then for ever vanisheth. Who can point us to-day to an earthly throne, which has been founded by military arms, and has endured? Vaulting ambition has always overleaped itself. They that have determined to be rulers, be the cost what it may, shall sink into infamy—into the pit of human scorn. "The judgment shall sit." A King of all other kings calmly rules, with irresistible sceptre, in a higher sphere; and woe be to the puny tyrant that dares resist *his* will! Jehovah hath "prepared his throne in the heavens;" and this is a fundamental principle in his kingdom: "He that exalteth himself shall be abased." They that bite and devour shall be consumed one of another.

III. LOWLY GOODNESS SHALL RISE TO A GLORIOUS AND PERMANENT THRONE. They who sink self shall rise into the possession of a better nature and of a loftier state. To live for others is heroic—god-like. Real goodness thinks little about itself—is blind to its own virtues and charms. It deems others' merits superior to its own, others' faults to be less. Its eye is mainly fixed upon the true standard of excellence, and it strains every nerve to reach that. So long as *that* is beyond, unattained, it mourns and grieves. The mark of true saints, in their present state, is not perfection, but consecration. They are God's devoted ones—"the sacramental host of his elect." Their characteristic mark is loyalty—growing holiness. They are devoid of personal ambition. If they have crowns thrust upon them, they will place them at once at the service of their Lord. To acquire wisdom, righteousness, love,—*this* is their ambitious aim, even to be worthy friends of the King of grace. In process of time they become "more than conquerors," for they acquire a conquest which is permanent and irreversible—a conquest which serves as a vantage-ground for higher conquest yet. Whether the dominion, which the saints of God obtain, is over evil principles, or over living personalities, or over men, may remain an open question. It may very properly be said to include all. It is a dominion over self, over sin, over death, over Satan, yea, over their fellow-men. For, in the nature of things, in proportion as any

man has wisdom, purity, love, he rules with invisible sceptre over other men. Yet, kings and priests though the saints are, they are willing vassals under Christ. He is "Lord of all."—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER VIII.

Vers. 1-27.—THE RAM AND THE HE-GOAT.

This chapter marks the change from Aramaic to Hebrew. The character of the chapter is like that which immediately precedes it. It consists, like it, of the account of a vision, and the interpretation of it. The subject of this vision is the overthrow of the Persian monarchy by Alexander the Great, the division of his empire, and the oppression of Israel by Epiphanes.

* Ver. 1.—In the third year of the reign of King Belshazzar a vision appeared unto me, even unto me Daniel, after that which appeared unto me at the first. The text of the Septuagint does not differ greatly from the Hebrew, but avoids the strange anarthrous position of *anu*, "I." The Septuagint renders this verse as a title to the chapter, thus: "A vision which I Daniel saw in the third year of the reign of Belshazzar (Beltasar), after that I saw formerly (πρότερον)." The Septuagint reading seems to have been *asher r'oech anee*. Theodotion and the Peshitta are in verbal agreement with the Massoretic text. *The third year of the reign of King Belshazzar*. We learn now that Belshazzar did not reign independently; but that for at least five years he exercised all the functions of government. If Daniel's investiture with the position of third man in the kingdom took place on the occasion of Belshazzar's inauguration of his vice-regal reign, Daniel may have remained in the royal service continuously till the overthrow of the Babylonian monarchy. *After that which appeared unto me at the first*. The former vision referred to is clearly the vision of the preceding chapter.

Ver. 2.—And I saw in a vision; and it came to pass, when I saw, that I was at Shushan in the palace, which is in the province of Elam; and I saw in a vision, and I was by the river of Ulai. The LXX. presents several slight differences, "And I saw in the vision of my dream, when I was in the city Susa, which is in the province Elymais, and I seemed in my vision to be at the gate Ailam." Theodotion renders more briefly, "And I was in Susa the palace (Σούσις τῇ Βάψει), in the province

Ailam, and I was on the Ubal." The Syriac is in close agreement with the Massoretic, even to the transcription of the doubtful word *Ubal*. The transcription is carried so far that *m'deenatha*, "a city," is used to translate *m'deena*, "a province." Jerome renders *m'deena*, *civitas*, and *ubal*, *portam*, and *beera*, *castrum*. The word אֵיבָל (*'oobal*) is nearly a *hapaz legomenon*, absolutely so if we do not admit *joobal*, in Jer. xvii. 8, to be the same word. There is, as will have been seen above, great differences among the versions. The LXX. and Jerome seem to have read אֵילָם (*oolam*), "porch" or "gate," instead of *oobal*. Ewald would make the word mean "river-basin," *Strom-gebiel*—a view supported also by Zöckler. In many respects "marsh" might be a more suitable rendering. To the south-west of the present ruins of Susa there is an extensive marsh, which may have been of old date. The preposition *liphnee*, which occurs in ver. 3, is all but meaningless applied to a river, if we use it in its ordinary meaning, "before." If we take it as meaning "eastward," the ram would be "westward" from Shushan, *i.e.* between Shushan and the river; but as Daniel was in Shushan, he would naturally state the position of the "ram" in relation to it rather than to the river. The preposition לְ (*'al*) is nearly as meaningless with regard to a river, unless a bridge or a boat is intended. We are inclined to read *oolam* as "porch." At the same time, we know that there was the river Ulai (Eulæus) near Shushan. It is mentioned in one of the inscriptions of Assurbanipal in connection with Shushan (Smith's 'Assurbanipal,' p. 130). *The palace*. *Beera* really seems to mean "fortress." It occurs ten times in Esther, and always as the appellation of Shushan. In Nehemiah it is once used with this connotation, but twice in regard to some building in Jerusalem, probably the temple; in Chronicles it is used for the temple. In Ezra vi. 2 it is used of Achmetha, equivalent to Ecbatana. From the fact that the LXX. translates πόλις, it might be reasoned that the translator had לְ before him, but the translation probably was due to ignorance of the precise meaning of the word. In Esther this word is rendered πόλις. In Nehemiah it is once rendered πόλις, once it is rendered ἑστία, and once Σίρα. The derivation of the word seems to be from the

Assyrian birtu. It really means "citadel" or "fortress," and thus may be compared with the Carthaginian *byrsa*. Jerome's translation, *castrum*, suits this. It is not necessary to maintain that at this time Daniel was in Shushan. All that is implied is that in his dream he was there. Shushan is first referred to in the inscriptions of Asshur-bani-pal as the capital of Elam. In the history of that monarch there is an inscription of his given in which he says, "Shushan, the great city, the seat of their gods, the place of their oracle, I captured." Then follows a description of the plunder he took from it. We do not know when it recovered from that overthrow. The name is said to be derived from the number of lilies growing in the neighbourhood; but *shushan*, "a lily," is a Shemitic word, and the Elamites are usually regarded as an Aryan people. The association of Babylon with Elam and Media must have been intimate, if any credit is to be placed on the Greek accounts of the marriage of Nebuchadnezzar. Hence, even if Elam was not, at the date specified, a province of the Babylonian Empire, perhaps never was, yet the Babylonian court might well have envoys visiting the court of Elam. We find from the well-known inscription of Nabunahid, that he regarded Cyrus at first as a friend and deliverer from the formidable Astyages, King of Umman-Manda. Daniel may have been sent to Elam, although there is no necessity for maintaining that this was the case. It was not until he had conquered Astyages that Cyrus held possession of Shushan.

Ver. 3.—Then I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and, behold, there stood before the river a ram which had two horns; and the two horns were high; but one was higher than the other, and the higher came up last. The rendering of the LXX. does not differ essentially from the Massoretic Version, save in the last clause, which is rendered, "and the higher ascended (*avébaue*). As in the former verse, *oobal* is translated "gate." Certainly, as before remarked, "before a river" is an awkward combination; "before" or "over against a gate" is intelligible. "Eastward," which *liphnee* also means, will not suit the geographical circumstances, as Shushan itself stood on the east bank of the river Euleus, or Shapur. If, further, *oobal* means a "marsh," as Jerome renders it, then "eastward" would not suit, for the existing marsh is to the south-west of Shushan. Theodotion is in closer agreement with the Massoretic text, but does not translate *oobal*, he merely transliterates it. The Peshitta is in strict agreement with the text of the Massoretes. Jerome, as we just said, in this verse renders *oobal* by *paludem*. Daniel in

his vision seems looking from the walls of the citadel of Shushan, most likely even now the capital of the triumphant young conqueror. The progress of the arms of Cyrus would no doubt be viewed with apprehension by the court of Babylon. Daniel's thoughts would be naturally filled with the new factor in the politics of the Euphrates valley. Hence it was not unnatural that the thoughts of the day should colour the visions of the night. The choice of the animal—the ram—to represent the Medo-Persian monarchy is by some supposed to be illustrated by the figures of goats and rams on Persian cylinders. If it has any special meaning, it probably is that the monarchy had sprung up among a pastoral people. It is maintained by Professor Bevan, that this figure of a ram with two horns proves that there were two successive empires—a Median and a Persian. If Mr. Bevan would use his ingenuity, and show us any way by which the actual facts of the history and constitution of the Medo-Persian Empire could be represented in a symbol that would not be liable to his misinterpretation, it would be an advantage. The empire, we know, was built up by two races—the race which last came into prominence became the predominant. Here in the symbol before us the unity of the empire is exhibited by the animal being one, and the two races are indicated by the two horns. The duality of the symbol ought to be noted.

Ver. 4.—I saw the ram pushing westward, and northward, and southward; so that no beasts might stand before him, neither was there any that could deliver out of his hand: but he did according to his will, and became great. The opening words of the Septuagint appear to be a translation of the last word of the preceding verse, *ba'aheronah*, being rendered, "after these things"—a change that is not defensible. It is more important to note that in the LXX. we have the four points of the compass mentioned, not merely three as in the Massoretic, "I saw the ram butting eastward, and northward, and westward, and southward." Had a *salutaris* been wishful to supply the missing direction, he would have inserted "eastward" between "northward" and "southward," only if he had begun with "eastward" would he have gone on as it at present stands in the Septuagint. What could make him change "west" to "east"? Our opinion is that the LXX. represents the original text. It is confirmatory of this that Theodotion, in strict agreement with the text of the Massoretes, renders the first direction "seaward" (*κατὰ θάλασσαν*). The Peshitta renders "westward," not by *yammah*, but by the term for "west" that became common in Exilic and post-Exilic Hebrew, *ma'arab*—the

word that is used in the next verse. Ezekiel uses *yammah* for "west," when in vision he places himself in Palestine, otherwise it is not used for "west" by Exilic and post-Exilic writers. If we take the statement of the next verse as fixing what was "the west" to the author of Daniel, where would "seaward" be? If we draw a line from Troas, where Alexander landed, and continue it through Babylon, it reaches the Persian Gulf. "Seaward" would mean consequently "eastward," or approximately so, to one writing in Babylon. A great number of suggestions have been offered to explain the singular omission of "eastward" from the direction in which the ram pushes with his horns. Hävernicks, and following him Moses Stuart, assert that "eastward" is not mentioned because the Persians made no conquests to the east until the days of Darius Hystaspis, and then not permanent ones. Against this is the fact that Elam and Media were mainly east of Ansan. Further, the picture here given of the Persian Empire is not restricted to the days of Cyrus and Cambyses, but all through its course. As to the permanence of these Eastern conquests, the territories of Darius Codomannus east of Arbela embraced modern Persia and other territories to the confines of India. Keil assumes that the ram stands on the western bank of the Shapur, so, if he pushed eastward, it would be against his own capital; but if *oobal* means "a river," then the only meaning possible for *liphee* is "eastward." He would then be butting towards the river across which the enemy was likely to come, moreover, against his own capital, unless the ram is supposed to be between the river and the city—an unlikely supposition, as Shushan was on the river Eulæus. He further maintains that the unfolding of the power of Persia was towards these three named directions, and not towards the last, whatever that may mean. Ewald declares the ram does not butt towards the east, because that already belongs to him. As a matter of fact, and, as exhibited by the Book of Esther, well known to the Jews, the Persian Empire did conquer towards the east. Behrmann says, "The ram does not push towards the east, because he comes from the east—a delicacy the Septuagint overlooked." In point of fact, there is no word in the vision of the ram coming from anywhere—this delicacy (*feinheit*) Professor Behrmann has overlooked. Kranichfeld and Zöckler follow this. The view of Bishop Nowton, followed by Archdeacon Rose, is that the east had no importance to the Jews; but north and south had just a little. Jophet-ibn-Ali and several modern commentators think the three directions, as

the three ribs, imply the limitation of the Persian Empire. It certainly was recognized by the Jews to be little, if at all, less than that of Alexander the Great. Hitzig propounds in all gravity an absurd view; he assumes that the ram was standing on the west bank of the river, and faced west, and argues that he did not butt eastward because he could not butt backwards. His preliminary assumption is groundless, as we have seen, and rams can change their position. The true explanation is that a direction has dropped out. While "seaward" had ceased to mean "west" to the Jews in Babylon, it did not take long residence in Palestine to recover this name for "west."¹ A copyist living in Palestine, finding *yammah*, in the first place would translate it "westward;" then after "northward" he would, in the third place, come upon *ma'arab*, which also meant "west;" so naturally he dropped the second of what seemed to him synonymous terms. If we are correct in our supposition, we have here demonstrative proof that Daniel was written by one living in Babylon. No *beasts might stand before him*. All the powers round Persia had to submit to him. And he became great affords proof, if proof were needed, that the vision applies to the whole of the history of Persia. There is little necessity for Moses Stuart's translation, "became haughty."

Ver. 5.—And as I was considering, behold, an he-goat came from the west on the face of the whole earth, and touched not the ground: and the goat had a notable horn between his eyes. The Septuagint, when completed from Paulus Tellensis, agrees in the main with the Massoretic, omitting only "whole" before "earth." The Chisian MS. omits the clause, "and touched not the ground," but it is in Paulus Tellensis. As I was considering. "Was" is here used much as an auxiliary verb—an Aramaic usage. "Considering" really suggests "meditating on." *He-goat*. The word here used does not elsewhere occur in the Hebrew Scriptures. It is really an Aramaic word, though vocalized here after the analogy of Hebrew. *On the face of the whole earth*. The writer had probably in his mind the negative idea expressed in the next verse; hence the word *kol*. *A notable horn*; "a horn of sight;" a horn that no one could fail to remark upon.

¹ We do not mean to say that *yammah* was the general word in Babylon for "east." It is used in this passage in its original meaning of "seaward." From the fact that, to the prophet writing in Babylon, the nearest sea was to the east, it by this accident happens to mean "east." To the Ninevites the Persian Gulf was "the sea of the sunrise."

No symbol could express in a more graphic way the rapidity of the conquests of Alexander the Great than this of the goat that flew over the ground. One can parallel with this the four wings of the leopard in ch. vii. It is singular that Alexander should generally on his coins be figured as horned. Had this vision been due to a knowledge of this—which could not have escaped a Jew of the days of the Maccabees—the writer would certainly have made Alexander not a goat, but a ram, as it is a ram's horn that is intended to be figured on the portraits of Alexander. As everybody knows, this refers to the fable that he was the son of Jupiter Ammon, the ram-horned. It is difficult to assign a reason why the goat was chosen as the symbol of the Grecian power, save that, as compared with the Persian power, the Greek was the more agile.

Ver. 6.—And he came to the ram that had two horns, which I had seen standing before the river, and ran unto him in the fury of his power. The differences of the Septuagint from the received text are slight here. *Oobal* is still translated *πύλη*; it renders, "fury of his rage" rather than "fury of his power." The Massoretic, as the less obvious collocation, is the better reading. Theodotion and the Peshitta leave *oobal* untranslated. The latter omits the last clause of the Massoretic. In the Hebrew the ram is called *Baal-karnayem*, "lord of two horns." Alexander's war against Persia was one of simple aggression.

Ver. 7.—And I saw him come close unto the ram, and he was moved with choler against him, and smote the ram, and brake his two horns: and there was no power in the ram to stand before him, but he cast him down to the ground, and stamped upon him: and there was none that could deliver the ram out of his hand. The two Greek versions, though differing very much in the Greek words chosen as equivalent to the Hebrew, yet both represent a text practically identical with that of the Massoretic. The Peshitta omits the introductory "behold," but otherwise can scarcely be said to differ essentially from the received text, though there are some peculiarities due to mistaken reading, but unimportant. The word *gillmarmar*, "he was embittered," is a word that occurs here and in the eleventh chapter. The root, however, as might be guessed from its meaning, is not uncommon, being found in Genesis, Exodus, Samuel, Kings, Isaiah, Ruth, Job, and Zechariah. How Professor Bevan can class this with "words or roots which occur nowhere else in the Old Testament" it is difficult to see. If this part of the verb occurs in later Jewish literature, it is singular that neither Buxtorf nor Levy chronicles the

fact. It does not occur in Western Aramaic, but does in Eastern (comp. Peshitta 2 Sam. xviii. 33; Acts xvii. 16). It is quite such a word as a man writing among those who spoke Eastern Aramaic might use. Alexander advanced always against Darius; he would not even speak of treating with him. After the passage of the Granicus, he pushed on to Cilicia, overthrew Darius at Issus, B.C. 333; then, after the conquest of Egypt, advanced against him again at Arbela, and once more inflicted on him an overwhelming defeat. When Darius fled from the field, Alexander pursued him to the shores of the Caspian and into Bactria and Sogdiana, till Darius fell a victim to the treachery of Bessus. Certainly relentlessness was the most marked character of Alexander's pursuit of Darius. The horns of the Persian power were broken, thrown to the earth, and trodden underfoot.

Ver. 8.—Therefore the he-goat waxed very great: and when he was strong, the great horn was broken; and for it came up four notable ones toward the four winds of heaven. The two Greek versions differ from the Massoretic only in this—that the four horns are not mentioned as notable horns, but simply *ἑτερα*, "other." The Peshitta agrees closely with the Massoretic. The Greek versions indicate that the reading they had before them was *ḥaroth* instead of *hazooth*; *hazooth* has been borrowed from the fifth verse. The empire of Alexander had reached its greatest extent when the young conqueror fell a victim to what seems malarial fever, aggravated by his drinking. His life was broken off before its legitimate conclusion. At his death there was great confusion. Perdiccas assumed the guardianship of the children of the conqueror, and attempted to succeed him in the empire. After his death Antigonus in turn attempted to secure the imperial power, but was defeated and slain at the battle of Ipsus. The empire of Alexander was then divided into four main portions—Macedonia and Greece, under Cassander; Asia Minor, under Lysimachus; Syria and all the East, under Seleucus; and Egypt and Cyrene, under Ptolemy. In the two first of these there were several revolutions, but finally the Antigonids established themselves in Macedonia, and the Attalids in Asia Minor.

Ver. 9.—And out of one of them came forth a little horn, which waxed exceeding great, toward the south, and toward the east, and toward the pleasant land. The Greek versions here differ considerably from the Massoretic text. The LXX. is as follows: "And out of one there sprang a strong horn, and it prevailed and smote toward the south, toward the south-west

(ἐλὶ νότον), and toward the east, and toward the north." In this case, ἐλὶ νότον is clearly a doublet—an alternative rendering that has got into the text from the margin. 'Eli Bopphā results from reading *tz'phonah* (תְּפֹנָה) instead of *tzebee* (צֶבֶעַ). Theodotion renders, "From one of them went forth a strong horn, and was magnified exceedingly to the south and to the power"—reading *tzaba* (צָבָא), "host," for *tzebee*. It is to be observed that both translate *mitz'zeeroth* as "strong" (ἰσχυρός) instead of "little." The reason of this is that they have taken צ as equivalent to *ex*, therefore equivalent to a negative. The Peshitta agrees with the Authorized in reading *mitz'zeeroth* as "little," but leaves out the difficult final word rendered "the pleasant land" in our Authorized Version. Jerome translates *mitz'zeeroth* by *modicum*, and *tzebee* by *fortitudinem*—a combination of Theodotion and the Massoretic; he must have had *tzaba* in his text instead of *tzebee*,—this may have been due to the fact that *tzaba* occurs in the next verse. The reference is sufficiently obvious to Antiochus. The description is accurate; he sprang from one of the four horns or dynasties that succeeded the great conqueror. He carried his arms to the east, but mainly to the south against Egypt. The great difficulties are in the two Hebrew words *mitz'zeeroth* and *tzebee*. As to the first word, the fact that the two Greek versions have read it are conclusive against the suggestion of Grätz and Hitzig, supported by Bevan, that we should omit צ (*min*). Jophot-ibn-Ali takes *min* as denoting the origin of the horn, "from a little one." The further suggestion of Grätz, that we should adopt the reading of the LXX., is rightly combated by Professor Bevan. The readings alike of the LXX. and Theodotion could have sprung from the Massoretic reading, whereas neither of these could so readily be the original reading. It was necessary that Israel should be prominent in this part of the prophecy; it all leads up to the persecution the Jews endured at the hands of Epiphanes. It is necessary, then, to hold that this word, whatever reading we adopt, and whatever immediate meaning we assign to it, must refer to Palestine. Ewald renders it "ornament;" Bevan, "glory."

Vor. 10.—And it waxed great, even to the host of heaven; and it cast down some of the host and of the stars to the ground, and stamped upon them. The reading of the LXX. is very different after the first clause, "And it was exalted to the stars of heaven, and it was shattered to the earth by the stars, and by them trampled down." The verb *לָפַס* (*tappayl*), translated "cast down," has been read as if it had been *לָפַס*

(*looppal*). So too the last verb has evidently been read *לָפַס* (*väyyir masohoo*) instead of *לָפַס* (*vattir masayin*), due to the resemblance which there was between *yod* and *lau* in the older script. Theodotion differs hardly less from the Massoretic, "And it was magnified to the power of heaven, and it fell to the earth from the power of heaven and from the stars, and they trode them down." The verb translated "fell" is evidently read with a vocalization different from both the Massoretic and the LXX. The sense of Theodotion is more in accordance with the Septuagint than with the Massoretic. The Peshitta and the Vulgate agree with the Massoretic. The question of which reading is to be preferred can scarcely be settled without regarding the meaning of the terms here used. The crucial point is—What is the meaning of the "host of heaven"? The general consensus of interpreters is that this refers to Israel. Some maintain that the host of heaven is Israel, and the stars their leaders (Glassius): the stars are the Levites (Grotius). Moses Stuart would hold the host to be the priests, and the stars the teachers. Kliefoth is right in commencing first with the picture, and requiring that it be realized in thought. The horn grows and grows before Daniel's gaze, until it seems to touch the stars, that is, the host of heaven. As to what is meant by the stars, we must look elsewhere for an explanation. Have we any right to take "the host of heaven" as meaning the people of God? The phrase, "host of heaven," occurs elsewhere in Scripture nearly a score of times, and it never means anything else than the stars or the angels. Therefore all interpretations that make this mean either the people of God or the Levites, must be thrown aside. It may, however, mean the people of God mediately. A quite elaborate line of deduction has been brought forward—the promise to Abraham (Gen. xv. 5), to Isaac (Gen. xxvi. 4), that their seed should be as the stars of heaven, is brought into connection with the use of the word "hosts" in regard to Israel (Numb. i. 52, etc.)—and the title given to God as the God of Israel, "Jehovah of hosts." This is very ingenious, but it has no support from scriptural usage or from the usage in apocalyptic writings. In the Book of Enoch, which, since it is modelled on this book, furnishes us with the earliest commentary on it, we find the stars are invariably the symbol of the angels. When we pass to the Book of Revelation, we find the same thing. We find when we pass on to the tenth chapter of this book, that all the nations are regarded as under the rule of some special angel. We must apply, so far

as we can, rules of interpretation which the author himself supplies us with. Using this guide, we see next that, when a nation was defeated and oppressed, its angel or star was regarded as thrown to the earth and trodden underfoot. The treatment Epiphanes meted out to Egypt and Palestine seems specially referred to. If we take the reading of the LXX., then the reference will be to the humiliation Epiphanes received at the hands of the Romans first, and then the Jews, and lastly the Elamites, whose temple he attempted to plunder.

Ver. 11.—Yea, he magnified himself even to the prince of the host, and by him the daily sacrifice was taken away, and the place of his sanctuary was cast down. This is said by Bevan to be the most difficult verse in this whole book. There is a difference here between the Q'ri and the K'thib. The latter reads *הָרָם*, the hiphil of *רָם*, while the former reads *הָרָם*, the hophal of the same verb. At first sight the difficulty is not lessened by consideration of the versions. The Septuagint as it at present stands is utterly unintelligible, "Until the leader of the host shall save the captivity, and by him everlasting mountains were broken down, and their place and sacrifice taken away, and he placed it in the very ground, and he prospered [reading with Syriac] and was, and the holy place shall be laid waste." This confusion is due to confluence of readings, and is not difficult to disentangle with the help of the Massoretic text. Up to the last two words the Septuagint is a translation of a text differing from the Massoretic simply by intelligible variations and repetitions not uncommon in the Septuagint. The first clause of the LXX. originally was probably, "Till the prince shall deliver the captivity," reading *שָׁבַע* (*sh'bee*) instead of *צָבָא* (*tsaba*)—a scribe, finding *צָבָא* in his Hebrew, then added the translation of it to the margin of his Greek copy, from which it got into the text. The original of the LXX. had also *יָצַדְרֵעַל* (*yatzdreeel*) instead of *הִגְדֵּעַל* (*lig'deel*)—a confusion easily made in the older script, in which *י* and *ה* were like. We learn from the Talmud (*Shabb.*, 103b) that *י* was liable to be mistaken by scribes for *ה*. Moreover, "captivity" would naturally suggest *וָצַד*, "to deliver." The second clause is, "By him the everlasting mountains were broken down." Here *hayreem* has been read with the K'thib, and vocalized as if it were *hareem*, and *tameed*, "continual," translated as equivalent to *עֹלָם* (*'olam*), "everlasting." The next clause reveals the other meaning of *tameed*, "sacrifice," which prob-

bably had been written on the margin, and then dropped into the text. The latter part of the Septuagint verse appears to be confused with the latter part of the following verse according to the Massorettes. Theodotion is even less intelligible than the Septuagint, "Until the leader of the host shall save the captivity, and through him the sacrifice was broken down, and he prospered, and the holy place shall be made desolate." It is to be noticed that the first clause here agrees with the LXX. It is possible that "and he prospered" is a doublet, *וַיִּשְׁרַח* being read for *וַיִּשְׁלַח* in some copy.

The Peshitta differs from both the Greek versions, "Until it arrive to the chiefs of the host, and by it was set up in perpetuity, and preparing he strengthened the sanctuary," and while it is difficult to understand the origin of the variation in the first clause, it is clear that in the second clause the translator must have read *hishleem* for *hooshlak*. The one thing that seems clear is that the reading of the K'thib is to be preferred. We should read *hayreem*, not *hooram*. Only the first of these could be read "mountains." If we translate the words as they stand, we shall certainly be removed out of the region of all the commentators. It is assumed that "the little horn" is the subject of this sentence; but "horn" is feminine in Hebrew, and the verbs here are in the masculine; this is against it being the nominative. The "prince of the host," then, must be the nominative of the verbs and subject of the sentence. The rendering of the first clause ought to be, then, "Until the prince of the host magnify himself (1 Sam. xii. 24), and by himself he shall offer the daily sacrifice. And he shall cast down the foundation of his holy place," reading *hishlayk* instead of *hooshlak*. We should feel strongly inclined to transfer the first "and" to *hayreem*, and, changing the punctuation, read, "Until the prince of the host shall make himself greater than he"—viz. the tyrant represented by "the little horn"—"and shall offer the daily sacrifice." If we might read *hishleem* with the Peshitta instead of *hooshlak*, we get a satisfactory meaning to the last clause, in which case we should render, "He shall complete the place of his sanctuary." We would understand by "complete," "to perfectly purify." Taking the Massoretic text thus with little modification, we have a description of the successes of Judas Maccabæus, who was prince of the host, and as such became stronger than Epiphanes, and then cleansed the temple, and offered the continual daily sacrifice. We give, as a curiosity, the note of Saadiah Gaon: "The King of Ishmael was more powerful than the kings of Rome who had

Jerusalem, and he took Jerusalem from them by force."

Ver. 12.—And an host was given him against the daily sacrifice by reason of transgression, and it cast down the truth to the ground; and it practised, and prospered. The renderings of the LXX. and Theodotion are closely related, and both differ from the Massoretic text. The first is, "And the sins were upon the sacrifice, and righteousness was fallen to the earth, and he (or, it) did, and prospered." Theodotion renders, "And sin was placed (given) upon the sacrifice, and righteousness is fallen to the earth, and he (it) did and prospered." The Peshitta is nearer the Massoretic text, but better in accordance with the Authorized Version, "A host was given against the perpetuity, in transgression the holy place was thrown to the ground, and he did and prospered." From the fact that *אָבָה* (*tsaba*) is omitted from the two Greek versions, we venture to omit it also; it has probably been inserted from the verse above. Both versions also omit the preposition before "transgression;" we omit it also. We would thus render, "And transgression was upon the sacrifice, and," reading *אֱמֶת*, "truth was cast to the ground, and it did and prospered." After Judas Maccabæus had cleansed the temple and offered sacrifices, sin mingled with it. We know that the stricter *Hasidim* objected to the foreign alliances into which the Maccabees were inclined to enter; the battle of Beth-zacharias was largely lost by the abstention of the stricter party. After that, Lysias, representing really the same movement as Epiphanes, advanced to the capture of Bethshur. Thus it might be said of the little horn, that "it did and prospered." Were it not that there is no authority for it in the versions, we should read *אֱמֶת* instead of *אֱמֶת*. In that case we should render, "And transgression was upon the sacrifice"—regarding this sacrifice as the atonement for the transgression (Lev. xvi. 21)—"and truth shall make peace in the land, and do and prosper."

Ver. 13.—Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint said unto that certain saint which spake, How long shall be the vision concerning the daily sacrifice, and the transgression of desolation, to give both the sanctuary and the host to be trodden under foot? Our Authorized rendering is clearly mistaken; it ought not to be "saint," but "holy one," as in the Revised Version. The versions leave *palmoni*, "a certain one," untranslated. Fürst's suggestion, held also by Behrmann, is that this is a contraction for *palmi almoni*. The renderings of the ver-

sions are worthy of note. The LXX., "And I heard one holy one speaking, and another holy one said to Palmouni who spake, How long shall the vision stand, and the removed sacrifice, and the sin of desolation given, and the holy place be desolate to be trodden underfoot (*eis katastrophē*)?" Here the word *σῆσεται*, "shall stand," is supposed by Professor Bevan to be an addition by one who did not fully comprehend the sentence. Following Grätz, Professor Bevan suggests a word, *מוֹרָם* (*mooram*), "removed," to explain the presence of *ἡ ἀφθεῖρα*—a suggestion that appears well-founded. His further suggestion, that *sim* (*שִׁם*), "to set up," has been read instead of *shomaym* (*שׁוּמַיִם*), must be due to inattention to the Greek. In it there is nothing about "set up," unless he transfers *σῆσεται* from its place in the beginning of the sentence to the middle, and changes it to the active voice. Equally extraordinary is the suggestion that the translators read *נֶחֱמַת* instead of *נֶחֱמַת*. The truth is, the introduction of *ἐρημωθήσεται* is probably due to a gloss or a confluence of readings. Theodotion is in close agreement with the Septuagint, save in the last clause, which he renders, "And the sanctuary and the power be trodden underfoot." The Peshitta is closer to the Massoretic, "And I heard a holy one who spake, and a holy one said to *palmoni*, who spake, When shall the vision of the perpetuity (daily sacrifice?), and of sin and of corruption be completed, and the holy place and the host be trodden underfoot?" The translators must have read *shahata* instead of *shomaym*. "Completed," *nechletem*, may have been added, as *σῆσεται* in the Greek, but the fact that all the versions have a word not represented in the Massoretic would indicate the probability that something has dropped out. Some part of the verb *נֶחֱמַת* is suggested by the Greek Version, whereas some portion of *נֶחֱמַת* is suggested by the Peshitta. Daniel hears one of those watching angels who desire to look into the evolution of the Divine purpose concerning man and his salvation, asking another, "How long shall be the desolation of Jerusalem under Epiphanes?" The irregular construction here suggests corruption. We would render the speech of the angel, "How long—the vision, the sacrifice—the sin of desolation to give the sanctuary and the service to be trodden underfoot?" as if Daniel had only heard snatches of what was said; we would, we may say, omit the "and" before "sanctuary." The Septuagint translators may have omitted *אָבָה* (*tsaba*), thinking only of its ordinary meaning, "host," forgetful of the fact that it is used of the temple service in Numb. iv. 23. These angels

are most interested in the length of time that the sanctuary shall remain desolate. This may indicate that it was evident, from the vision, that the period of desolation was a limited one. The scene presented to the imagination is striking. The seer, as he gazes on the vision appearing to him over the marsh at Susa, hears angelic voices that direct attention to what was most important to him and to his people. To the Israelites of the period of the Maccabees, the length of time that the temple service would be in abeyance was of the highest importance. It was well that they should know that the time was shortened for the elect's sake.

Ver. 14.—And he said unto me, Unto two thousand and three hundred days; then shall the sanctuary be cleansed. The Massoretic reading is here clearly corrupt. "Unto me" ought to be "unto him," as proved by the versions and necessitated by sense. The LXX. is somewhat violent in construction, but means, "And he said to him, Until evenings and mornings are two thousand three hundred days, and the sanctuary shall be purified." Theodotion agrees closely with the LXX., only he has "five hundred" instead of "three hundred." The Peshitta agrees with the Massoretic, save as above mentioned—"him" instead of "me," and the last clause, which ought naturally to be rendered "and the sacrifice be purified." The Hebrew phrase for this clause is an unnatural one—it might be rendered, "And holiness (or, 'holy thing,' 'offering') shall be justified." The want of the article is not an objection, as the manner of the author is to use the article sparingly. The word translated "cleansed" really means "justified;" it is the only example of this part of the verb. All the versions translate as if the word had been some derivative of טָהַר (*tahar*). The period referred to is that between the desolation inflicted on the temple by Antiochus Epiphanes and its cleansing by Judas Maccabæus. It is somewhat difficult to fix the exact space of time intended by these two thousand three hundred evening-mornings. Does it mean two thousand three hundred days? For this may be urged that this succession, "evening and morning," not "morning and evening," resembles Gen. i. If this resemblance is intentional, then "evening-morning" means a space of twenty-four hours. If the days are literal days, then the space of time would amount to nearly six years and a half, if we take the year here as three hundred and sixty days. Another view is that day and night are separated and each reckoned; hence the number of days involved would be eleven hundred and fifty—fifty-five days more than

three average years, and seventy days more than three years of three hundred and sixty days each. If, however, the year be the lunar year of three hundred and fifty-four days, it closely approximates to three years and a quarter. The period that one would naturally think of is that between the setting up of the abomination of desolation (1 Macc. i. 54), on the fifteenth day of Casleu, in the hundred and forty-fifth year of the Seleucid era to the rededication of the temple on the twenty-fifth of Casleu, in the hundred and forty-eighth year (from B.C. 167 to B.C. 164), but that is only three years and ten days. If the first and last of these years were respectively the fifth and seventh of a metonic cycle, in each of which there were intercalary months, then there is only a difference of eighteen days between the interval given above and the actual historical interval. If, however, we are to believe Macrobius ('Satur.' i. 13, § 9), and hold that the intercalations were supplied by adding the three months in one year, if one of the years in question was the year in the cycle in which this took place, then the interval would be twelve days too much. In either case the difference is very small. The attempt to take the interval as two thousand three hundred days leads to very arbitrary results. Behrmann takes the victory of Adasa, which Judas gained over Nicanor, as the termination of the period—a purely arbitrary date, and reckons back to the displacement of Onias, another date that, so far as can be seen, was not regarded as of importance by the Jews, however important it has become in the eye of critics.

Ver. 15.—And it came to pass, when I, even I Daniel, had seen the vision, and sought for the meaning, then, behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man. The versions here are unimportant. Daniel desires to understand the meaning of this vision. From this we see that, at the time when this book was written, it was understood that prophets might be ignorant of the meaning of the revelations made to them. This is at variance with the assumption of even believing critics, that if a prophecy were given to a prophet, he must have understood the reference of the message. On the accuracy of this assumption, they found the rejection of any interpretation of a prophecy which sees more in it than the prophet could have seen. This latest critical date of Daniel is separated by approximately two centuries and a half from prophecy in actual existence in Malachi. The tradition of the conditions of the phenomenon would still be vital. The phrase before us probably means that Daniel applied the various Babylonian formulæ to the dream, to find the inter-

pretation, but, suspicious of them, he still continued his search. In answer to Daniel's search, there stood before him one having "the appearance of a man (*gaber*)"—an angelic being in human form. The Hebrew word translated "man" is *gaber*, which suggests the name given to the angel, "Gabriel."

Ver. 16.—And I heard a man's voice between the banks of Ulai, which called, and said, Gabriel, make this man to understand the vision. The Septuagint has an addition, "And the man called out, saying, To that purpose is the vision." This seems to be a gloss. Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic, only that Theodotion does not indicate the difference of the word used for "man" in this verse from that in ver. 15, and renders Ulai "Oubal." "Between Ulai" is a singular phrase. The versions do not attempt any solution. The preposition *bayin* means usually "between." If we assume that the river Ulai is here meant, and that it divided into two branches, the thing is explicable. Only it would have been more in accordance with usage to have put "Ulai" in the plural. It may, perhaps, refer to the marsh, in which case it might be between the citadel and the marsh. Daniel had seen the appearance of a man; now he hears a voice addressing the man, and naming him *Gabriel*, "Hero of God." It is to be noted that this is the earliest instance of the naming of angels in Scripture. In the tenth chapter Michael is also named. These are the only angelic names in the whole of Scripture. These two names, and these alone, recur in the New Testament, the first of them in the first chapter of Luke, and the second in Rev. xii. 7 and Jude. The Book of Tobit added another angelic name on the same lines, Raphael. When we pass to the Books of Enoch, we have most elaborate hierarchies of angels, in all of which, however much they may otherwise differ, occur the two angels mentioned here and Raphael. The difference in atmosphere between the elaborate angelology of Enoch and the reticent accounts in the book before us is great. It is hardly possible to imagine so great a difference between the works of men that were all but contemporaries. The function assigned to Gabriel here is in accordance with that he fulfils in the New Testament—he is to make Daniel "understand the vision."

Ver. 17.—So he came near where I stood: and when he came, I was afraid, and fell upon my face: but he said unto me, Understand, O son of man: for at the time of the end shall be the vision. The versions are here in close agreement with the Massoretic text. On Gabriel's approach Daniel

fell on his face, overwhelmed at contact with the spiritual. It is mentioned as if this were the natural result of such an interview as that vouchsafed to Daniel. At first sight this contradicts ch. vii. 16, where Daniel interrogates one of the angelic bystanders. In the first place, ch. vii. 15 shows that Daniel had been grieved and disturbed before he ventured on the question; and, next, Gabriel was one of the great angels that stood before God. Gabriel addressed Daniel by the title so often given to Ezekiel, "son of man," *ben-adam*. Professor Fuller, and also Kranichfeld, remark on the contrast between *Gabriel*, "Hero of God," and *ben-adam*, "son of man." The time of the end does not mean the end of the world, or of the appearance of the Messiah, for in this vision there is no reference to either of these. It is rather to be rendered, after the analogy of Jer. l. 26, where *migetz* means "from the utmost border," and reaches to a far-off time.

Ver. 18.—Now as he was speaking with me, I was in a deep sleep on my face toward the ground; but he touched me, and set me upright. The LXX. joins the opening words of the next verse to this. *I was in a deep sleep* suggests the case of the three apostles, Peter, James, and John, on the Mount of Transfiguration (Luke ix. 32). The numbing effect of the presence of the supernatural produces a state analogous to sleep, yet "the eyes are open" (Numb. xxiv. 4)—the senses are ready to convey impressions to the mind. The angel, however, touched Daniel, and set him upright.

Ver. 19.—And he said, Behold, I will make thee know what shall be in the last end of the indignation: for at the time appointed the end shall be. The Septuagint here inserts a clause after "indignation." It reads, "on the children of thy people." It may have been inserted from ch. xii. 1, only it is used in such a different sense that that does not seem very likely. It may have been in the original text, and dropped out not unlikely by *homoteleuton*. The missing clause would be *וְעַל בְּנֵי עַמְּךָ*, the last word of which is like *עַל*. On the other hand, its omission from Theodotion and the Peshitta is not so easily intelligible. Theodotion is in close agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta is more brief, practically omitting the last clause. We have here the reference to the end, as in ver. 17 it is not the end of the world that is in the mind of the writer, but the "end of the indignation." The Jews, while maintaining their gallant struggle against Epiphanes, have need of being assured that the battle will have an end, and one determined before by God. The angel has to make Daniel know the end of the indignation. It may be said

that the present time, when Israel has neither country nor city, is one of indignation; but the immediate reference is to the persecution against the Jews inaugurated by Epiphanes.

Ver. 20.—The ram which thou sawest having two horns are the kings of Media and Persia. All the versions—the Septuagint, Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate—have read, not רָאָה , as we find in the Massoretic text, but רָאָה . The ancient construct case in Hebrew was formed by adding ' to the root. Possibly this may be a survival of that usage. In this case the change is due to scribal blunder. When we turn to Jer. xxv. 25 and li. 11, 28, we have the same phrases used as here: this is probably the origin of the blunder. For any one to ground an argument, as does Professor Bevan, on this, and maintain that it proves the writer to have held that there were two separate empires—one of Media, and the other of Persia—is absurd. When the true reading is adopted, this passage proves the very reverse of that for which Professor Bevan contends. The reasoning of Kliefoth, that the distinction between plural and singular points to the fact that, while several kings reigned over the Persian Empire, only one ruled over the Greek, is very ingenious, but, unfortunately, it has no foundation in fact. "King," it may be observed, stands for dynasty, only that in the crisis of history, when the two powers encountered, each was ruled and represented by one king—Persia by Darius Codomannus, and Greece by Alexander.

Ver. 21.—And the rough goat is the King of Grecia; and the great horn that is between his eyes is the first king. Again all the versions agree in omitting the word "rough," and in inserting "of the goats," as in the fifth verse. The authority of these is much too great to be resisted. The Massoretic reading is probably due to a confluence of readings, as the word translated "rough" also means "goats." The omission of the word "of the goats" is probably due to the inclusion of רָאָה (*ae'eer*). Here, as in the previous case, "king" stands for dynasty; and this is proved by the fact that there is implied a series of kings, of whom the great horn is the first.

Ver. 22.—Now that being broken, whereas four stood up for it, four kingdoms shall stand up out of the nation, but not in his power. The LXX., if we take the reading of the Roman edition, agrees with the Massoretic, save in the last clause, where it reads, "their power" instead of "his power." In this variation we find also Theodotion and the Peshitta agreeing. Jerome has

"ejus." It is difficult to decide what is the true reading here. In the reading of the older versions the meaning is that those kings which should succeed Alexander should not be mighty. The reading of the Massoretic and Jerome implies a direct and natural comparison with Alexander the Great. As for the Greek versions, *eu* is easily mistaken for *e* in uncial manuscripts. As for the Syriac, ܐܘ is apt to be

added to ܐܘ of the third person, and produce the difference we find. While the Greek versions and Jerome render, "his nation," instead of "the nation," as in the Massoretic, the Peshitta follows the Massoretic, which is wrong here. The point of the contrast is that the kings that succeeded Alexander were not of his family. Certainly none of the successors of Alexander had an empire nearly so extensive as his. The only one that really even comes into comparison with the empire of Alexander is that of Seleucus Nicator. But not only had he neither European nor African dominions, he did not possess, save for a little while, Asia Minor, nor Palestine, nor India beyond the Indus at all. The Parthian Empire soon sprang up, and wrested from the Seleucids a large portion of their possessions east of the Euphrates. It can well be said, even of the empire of Seleucus, that it had not the power of that of Alexander the Great.

Ver. 23.—And in the latter time of their kingdom, when the transgressors are come to the full, a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up. The versions here are, on the whole, in agreement with the Massoretic. The Greek versions read, "their sins," as if it were the iniquities of the successors of Alexander that had become full, and thus afforded the occasion of the appearance of Epiphanes. The Peshitta and Jerome have "iniquities" generally, without reference to the kings, but with probable reference to the Jewish people. The probability is decidedly in favour of the Massoretic reading; it was an easy suggestion that the iniquities to be punished were those of the heathen kings. The whole analogy of Scripture leads us to look at the iniquity of the people of God being the cause of evil befalling them. Certainly immediately before the persecution inflicted on the Jews by Antiochus, the progress of the unbelieving Hellenizing party had been very great, as we see by I Macc. i. 13—16. It was "like people, like priest;" the people devoted themselves to Grecian games with all their heathen associations, and strove to hide their Hebrew origin and the covenant of their faith, and high priests were ready

to abet their practices. *A king of fierce countenance*; "strong of countenance." This refers to courage and success in war. Thus Amaziah (2 Kings xiv. 8), when he wishes to challenge Joash King of Israel, desires to "look in his face." Epiphanes' countenance was one that could successfully stand a hostile meeting. The Greek versions render *ὑψ* ("az") by *ἀναιδής*, "reckless." *Understanding dark sentences*. There may be some reference to incantations and superstitious observances; it may mean that he was well acquainted with omens, and how to benefit by them. Regardlessness in the matter of religion was a prominent characteristic of Antiochus; but it is quite a possible thing that, like most irreligious men, he was superstitious. He certainly was very keen-sighted in observing the political signs of the times, and very adroit at availing himself of what made for his own advantage. This last is the interpretation of Ewald. Zöckler and Hitzig think it means that the king here pictured "will be cunning to hide his own designs from friend and foe." Yet more common is the view of Keil, Behrmann, Stuart, and Bevan, that it refers generally to his mastery in the use of artifice. The main difficulty in regard to this view is that usage does not support assigning such a meaning to *heedoth*. On the other hand, when we bear in mind that here we have the language of symbol and prophecy, so tricks of strategy and chicanery of policy may all be symbolized by "dark sayings," without necessary reference to sentences such as those with which the Queen of Sheba tested the wisdom of Solomon.

Ver. 24.—*And his power shall be mighty, but not by his own power: and he shall destroy wonderfully, and shall prosper, and practise, and shall destroy the mighty and the holy people*. This verse involves many difficulties, grammatical and exegetical. These difficulties may be said to be present in all the versions of this passage. The LXX. renders, "And his power shall be confirmed, and not in his strength, and he shall destroy marvellously, and prosper and do, and shall destroy the rulers and people of the saints." Theodotion is so far slavishly close to the Massoretic text; but he seems to have read *godeh*, an adjective agreeing with "people," instead of *q'dosheem*, "saints;" and he omits the negative clause. The Peshitta is very close to the Massoretic. It emphasizes the negative clause by adding *d'naphsho*, and translates "wonders" instead of "wonderfully." Jerome, more intent on expressing what is his own interpretation of the passage than on representing the original, translates the first *heel* ("power") by *fortitudo*, and the

second by *virtus suis*. That the power of Epiphanes was great—greater than that of his brother and immediate predecessor—is undoubted. It is also the case that he was confirmed in his place by the Romans, though, if we are to receive the account of Appian, the direct means of his elevation to the throne was the intervention of Eumenes of Pergamus on his behalf. Thus the reference of the phrase, "not by his own power," may be to this. Little as he might brook the thought, he was but a subjectally of the great republic. The other interpretations are (1) that of Theodoret, Keil, Fuller, Hävernick, Kranichfeld, and Moses Stuart, that the reference here is to Divine power as setting up Epiphanes to be a scourge to his people; (2) that of von Lengerke, Kliefoth, Bevan, Behrmann, etc., not by might, but by his cunning; (3) that of Hitzig, which combines the two—his cunning is divinely given; (4) that of Calvin and Ewald, that the contrast is with the might of Alexander the Great. All of these have something to favour them, but also something against them. There is against the first that there is no reference in the context to the fact, true though it was, that Antiochus was raised up by God for his own purposes. Against the second is the prenominal suffix, which would be needless if the contrast were between force and fraud. Of course, Hitzig's combination falls with this. Against the view advocated by Calvin and Ewald is the fact that it seems a long time to hold the reference to Alexander in abeyance. Still, it may be urged that the vision was before the prophet; on the other hand, the relative strength of Epiphanes and Alexander does not seem to be of importance. We still think that the real reference is to the fact that he did not attain the throne either by inheritance or by his own prowess, but by the help and authority of others, namely, Eumenes and Rome. *And he shall destroy wonderfully*. Grätz thinks *yaseeth*, "destroy," suspicious, and Professor Bevan suggests *yaseeh* (yaseeh), and would render, "He shall utter monstrous things;" but, unfortunately for his view, there is no hint in the versions of any difficulty as to the reading, and, further, *סוף* (*soof*) does not mean "utter," but "meditate." We must take the words as they stand (comp. Judg. xiii. 19), and translate, "He shall destroy portentously." Certainly Epiphanes was to the Jews a portent of destruction; there had not been his like—not Nebuchadnezzar, who burned the temple, was to be compared to him who endeavoured to blot out the worship of Jehovah altogether: not any other of the Greek monarchs. He was unique in his enmity against God and his worship. *He*

shall destroy the mighty and the holy people. The rendering of the Revised Version better conveys the sense of the original, "He shall destroy the mighty ones." There has been discussion as to the distinction involved here. Ewald regards the mighty as the three other horns of the ten (ch. vii. 8)—an interpretation which proceeds on the false identification of the fourth beast with the Greek Empire. Rashi imagines the star-worshippers; this seems the height of caprice. Jephth-ibn-Ali, who identifies the little horn with Mahommed, holds the "mighty" to be the Romans. Keil and Fuller hold it to be the heathen rulers generally. Von Lengerke, Kliefoth, and others maintain it refers to the rich of the holy people, while *am* ('am) are the poor. Hitzig refers it to the three claimants for the crown, whom Antiochus is alleged, on somewhat insufficient evidence, to have overthrown; Behrmann and Zöckler, to the political and warlike enemies of Epiphanes, in contrast to the holy people, who were unwarlike. Kranichfeld refers it to the rulers of Israel, as distinct from the people; Calvin to "neighbouring nations." Moses Stuart would render, "great numbers, even the people of the saints;" while Professor Bevan thinks there is an interpolation here, and adopts a reading of Grätz from the LXX. for the beginning of the following verse. On the whole, this seems the best solution of the difficulty. After Epiphanes had destroyed the "mighty," that is to say, the political enemies he had, the Egyptians, etc., he directed his mind to the "people of the saints."

Ver. 25.—*And through his policy also he shall cause craft to prosper in his hand; and he shall magnify himself in his heart, and by peace shall destroy many: he shall also stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand.* The versions here are at variance with each other and with the Massoretic recension. The LXX. renders, "And against the saints shall his purpose be"—evidently reading, as suggested by Grätz, *al qdosheem silo*—"and craft shall prosper in his hands, and his heart shall be lifted up, and by treachery he shall destroy many, and for the destruction of men shall he stand, and he shall make a gathering of power, and shall sell (it)." Theodotion is, in regard to the first clause, considerably more at variance with the Massoretic, "And the yoke of his collar (or chain) shall prosper." Evidently Theodotion had read *by* ('ol), "yoke," instead of *by* ('al), "upon," and probably *sil'lo* ('sil'lo), "his burden," instead of *sil'lo* ('sil'lo), "his thought." "And in his heart he shall be magnified, and by treachery

shall he corrupt many, and for the destruction of many shall he stand, and as eggs shall he crush (them) in his hand," reading *k'bayteem b'yad yishbar* instead of *b'eseeph yad yishshabayr*. The Peshitta has several points of peculiarity, "And in his might he shall prosper: he shall restrain with his hand, and his heart shall be lifted up, and by treachery shall he corrupt many, and against the Ruler of rulers shall he rise up, and with grasp of the hand shall he be taken." Even Jerome, who is usually in close agreement with the Massoretic text, translates at variance with their pointing. He begins this verse really with the last clause of the previous one, "And he shall slay strong ones and the people of the saints according to his will, and treachery shall be directed in his hand, and in plenty of all things he shall slay many, and against the Prince of princes shall he rise, and without hand shall he be broken." The most singular thing is the omission by both the Greek versions of the phrase *sar sareem*, which both appear to have read *yishhaf rabbeem*—a variation of reading difficult to understand. On the whole, these varying versions seem to have sprung from a text originally not differing much from the Massoretic, save in the opening clause, in which the Septuagint appears to suit the succession of thought better. The return of Antiochus from his expedition to Egypt was the signal for his persecution of the saints; then his "purpose was against the holy people." *Craft shall prosper in his hand.* The account we have in the First Book of the Maccabees shows the perpetual exercise by Antiochus and those under him of treachery. At first, at all events, his craft prospered (1 Macc. i. 30). *And he shall magnify himself in his heart.* Bevan thinks this hardly accurate, as the *hiphil* is ordinarily causative. Only Zeph. ii. 8 has this verb used in *hiphil* as reflexive. The sense, however, seems to be, not that he shall become proud, but that he has many great projects in his mind—one (1 Macc. i. 42) being to unify all the various peoples that were under his sceptre, so that they should be one in religion and law. He further had the design of conquering Egypt and uniting it to his empire, and would have done so had the Romans not intervened. *And by peace shall destroy many.* The word translated "peace" means also "suddenly." The Greek versions both render it by *δολω*. Schleusner suggests that the word was derived from another root. There does not seem such a root in *Levy*. The probability is that the meaning passed from "tranquillity" to the notion of "treachery." The meaning assigned to the word by Jerome is inexplicable, *copia*

rerum. It happens that both the meaning attached to the word *shalvah* by the Greek versions here, and that found in other passages, harmonize. The treachery of the chief collector of tribute lay in feigning peace, and then slaying the people (1 Macc. i. 29). *He shall also stand up against the Prince of princes*. The Greek versions, as above observed, have instead of this, ἐπὶ ἀπωλείας ἀνδρῶν στήσεται—a phrase that might be a rendering of רבבים וסחל. The Massoretic text here seems the preferable. Antiochus had certainly risen up against God, the "Prince of princes," or, as the Peshitta renders, "Ruler of rulers." *He shall be broken without hand*. The fact of Antiochus dying immediately after an ineffectual attempt to rob a temple in Elymais, and dying, not from the effect of wounds received, but from chagrin, is symbolized by this statement. The figure of a horn pushing in this direction and in that is resumed; hence Epiphanes is said to be broken. And that he was not overthrown in battle by any rival for the crown is shown by the statement that it was without hands that he was so broken. The Romans resisted his attempt to take possession of Egypt, so he was balked in his pursuit after one object. He desired to unite his whole multifarious empire, so that it should be homogeneous; that was balked by the victorious revolt of the Jews under Judas Maccabæus. If he could have made his empire homogeneous, he might have expected to be able to defy the Romans. The defeat of his army by Judas might easily be remedied if he had money to pay his troops, so he attempted the plunder of the temple in Elymais, said to be that of Artemis. The inhabitants resisted so vehemently, that he had to retire baffled. This it was that caused his death. Polybius hints at madness inflicted by a Divine hand.

Ver. 26.—*And the vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true: wherefore shut thou up the vision; for it shall be for many days*. The rendering of the LXX. here is, "The vision of the evening and morning was found true, and the vision has been secured for many days." אֲשֶׁר נִעְמַר (*asher ne'emar*) has been read by נִסְמַר, although it is difficult to see the genesis of such a reading from the Massoretic, or *vice versa*. The LXX. rendering of סָמַם ought to be observed—not "shut up," in the sense of being "sealed," but "defended from interference by being secured as with a hedge." Theodotion and the Peshitta agree with the Massoretic text, but have סָמַם instead of סָמַם. *The vision of the evening and the morning* refers to ver. 14. The phrase used here differs by the insertion

of the definite article; but this merely intimates a reference. This statement does not mean that the period indicated by the two thousand three hundred evenings and mornings would end with the death of Antiochus. Certainly, his death occurred in the year following the cleansing of the temple (1 Macc. vi. 16). If the writer reckons the beginning of the year according to the Macedonian Calendar, almost a year must have elapsed between the temple-cleansing and the death of Antiochus; but it is the cleansing that is the *terminus ad quem*, not the death of Antiochus. The pollution of the temple was the event that, of all others, would be trying to the faith and patience of Jewish believers; therefore attention is directed to this. As the beginning of this season of trial is the point to which the whole history of the Greek Empire travels, so the termination of this desecration is the end contemplated. *Shut thou up the vision*. Certainly the verb *satham* means sometimes "to hide;" and it is also certain that it is a characteristic of apocalyptic literature to contain, in the text, elaborate directions for hiding the vision; e.g. the Apocalypse of Moses. It has been argued that this is a preparation for the publication of Daniel in the age of the Maccabees, so long after the date at which it purports to be written. But there is no description of how the book is to be hidden, as in the Assumption of Moses. Moreover, the translators of the LXX. did not understand *satham* as "hide." If it had been bidden, and had been discovered, he would have known and translated accordingly. Then when we turn to the next verse, we find that Daniel himself did not understand the command as meaning that he was to keep the vision secret from his contemporaries; so far from that being the case, one of his reasons for distress is that no one understood the vision. *The vision shall be for many days*. That is to say, that a long interval divided the time when the revelation was made from the time of its fulfilment (Ezek. xii. 27); the vision he sees is for many days to come. Before the beginning of the history revealed to Daniel, certainly not many years intervened; but between the days of Belshazzar and those of Antiochus was an interval of approximately four centuries. The Persian Empire rose and fell, and the Macedonian Empire rose and was approaching its fall. At the end of the period, the light of the vision fell most clearly. It was not necessary that Daniel should know the events portrayed to foretell them truly, any more than it was needful that the Second Isaiah should know the exact historical events portrayed so clearly in his fifty-third chapter. Daniel

could not fail to know of Persia, and it even did not require more than a knowledge of the past, and ordinary powers of political forecast, to see that Cyrus might, and probably would, found a world-empire. He knew of the Greeks: there were Greeks in the army of Nebuchadnezzar. Moreover, we learn from Herodotus (i. 77) that Nabunahid Labynetus had made an alliance with Croesus, in order to check the advance of Cyrus. We know from Herodotus (i. 26, 27) that Croesus subdued all the Greek cities in Asia Minor. To Daniel, who possibly had favoured this alliance with the Western monarch, the King of Javan would mean, not Alexander the Great, as it means to us, but Croesus. But his hopes that Babylon will be delivered by the help of Croesus are shown to be groundless, by the intimation that it will be "for many days." The intimation that he had made to Belshazzar, of the interpretation of the inscription on the palace wall, did not necessarily, in his mind, militate against the hope that repentance might lead to respite. Daniel may have made use of political expedients to help in the result he wished.

Ver. 27.—*And I Daniel fainted, and was sick certain days; afterward I rose up, and did the king's business; and I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.* The Septuagint omits "fainted," but otherwise agrees with the above. Theodotion evidently has had the Massoretic text before him; but he has not understood, and has slavishly rendered it word for word. The Peshitta represents also a text practically identical with that of the Massoret. Jerome also agrees with the received text; he renders the last clause, *non erat qui interpretaretur*. That Daniel should faint, and remain sick for days—"many days," says the LXX.—is quite in accordance with what we might imagine to be the natural effect of intercourse with the spiritual world. The mental strain and the intense excitement incident upon such an occurrence would necessarily produce a reaction.

Afterward I rose up, and did the king's business. We have no distinct evidence of what the business was that took Daniel to Susa, if he was there in reality, and not merely in vision; but we may surmise that it was about the advance of Cyrus. Elam and Media were both embraced in the dominion of Cyrus very early. Cyrus had overthrown the Umman-Manda, and delivered Babylon. At that time there seems to have been somewhat of a *rapprochement* between Nabunahid and Cyrus; but at the time before us, Cyrus must have begun to realize his destiny, and possibly would not be easy to treat with. Daniel may have been plenipotentiary of Babylon at the court of Cyrus, endeavouring to secure a treaty. At the same time, aware that Croesus, the rival of Cyrus, might be called in, he continues the negotiation. *I was astonished at the vision, but none understood it.* The idea of the word translated "astonished" is "benumbed;" it may be exegetic of the first clause, explaining the cause of the fainting and subsequent sickness. It is clear that Daniel did not regard the command "to guard *סוד* (*satham*) the vision" as implying that he should keep it secret. We see, as we said above, that his complaint is that no one understood the vision. Behrmann maintains that *יָדָע* (*maybeen*), "to understand," ought to be translated "marked," "observed," but *יָדָע* would be the natural verb to use in such a connection, not *יָדָע*. Hitzig explains this by saying, "He had imparted the vision to no one." If Daniel had indulged in statements of that kind, the work before us would not have inaugurated a new form of literature. Professor Bevan's interpretation is as far-fetched, "And I was no understander thereof." The example he brings forward of ver. 5 is not to the purpose, because the distinction between the first person and the third is too great. Moses Stuart has the same view.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 1—14.—*The triumph of evil.* I. THE DARK SIDE OF THE TRIUMPH OF EVIL. Evil is sometimes not only powerful, but ascendant and dominant, apparently sweeping all before it. 1. Evil is *destructive*. Kingdoms under the sway of evil become mutually destructive. The successive visions of the world-empires represent them with increasingly destructive characteristics. The first brings before us a monstrous image of incongruous elements, but with a certain unity and peaceful relation of parts (ch. ii.). The second shows us a series of ravenous beasts, which, however, are not represented as all fighting one with another (ch. vii.). The third introduces us to animals, by nature peaceful, in fierce mutually destructive conflict. Thus as the knowledge of the evil kingdoms grows, they are seen to be more destructive, even in their most peaceful relations. The more we see of evil the more

shall we feel its essentially destructive character (Jas. i. 15). 2. The world without God *deteriorates*. These kingdoms get worse and worse. The moral progress of mankind is dependent on our relation to God—on our submission to his redemptive and educational influence. When these are discarded, morality declines. 3. When evil triumphs in the state, the exercise of *religious ordinances is endangered* (ver. 11). Persecution usually has a moral cause. The protest of pure public worship is regarded as a danger to the sway of wickedness. 4. *Evil is inimical to truth*, and when it triumphs truth suffers. Evil is darkness; it is essentially a lie (John viii. 44). Truth is a protest against evil, therefore evil “casts truth to the ground” (ver. 12; see 2 Thess. ii. 11). 5. Evil gains power from its *prosperity*. It “practises and prospers.” When it flourishes it puts on an imposing appearance and grows by popularity. Thus the more it prospers the more it tends to prosper.

II. THE LIGHT SIDE OF THE TRIUMPH OF EVIL. 1. It is *foreseen and predicted*. Therefore it should not surprise us. It was foreknown by God from the Creation. It was known when the promises of Divine blessing were given. All the plans of Providence were made in view of it. Yet they are bright and hopeful (Rom. viii. 19—23). 2. It is converted into a *chastisement* for sin and a means of purifying those who suffer by it. Though wicked men may only intend harm to God’s people, the wrong they do may be the means of the highest good. 3. Its *duration* is limited. A period is named for the termination of its sway (vers. 13, 14). Evil is but for a time, and this is short compared with eternity. God holds power over it and fixes its limitations. 4. Ultimately evil shall be *entirely cast out*. Then the triumph of goodness will be the greater by its contrast with the sway of evil. The glory of Christ in redeeming from sin and restoring the world to God is only possible after evil has had an opportunity of asserting its power (2 Thess. ii. 7, 8).

Vers. 23—25.—*Subtle sin*. We have here a description of a terrible evil power which, in manner and appearance, is deceptively harmless, and yet which is really most destructive and wicked and destined to detection and overthrow.

I. EVIL WORKS MOST EFFECTIVELY WHEN IT HIDES ITS TRUE CHARACTER. 1. It works under a *fair show*. The king has “an insolent countenance” and “magnifies himself in his heart.” There is a bold self-assertion and an apparent frankness which sometimes blind men to the falsehood beneath. 2. It works by *craft*, as much as by force. The king “understands dark stratagems” and “craft prospers under his hand.” The tempter is more successful when he appears as the subtle serpent than when he comes as a raging lion. Transformed into an angel of light, he persuades by deceit. Intellect is a more dangerous weapon in the hands of a bad man than mere brute force. 3. It turns peaceful *prosperity* into a means of harm. Warfare and persecution are less dangerous than the insidious temptations of luxurious vices and flattering indolence.

II. THOUGH EVIL MAY BE OBSCURE TO US, ITS CHARACTER AND DESTINY ARE NOT CHANGED. 1. It is still *destructive*. This crafty and peace-loving king is really as destructive as the old warlike monarch. Sin is not the less fatal because it wears a fair mask. 2. It is still only the *abuse of Divine gifts*. The king is mighty, “but not by his own power.” All sin is only possible by the abuse of talents lent us by God. The boldness of self-assertion is no proof of independence and liberty to pursue our own course. 3. It is still *defiance of the will of God*. “He shall stand up against the Prince of princes.” We may rebel against God with a smile as much as with a frown. Guilt is not measured by manners, but by motives. Crafty treachery is not less guilty than open rebellion. 4. It is still destined to *judgment and overthrow*. We may deceive men; we cannot deceive God (Rom. ii. 16). God also “understands the dark stratagems” of subtle wickedness. They will be detected and defeated. The punishment of sins of subtlety and craft is as certain as that of sins of open and confessed guilt.

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 2, 13, 15.—Modes of supersensual vision. "I saw in a vision" (ver. 2); "Then I heard one saint speaking, and another saint" (ver. 13); "Behold, there stood before me as the appearance of a man" (ver. 15). Of the next vision, the *time* should be noted—two years after the last, Belshazzar still living; and the *place*, viz. Shushan. Daniel seems not to have been there in reality, but only in vision. So Ezekiel from Babylon was "brought in the visions of God to Jerusalem." This vision concerned the overthrow of Persia, and so the prophet was placed at the centre of the empire, whence he might see the desolation coming. This vision develops dramatically: 1. We have *symbols*. (Vers. 1—12.) Then: 2. *Answering voices*. (Vers. 13, 14.) 3. *Communication from God through Gabriel*. (Vers. 15—27.) This may suggest discourse on some modes of coming to the vision of supersensual truth. By—

I. CONTEMPLATING PICTURES IN THE WORLD OF SENSE. Daniel was brought first into contact with symbol—picture of power and action, the ram, the goat; destruction of the ram; certain transformations of the goat. So man's first lesson now comes through the sense-pictures of the world. This depends, as a fact, on the truth that the world is one transparency, through which is ever shining supersensual truth. Behind all phenomena of space and time lie luminous eternal truths. Consider how much we can see in and learn from: 1. Our *present home* of the material world. 2. The *life-forms* with which it is crowded. 3. *Common employment*. 4. *Social relations*. How much of spiritual truth may be seen, e.g., in paternity, the family, civil constitution, law, etc. 5. Our *training* through the successive incidents of life.

II. LISTENING TO ANSWERING VOICES. "Then I heard one saint," etc. (ver. 13). Here we pass to a higher realm than that of sense-pictures, into the arena of pure *intelligence*. An angel-voice addressed Daniel, or was about to address him, when another, interrupting, requested the first angel to afford Daniel definite information on certain points; which he did. We may learn much: 1. From the *colloquy of the angels*. True, we cannot hear this; but much of angel-discourse is recorded in the book. Think of Stier's 'Words of the Angels.' 2. From the *controversies of the Church*. Present and past. What have they been but contentions, out of which truth has come with a clearer definition and more resplendent aspect? 3. From the *assaults of unbelief*. The indebtedness of the Church to disbelief, misbelief, and non-belief can never be accurately reckoned. Scepticism often has: (1) *Stripped the Church of untenable positions*. (2) *Driven her back on deeper foundations*. (3) *Corrected the interpretation of supersensual truth*. We may go a step further: 4. *From the continuities of infidelities among themselves*.

III. DEVOUT ATTENTION TO MAN INFORMED BY GOD. (Ver. 15.) Daniel looking on the vision, behold, the apparition of a man! Gabriel—the man (the *vir*, not the *homo*) of God. To Gabriel a voice—not that of the genius of the river Ulai, but of God. Here we have intimated another way in which supersensual truth may be uncovered to man; i.e. by man, but by man informed by God. We use the word "informed" in two senses: (1) in the grand old sense—the *form filled out* with spirit and power; (2) in the more modern sense, of *being instructed* simply. The name "Gabriel," equivalent to "Vir Dei," suggests that revelation may come: 1. *Through manhood*. Through man at his highest, noblest, best. Through holiness unfallen, as in the case of Gabriel. Or through holiness restored, as in the case of a man. Through power, virility, genius sanctified. 2. *Vitalized by God*. Filled with God. 3. *Spoken to by God*. (Ver. 16.) Note: The Divine voice has a human tone in it. We may take, as examples of this mode of revelation, the case of the text, *Gabriel*; any *real prophet*; *Christ*, the Divine Man; the true *preacher of modern times*. The first effect of Divine revelation, as with Daniel, may be *consternation* (ver. 17); but that effect may be relieved and softened by *sympathy* (ver. 18): "but he touched me." Think of Christ's healing touch.—R.

Vers. 3—8, 20—22.—Two world-empires. "The ram which thou sawest," etc. (vers. 20, 21). The only way in which the substance of the vision can be legitimately treated seems to us the expository. But be it remembered that the exposition of a

chapter like this is really an explication of the gradual unfolding of a part of the history of the kingdom of God antecedent to the Incarnation. We set up here simply directing-posts to mark the way. Note particularly the partial character of this vision—it is not now of the four world-empires and of the everlasting kingdom, but only of two—Persia, Greece—and the development of Greece. And mark, the symbols are authoritatively interpreted (vers. 21, 22). Here we have a key wherewith to unlock the secrets of the rest of the book.

I. PERSIA. In the symbol we have: 1. *Its unity*. "A ram." 2. *Its duality* "Two horns." Media and Persia. 3. *Its inequality*. One horn the higher; and came up last. 4. *The direction of its aggression*. (Ver. 4.) Babylon; Lydia; Egypt. 5. *Its temporary irresistibility*. (Ver. 4.) 6. *Complete overthrow*. (Ver. 7.) Compare throughout with the bear of ch. vii.

II. GREECE. Here should be opened out: 1. *The fitness of the goat as a symbol*; e.g. Greece abounded in goats; several municipalities adopted it as a symbol, and struck its image on their coins, etc. See detailed Expositions. 2. *Its ubiquity*. "On the face of the whole earth." 3. *Celerity*. "Touched not the ground." 4. *The concentration of its genius*. "A notable horn." Alexander (ver. 21). 5. *Its victory*. (1) *The conflict was within the Persian lines*. "Close unto the ram." (2) *The attack made with the concentrated wrath of Greece*. "Moved with choler." The provocation was the successive Persian invasions. (3) *Complete*. 6. *Its subsequent growth*. 7. *Sudden break-down*.

III. GREECE DIVIDED. 1. *Into four*. Greece; Asia Minor; Syria; Egypt. 2. *At the zenith of power*; i.e. under Alexander (ver. 8). 3. *With instant collapse*. (Ver. 22.) "Not in his power."—R.

Vers. 9—12, 23—25.—*The scourge of Israel*. "He shall stand up against the Prince of princes; but he shall be broken without hand" (ver. 25). As in the previous homily, we give a mere directive outline, for the help of those who may care to make the antichrist of the later Hebrew time the subject of treatment. The sketch given by the prophet undoubtedly applies to Antiochus Epiphanes. The only question has been raised by those who wish to throw discredit on the supernatural in prophecy, and who, struck by the marvellous minuteness of Daniel's description, have tried to show that it must have been written after the event, and therefore not by Daniel at all. Observe: 1. *The general description*. Out of one of the four kingdoms into which Alexander's empire was divided, came forth a new kingdom—at least a new king, with special characteristics, and with special antagonistic relations to the kingdom of God. 2. *The notes of time*—very remarkable. The date of the rise of Antiochus is given. "In the latter time" of the dominion of the four kingdoms "a king of fierce countenance, and understanding dark sentences, shall stand up." These kingdoms were gradually absorbed into the Roman empire, but may be considered to have commenced with the defeat of Perseus at the battle of Pydna, B.C. 168. Another note: "When the transgressions are come to the full." We understand that to be said of the state of things in Judea. There affairs were in a frightful state. We can imagine the condition when men fought for the high priesthood, and obtained it often by bribery or murder. "The sacred writers often speak of iniquity as being *full*—of the cup of iniquity as being full—as if there was a certain limit or capacity beyond which it could not be allowed to go. When that arrives, God interferes, and cuts off the guilty by some heavy judgment." Such a state of things existed at Jerusalem, when Antiochus ascended the throne of Syria.

I. HIS CHARACTER was marked by: 1. *Shameless audacity*. "Of fierce countenance;" i.e. "hardy of countenance" (ver. 23). Destitute of shame. Most conquerors respected the religion of the conquered; this man forced on the Jews his own. 2. *Deceitful subtlety*. Master of deceitful wiles. "Understanding dark sentences" (ver. 23). 3. *Power*. But such advantage as he gained against Israel was "not by his own power." By whose? By God's. In what sense? The eternal law of righteousness made him its instrument, as against the iniquity of Israel. 4. *Practical genius*. "He shall practise" (ver. 24); i.e. "he shall do;" i.e. the man was to be no mere dreamer. What he professed he would perform. 5. *Destructiveness*. (Ver. 24.) The activity should be malicious,

II. HIS ACTION. 1. *He practised deceit.* (Ver. 25.) "And though . . . by peace shall destroy many." He would destroy a people resting in an unreal security. 2. *He disliked the ecclesiastical rulers in Israel.* (Ver. 10.) Read, The horn "waxed great against the host," etc. 3. *He acted so that the whole Hebrew commonwealth was at his mercy.* (Ver. 12.) Read, "A host was given [him] with the daily sacrifice, by reason of transgression." 4. *He abolished the daily sacrifice.* (Ver. 11.) Read, "And by him was taken away the perpetual, and was cast down the place of his sanctuary." No doubt the daily sacrifice is principally intended, but there is given to it grandeur by designating it "the perpetual," i.e. the everlasting changeless element in the Hebrew ritual. The undying testimony to the atonement of the Lord (Exod. xxix. 38—41; Lev. vi. 13). Against the Redeemer's own memorial did Antiochus lift up his hand. That struck down, the sanctuary was desolate. (See terrible description, 1 Macc. i. Note the heroic fidelity of some, vers. 63, 64.) 5. *He struck at the truth.* (Ver. 12.) 6. *He sets himself against God.* "He magnified himself against the Prince of the hosts;" "He stood up against the Prince of princes" (vers. 11, 25). 7. *He attained to a certain sort and measure of prosperity.* (Ver. 9.) The reference is to Egypt, to what remained of Persia, and to Judæa.

III. THE DOOM. How sublime the prophecy! "He shall be broken without hand." How terrible the fulfilment! He fell by an invisible blow from the King of kings. He died of grief and remorse at Babylon (1 Macc. i. 16; 2 Macc. ix.).—R.

Vers. 13, 14, 26.—*Prophecy's sure fulfilments.* "Unto evenings and mornings, two thousand and three hundred;" "The vision of the evening and the morning which was told is true" (vers. 14, 26). Two thousand three hundred days, that is, six years and a hundred and ten days. Whence reckoned? To what time? The cleansing of the sanctuary took place under Judas Maccabæus, December 25, B.C. 165. Reckoning back two thousand three hundred days, we come to August 1, B.C. 171. Up to this latter date the relations between Antiochus and the Jewish people had been peaceful; then began a series of aggressions, which ended only with his death. (For account of the new dedication of the temple, see 1 Macc. iv. 36—61.) We suggest a homily on *The certainty of the fulfilment of the Divine Word.*

I. THE DEFINITENESS OF THE END. Here "the cleansing of the sanctuary."

II. THE EXACT MEASUREMENT OF ALL INTERMEDIATE SECOND CAUSES. The number, force, combination, duration of their action.

III. CONSEQUENT LIMIT OF TIME. In the Divine mind. Not necessarily revealed to us; though the exact number of the days was so in this case.

IV. OUR MORAL ATTITUDE. *Belief in the word. Confidence in the Word-giver. Obedience, active and passive. The entertainment of a great hope. Let the sunshine of the assured future light the present.*—R.

Ver. 27.—*The effects of visions Divine.* "And I Daniel fainted," etc. We have here the effects of visions Divine—

I. ON THE BODY. Even the prophets were but men like ourselves. Daniel was utterly prostrated by this overpowering vision. Became ill for a long time. In our present state we can only bear so much.

II. ON THE MIND. "I was astonished at the vision. . . . And there was none who understood it." 1. *Fulfilled prophecy is an open book.* 2. *Unfulfilled, a book only partly open.* There should, then, be: (1) *Devout inquiry.* (2) *The glad acquisition of some knowledge.* But: (3) *No dogmatism.* Even a prophet, who had with his own eyes seen the glory, had to grope along the path of daily duty, with only the common dim and partial light.

III. ON THE LIFE. "I rose up, and did the king's business." These grand disclosures of things heavenly, of things future, of things Divine, to his soul; the high enjoyments of religion; only disposed him to be more faithful in meeting present obligations. There is no proper separation between deepest spirituality and the faithful plodding on the path of duty, which so much becomes us. "He who has been favoured with the clearest views of Divine things will be none the less prepared to discharge with faithfulness the duties of this life. He who is permitted and enabled to look into the future will be none the less likely to be diligent, faithful, laborious in meeting the

responsibilities of the present moment. If a man could see all that there is in heaven, it would only serve to inspire him with a deeper conviction of his obligations in every relation. If he could see all that there is to come in the vast eternity before him, it would only inspire him with a profounder sense of the consequences which may follow from the discharge of the present duty."—R.

Vers. 1—12.—The temporary triumph of violence. The good use of God's revelation leads to the impartation of further and clearer revelation. "To those who have, it shall be given." The former vision had well exercised Daniel's mind; now a more minute vision is vouchsafed. In the improvement of character is piety's reward.

I. GOD'S GOOD GIFTS ARE DESPISED BY THE CARNAL AMBITION OF MEN. Lands, cities, palaces, extensive provinces, all fail to satisfy the man in whose breast vulgar ambition dwells. The possessor of the great kingdom of Persia did not conduct himself as a man, but as a silly ram. He was supreme master of these things; but since he did not extract advantage or enjoyment from them, he could not be said to possess them. His one thought was how to acquire more. Instead of cherishing a grateful disposition that God had given him so much, and afforded him such fine opportunities for useful service, his dominant passion was to dispossess others of their dominion. Nor did the fact afflict his soul, that in the career of violence, much innocent blood would be shed, men would be diverted from occupations of husbandry, and misery would be widely sown. The palace in which vain Ambition hatches her plots is no better than a pest-house. And the monarch who is prodigal with human blood is no other than a murderer. Like Satan, the destroyer, "he also goeth about seeking whom he may devour."

II. MILITARY CONQUESTS SOW DEEPLY THE SEEDS OF DEADLY REVENGE. The arbiter of war settles nothing. The victor to-day is the vanquished to-morrow. The memories of the conquered people hold, with a deathless tenacity, purposes of revenge; and if the conqueror himself does not live to see his military fortune reversed, his successors feel the blow with accumulated fury. The ram, with his two unequal horns, pushed westward, northward, and southward, and for a moment was accounted great. But ere long the goat with one strong horn assailed him with uncontrollable rage, smote him to the ground, and trod him underfoot. The arm of muscular strength soon decays. If a monarch has nothing better to depend upon than an arm of flesh, his glory will soon fade. It is surprising how that generation after generation, monarchs still rely upon human battalions rather than on the living God. So ingrained in their imperial nature is ambitious pride, that they need to be bruised and pulverized in a mortar before the pride can be extracted.

III. THE MILITARY POWER OF A KINGDOM IS EASILY BROKEN. Very significantly is it said respecting this he-goat, that "when he was strong, the great horn was broken." Alexander, surnamed by flatterers "the Great," was to the kingdom of Macedon merely a horn—a weapon of offence. Can there be a more humiliating statement? If God has given to the inferior animals natural horns, they are intended to serve as defensive weapons. If the animal has any native sagacity, it will reserve its horns for fitting occasions of danger; for if it should rush into needless hostilities, its horns may be broken, and in the hour of peril the animal will become a helpless prey. How often does God snap the horn of human power in the hour of boastful triumph! Herod was drinking the sweet potion of profane flattery, when an angel smote him, and he was eaten up of worms. Nebuchadnezzar was feasting on the pride of his great success, when his reason forsook him, and he was degraded to a place among the cattle. Alexander sat down to weep, because there seemed no further scope for his ambition; but God's shaft of disease pierced him, and left him a corpse.

IV. TRANSIENT SUCCESS MAKES MONARCHS INSOLENT AND PROFANE. If God takes away, he also gives. Where the one strong horn had been broken off, four other horns came up instead. The vital energy which could produce this is the direct gift of God. Whoever is meant by this "little horn," he ought to have learnt, as the very first lesson of his life, that he had been raised up by God to replace one who had been removed by death. But instead of learning lessons of humility and pious trust from the patent scenes of human mortality, men, for the most part, become more

presumptuous and profane. No outward events permanently impress the soul. Nothing but the mysterious grace of God can soften and purify man's heart. This "little horn" ventures to assail the very stars of heaven. As high as the stars are above the earth—as bright and as useful—so are God's saints compared with earthly and sensual men. Against these this proud ruler arrays his hostile forces—yea, against the Prince of heaven. He corrupts the priesthood, defiles God's sanctuary, interrupts the daily sacrifice. This is a sin of sins—a crime of blackest dye. Herein we see what is the natural effect of military conquest upon the victor himself. It hardens the feelings, stupefies the conscience, makes the man a demon, and hurries him along to the brink of self-destruction.

V. PRESENT TRIUMPHS OVER THE RIGHTEOUS ARE DIVINELY PERMITTED, IN ORDER TO SECURE HIGHER GOOD. Although the leaders among the Jews were vastly superior to the invading hordes of Antiochus—superior in virtue and morality—nevertheless they were far from perfect. A strange intermingling of good and evil—of light and darkness—appeared in their nature. So great was God's regard for his chosen people, that he made adversity to serve as moral medicine. Military disaster may serve as moral triumph. The armies of proud monarchs God used as his instruments of chastisement. The wicked are his hand—his sword. The victorious army usually boasts that, by their own might, they have conquered. They can see no other result or end than their own fame. But God sees other and remoter results. In this case it was not simply because Syria's army was mightier than the Jewish force, that the former triumphed, and made the daily sacrifice to cease. The real cause was that transgression was found in Israel; and if God's remedy was severe, it was not more severe than needful. Israel was smitten before the Canaanites, because a spirit of mercenary selfishness was found in Achan. The cause of righteousness may be arrested, impeded, dishonoured, if some flagrant sin be found in its leaders. The kingdom of righteousness can only be advanced by righteous methods. It is true that God had promised to shield his people Israel from their foes, but there was a condition, tacit or expressed, viz. that they should honour his commands. An army is defeated; the temple desecrated; access to God interrupted; because transgression was found in Israel.—D.

Vers. 13—27.—*The place of angelic ministration.* Angels appear upon Daniel's visionary scene, and indicate the manifold services they discharge for men. In all probability they have individual and special qualifications for different kinds of service. The utmost variety of gift is consistent with wisdom, happiness, and purity.

I. OBSERVE THEIR HOLY CHARACTER. They are denominated "saints," i.e. "holy ones." Our Lord distinctly styles them by this epithet, "the holy angels." They are capable of sin; have been exposed to temptation; and yet have preserved their original purity. This is their high distinction, their crown of excellence. So far they are models for our imitation.

II. THEIR PREVAILING DISPOSITION. They are not absorbed in thinking and planning about themselves. The very reverse. Their chief concern is the honour and majesty of God—about the well-being of man. They are represented as inquiring of each other respecting the cessation of symbolic sacrifice, the desolations of God's temple, and the unhappy prospects of mankind. Into the great problems of atonement and redemption "the angels desire to look." So absorbed are their minds in these momentous themes, that all time appears to them but as a season of atonement. "Days" are described as "evening-morning." They are the subjects of hope, even as are men; and they encourage the faith of the godly by announcing the brevity of the disaster. It stirs their joy to anticipate the termination of the transient eclipse, and to see beforehand the brightness of Messiah's reign.

III. THEIR SUBMISSION TO THE GOD-MAN. The Son of God is Lord of angels, as well as Lord of saints. Without doubt this was a pre-incarnate visit of Christ to our earth. Daniel was staggered by the vision, and stood in an attitude of reverent inquiry. He was knocking at the gate of truth, and lo! Incarnate Truth himself stood before him. To his rapt vision there was "the appearance of a man." His organ of hearing caught the sounds of a human voice. Yet this voice was not addressed directly to Daniel. Gabriel was summoned to intervene as mediator and

instructor. Immediately Gabriel undertakes the office, and proceeds to instruct the trembling prophet. The obedience of angels is prompt, hearty, and complete.

IV. THE SUPERIORITY IN KNOWLEDGE OF ANGELS TO MEN. They are said in the Book of Psalms to "excel in strength." We know that they excel in purity; here we learn that they excel also in wisdom and knowledge. Without doubt, they have clearer and larger vision of the kingdom of God, as it extends through the entire universe. As man possesses, through God's goodness, a gift of memory; so it is possible that the unfallen angels are endowed with a measure of foreknowledge. In this case Gabriel certainly knew the precise import of the vision, and knew the order of events which were about to occur in the Eastern empires. Such prescience may be an assistance to *their* loyal service; it would be mainly a hindrance in the discharge of human duty. But the case of Daniel was exceptional. So much of humility and patient trust had *he* that he would not run counter to the revealed will of God. This was a manifest reward of his piety, and was a banquet of peace for his soul. A large accession was made to his knowledge through the friendly interest of Gabriel.

V. THEIR DESIRE THAT MEN, LIKE ANGELS, SHOULD DO ALL THE WILL OF GOD. Having certified to the veracity of the vision and to the certainty of approaching events, Gabriel enjoins Daniel to fulfil his part, viz. to seal up the vision. For the present it must be concealed from the common eye, and be carefully preserved for the future confirmation of human faith. To many men there would be a subtle temptation to publish abroad what they knew touching the march of events. This would serve to swell their self-importance. But Daniel was a wiser man. Fully to obey his God was his first principle in creed and life. To disclose these things prematurely might have injured the existing prospects of the captive Hebrews—might, in some measure, have turned the history of the world into another channel. To *wait* is at times as plain a duty as to *act*. Patiently to endure is one of the most heroic virtues the world has seen.—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER IX.

Vers. 1—27.—THE SEVENTY WEEKS.

This is the chapter of Daniel which has occasioned most controversy. It was appealed to by Tertullian and the early Fathers as a demonstration of the correctness of our Lord's claims to Messiahship. It is now received by critical commentators that to our Lord this prophecy cannot refer. Many treatises have been written on the "seventy weeks" of Daniel, and none of them have entirely cleared up the difficulties; indeed, it may be doubted whether all together they have illuminated the subject very much.

Vers. 1, 2.—In the first year of Darius the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes, which was made king over the realm of the Chaldeans; in the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood by books the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet, that he would accomplish seventy years in the desolations of Jerusalem. The version of the Septuagint goes on the assumption that the critics are correct in their belief that the author of

Daniel imagined a Median Empire between the Babylonian and the Persian. "(1) In the first year of Darius son of Xerxes, of the seed of the Medes who," that is, the Medes—the LXX. seems to have read *malakoo* instead of *homlak*—"reigned over the kingdom of the Chaldeans. (2) In the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood by the books the number of the years when the ordinance (*πρόσταγμα*) about the land was (revealed) to Jeremiah the prophet to accomplish seventy years to the fulfilment of the reproach of Jerusalem." Theodotion is closer to the Massoretic, only he does not seem to have read the hophal of "reign," but the *kal*. Further, Theodotion omits the second statement of the year of Darius, with which, both in the LXX. and in the Massoretic, the second verse begins. We have in Tertullian a few verses from this chapter in the Old Latin Version, called sometimes the *Vetus*. It coincides exactly with neither of the Greek Versions, nor with the Massoretic, but is in closer relationship with Theodotion. The Peshitta in the first agrees in the main with the Massoretic text, but renders the second verse thus: "In the first year of his reign, I Daniel understood in the book the number of years; I saw what was the ordi-

nance of the number which Jeremiah the prophet had said concerning the completion of the desolation of Jerusalem—seventy years." Theodotion, the Vetus, the Peshitta, and also Jerome, neglect the fact that הֶחָלָל (*hom'lak*) is hophal, and translate as if the word were kal. This neglect is due to the difficulty of understanding the semi-satrapial position occupied by Gobyras. He had regal powers given him to appoint satraps in the divisions of the province of Babylonia. Not improbably, further, he could fulfil certain sacred functions which customarily only a king could fulfil. This is the only case where the hophal of this verb occurs. Such a unique use of a verb must imply unique circumstances; such unique circumstances existed in the position of Gobyras in Babylon. Only a contemporary would have indicated this singular state of matters by the use of an out-of-the-way portion of a verb without further explanation. It is singular that critics will not give the obvious meaning to the persistent indications that the author of this book gives, that he regards Darius, not as an independent sovereign, but as in some sort a vassal of a higher power, on whom he is dependent. *Of the seed of the Medes.* This statement naturally implies that while Darius was of Median descent, he was naturalized into some other race. *In the first year of his reign.* This phrase has the appearance of representing the original beginning of the narrative. Probably there were originally two recensions of this narrative, one of them beginning with the first verse, the other with some modification of the second verse which has been still further modified till it has reached its present form. The year indicated corresponds to B.C. 538, the year of the capture of Babylon, therefore sixty-eight years from the time that Daniel was carried captive. The period, then, which had been foretold by Jeremiah during which the Jews were to be captive and Jerusalem desolate, was drawing to a close. According to the critical assumption, that this date is to be reckoned from the captivity of Jehoiachin (B.C. 598), there were yet ten years to run, and if it reckoned from the capture of Jerusalem during the reign of Zedekiah, there were twenty years. There is a certain dramatic suitability, if no more, in Daniel studying the prophecies of Jeremiah, with always growing eagerness as the time approached when God had promised release. *I Daniel understood by books.* The critical school have assumed that this phrase "books" applies, and must apply, to the canon; therefore it is concluded that this book was written after the formation of the canon, and therefore very late. Unfortunately for the assumption brought forward,

s'phareem is by no means invariably used collectively for the books of the Bible, but K'thubim, e.g. Talmud Babli Shabbath (Mishna), p. 115a, was also used. Many of the cases where *s'phareem* appears it is used distributively, not collectively; e.g. Talmud Babli Megillah (Mishna), p. 8b. From the fact that the same word was used for the third division of the canon, and for the books of the canon as a whole, there was liable to be a difficulty, and hence confusion. Traces of this we find in the prologue to the Greek Version of Ecclesiastics. Thus in the first sentence the translator speaks of "the Law, the Prophets, and the others (*τῶν ἄλλων*)," as if *τῶν βιβλίων* were mentally supplied before *νόμου*. While *sepher* is used for any individual book of Scripture, and *s'phareem* used for a group of these books, as the Books of Moses, it is not used for the Bible as a whole, just as in English we never call the Bible "the books," but not unfrequently "the Scriptures;" on the other hand, we speak of "the Books of Moses," never of the "Scriptures of Moses." If *s'phareem* does not mean the canon, what does it mean? We know from Jer. xxix. 1 that Jeremiah sent to the exiles a "letter," and in that letter (ver. 10) it is said, "For thus saith the Lord, After seventy years be accomplished for Babylon, I will visit you, and perform my good word toward you in causing you to return to this place." It is true that this letter is called *sepher* in Jeremiah, but in 2 Kings xix. 14 and Isa. xxxvii. 14 we have *s'phareem*, the plural, used for a single letter. This is proved by the fact that in Isaiah all the suffixes referring to it are singular; in Kings one is in the plural by attraction, but the other is singular as in Isaiah. The correct rendering of the passage, then, is, "I Daniel understood by the letter the number of the years, whereof the word of the Lord came to Jeremiah the prophet." It is clear that the reference in this verse is to Jeremiah's letter, for we have the use of יהוה, *Jahve* (Jehovah), which out of this chapter does not appear in this book; we have in this verse נאָמַרְתָּ, which we have in Jer. xxix. 10; it is vocalized as infinitive *piel* in Daniel, and infinitive *kal* in Jeremiah, but there is probably some error in Daniel. Another peculiarity which connects this passage with the "letter" of Jeremiah is the form the prophet's name assumes. In the rest of his prophecy it is usually called יִרְמְיָהּ (*Yir'myahoo*); in the section of which the letter forms part, as in this verse in Daniel, he is called יִרְמְיָה (*Yir'myah*). It is thus clear that Daniel had in his mind Jeremiah's "letter;" hence it is far-fetched to imagine that he claims acquaintance with all the books of the Hebrew canon, in order

to know the contents of a letter. Even a *falsarius* of the most ignorant sort would scarcely fail to avoid the blunder attributed to the author of Daniel by critics. How do the critics harmonize their explanation of this verse with their theory that the canon closed in B.C. 105, while Daniel was written in the year B.C. 168? It would be as impossible for an author to speak of the canon in terms which denote it being long fixed, sixty years before it was actually collected, as four hundred years. The impossible has no degrees. *That he would accomplish seventy years.* That seventy years would fulfil the period of desolation to Jerusalem. It is to be noted that the word translated here "accomplish" occurs in Jeremiah's letter in regard to this very period (Jer. xxix. 10). The word for "desolations" is connected by Fürst with "drought;" it is also connected with the word for "a sword." The date at which the vision related in the chapter was given was, as we have seen, shortly after the fall of Babylon. The period set by God, if we date from Daniel's own captivity, was rapidly nearing its conclusion. As yet Cyrus had given no sign that he was about to treat the Jews differently from the other nations. The King of Ansan had declared himself—whether from faith or policy we cannot tell—a fervent worshipper of Merodach and the other gods of Babylon: would he not be prone to pursue the policy of the kings of Babylon, whose successor he claimed to be? He had certainly ordered the return to the various cities of the images of those gods which had been brought to Babylon by Nabunahid, but there was no word of the return of the captives of Zion. Would Jehovah be true to his promise or not? Like believers in every age, Daniel takes refuge in prayer.

Ver. 3.—*And I set my face unto the Lord God, to seek by prayer and supplications, with fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes.* The Septuagint Version here is slavishly close; it renders *ἑτάληνα* ('*ell'na*') in accordance with its more common meaning, *ἔδωκα*, and the idiomatic phrase, "to seek prayer and supplication," is rendered *ἐπεὶ προσευχῆν*. The true rendering is, as Professor Bevan points out, "to set to prayer." Theodotion is nearly as slavish; only he omits "ashes," and has "fastings." The Peshitta is close, but does not follow the change of construction in the last clause. Jerome seems to have read, "my God." The cessation of the temple-worship, with its sacrifices, was naturally fitted to bring prayer as a mode of worship into a prominence it had not before. Yet we find prayers made while the first temple was yet standing, as the prayer of Hezekiah (2 Kings xix. 15), of Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xx. 6). The comparison more naturally

stands with the prayers of Ezra and Nehemiah, as the subject of their supplication is similar to that of the prayer before us.

Ver. 4.—*And I prayed unto the Lord my God, and made my confession, and said, O Lord, the great and dreadful God, keeping the covenant and mercy to them that love him, and to them that keep his commandments.* The versions do not call for remark. The first clause is somewhat of a repetition of the end of the previous verse, and may thus be the indication of there having been two recensions; at the same time, the Oriental style allows greater repetition and redundancy than in Western countries would be permitted. There is a reference here to Deut. vii. 9, from which the latter clause is quoted *verbatim*. It is also quoted with equal exactness in Neh. i. 5. The chapter in Deuteronomy exhibits God's love for Israel, and hence, as that love is his plea, Daniel appeals to it. We note the evidence of careful acquaintance with preceding Scripture.

Ver. 5.—*We have sinned, and have committed iniquity, and have done wickedly, and have rebelled, even by departing from thy precepts and from thy judgments.* While otherwise close, neither of the Greek versions retains the change of construction before the last clause, which is exhibited in the English versions. The Peshitta fails in this way also, but uses participles all through. This verse has a strong resemblance to Neh. i. 6, 7, only in Nehemiah there is more elaboration and all the signs of a later development. There is a climax here from simple sin to rebellion; at the same time, this heaping up of terms so nearly synonymous is more liturgic than literary; these words may have been used in the synagogue service in Babylon.

Ver. 6.—*Neither have we hearkened unto thy servants the prophets, which spake in thy Name to our kings, our princes, and our fathers, and to all the people of the land.* The Septuagint, while agreeing in the main with the Massoretic, translates "to all the people of the land" as "to every nation on the earth." Theodotion is more accurate, but the Peshitta maintains the ambiguity. Daniel continues his confession of sin. Not only will they not keep God's commands, but when God sent prophets, men of their brethren, to speak to them with human voice, they would not hearken. The designation of the ordinary inhabitants, the common people, as *עַם הָאֶרֶץ* ('*am ha'aretz*') is a usage that became more pronounced in later days, when all not educated as rabbins were called '*am ha'aretz*'. The resemblance is striking between this passage and Neh. ix. 30-32. It is, perhaps, impossible to settle on merely critical grounds which is the more primitive form. There is much in both

passages that would suggest a third form, the independent source of both. Not unlikely the source was some liturgic prayer. As the shorter, the passage before us may be nearer this original source.

Vers. 7, 8.—O Lord, righteousness belongeth unto thee, but unto us confusion of faces, as at this day; to the men of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and unto all Israel, that are near, and that are far off, through all the countries whither thou hast driven them, because of their trespass that they have trespassed against thee. O Lord, to us belongeth confusion of face, to our kings, to our princes, and to our fathers, because we have sinned against thee. The versions are all very close to the Massoretic text. The most important variation is Theodotion's repetition of the first clause of ver. 7 at the beginning of ver. 8. Neither of the English versions brings out the contrast in the Hebrew of the second clause of ver. 7; it is "man," not "men," of Judah. This contrast is observed by Theodotion and Jerome, but not by the LXX. or the Peshitta. These two verses have a strong resemblance to Bar. i. 15, 16, "And ye shall say, To our God *belongeth* righteousness, but unto us the confusion of faces, as it is come to pass this day to man of Judah, and to the inhabitants of Jerusalem, and to our kings, and to our princes, and to our priests, and to our prophets, and to our fathers." This confession is introduced into the text of Baruch as a quotation. The captives on the river Lud send money to Jerusalem for offerings and sacrifices, and with the money send certain advices. As the circumstances in which the Baruch version purports to be written do not so naturally suit the words used, we can, we think, have no difficulty in recognizing that it is not the primitive recension. The words have the look of a liturgic prayer. The relationship between the present passage and Jeremiah is close; "confusion of face" occurs in Jer. vii. 19 as well as Ezra ix. 7. The most marked case is the collocation, "*man of Judah, and inhabitants of Jerusalem*." This phrase is frequent in Jeremiah; e.g. Jer. iv. 4; xi. 2; xvii. 25. There is also a resemblance to Ezekiel in the phrase, "their trespass that they have trespassed against thee;" e.g. Ezek. xv. 8; xx. 27. The language thus is in strict dramatic suitability to one who has just been studying the prophets of the Captivity. *To our kings, to our princes*. This could not be used naturally after the date of Daniel. To him who remembered kings and princes in Judah and Jerusalem, this language is natural. In the age of Epiphanes it would be absurd and meaningless. The phrase is used in the liturgic prayer in

Nehemiah, because there is a narrative of the history of the people. When we compare the Psalter of Solomon, we find the only King of Israel is God: yet Alexander Jannæus, who was not long dead when that Psalter was written, had assumed the crown; and his sons had competed for the possession of it.

Vers. 9, 10.—To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him; neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws, which he set before us by his servants the prophets. The Septuagint renders the last clause, "The Law which thou gavest before Moses, and us by thy servants the prophets." There is a change here which has the appearance of marking an interpolation. The prayer ceases, and an explanatory narrative begins. In content it resembles the parallel passage in Bar. i., but is much briefer, and therefore more likely to be the older. "Forgivenesses" occurs only here and Neh. ix. 17 in a prayer that otherwise seems borrowed from that before us.

Ver. 11.—Yea, all Israel have transgressed thy Law, even by departing, that they might not obey thy voice; therefore the curse is poured upon us, and the oath that is written in the Law of Moses the servant of God, because we have sinned against him. The versions do not present any points worthy of special consideration. The prayer is resumed during the greater part of this verse. The reference here is to Lev. xxvi. 14 and Deut. xxviii. 15, the probability being more in favour of the latter, from the reference to the "oath." The last clause is a lapse again into the narrative style. In the parallel passage in Baruch it is narrative throughout. This clause may easily have been a gloss added by a scribe and inserted in the text by a copyist. There may, however, simply be an error in the prenominal suffix.

Ver. 12.—And he hath confirmed his words, which he spake against us, and against our judges that judged us, by bringing upon us a great evil: for under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem. The LXX. differs somewhat, "And he hath confirmed against us (*ἐστέρησεν ἡμῖν*) his words (*προσθήματα*), such as he spake against us, and against our judges, such great evils as thou didst adjudge us (*ἐκρίνας ἡμῖν*), to bring upon us." The rest is fairly in accordance with the Massoretic. It is clear that in the text before the LXX. translator the word was *sh'phattanoo* instead of *sh'phatonoo*, that is to say, *τ* (*tau*) instead of *ν* (*nu*). These letters in earlier scripts were liable to be confounded. The meaning assigned to

shaphat in this reading is unusual; but this is rather in favour of it being the true reading; and the return to the second person, while awkward, also has weight. Theodotion and the Peshitta do not call for remark. The use of the word "judges" for rulers generally ought to be noted. If we take the Massoretic reading, there may be a reminiscence of 2 Kings xxiii. 22. Among the Carthaginians the principal magistrates bore the title *suffetes*, equivalent to *shoph'teen*. *Under the whole heaven hath not been done as hath been done upon Jerusalem.* Such language is to be regarded in any case as the exaggeration of grief; but it would have something like a justification twice in the history of Jerusalem, and only twice—after the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, and after its capture by Titus. No one has maintained that the origin of Daniel is so late as the latter event; hence we are thrown back upon the former. With the fact before him that temples had been plundered everywhere, and desecrated, and cities sacked, the writer could not have regarded the case of Jerusalem, and its temple, in the days of Epiphanes, as unique under all heaven. After the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar, the temple was left in ruins and the city deserted. Such measure, so far as we know, was not meted out by Nebuchadnezzar to any other city. Only rarely had even the Ninevite monarchs taken such terrible vengeance on rebellious subjects.

Ver. 13.—As it is written in the Law of Moses, all this evil is come upon us: yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God, that we might turn from our iniquities, and understand thy truth. The LXX. renders "laws," *διαθήκη*, "covenant," which is applied to the "Law" (Heb. ix. 20, quoting from Exod. xxiv. 8; Deut. xxix. 1). Theodotion agrees in the main with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta differs only in joining the first clause of the next verse to this. Ewald makes the prenominal suffix at the end of the verse third person, not second. The very awkwardness of the construction is an evidence in favour of the received reading, "As it is written in the Law of Moses." The passages referred to are those denoted previously (Lev. xxvi.; Deut. xxviii.). *All this evil is come upon us*—the curses referred to there. *Yet made we not our prayer before the Lord our God; literally, entreat the face.* The face being the sign of favour, "entreated not the favour of the Lord" would be really what is meant; therefore not quite as Ewald renders, "appeased not Jahve." *Understand thy truth.* Hitzig thinks here the reference is to God's faithfulness, either in promises or in threats. Keil objects to this, contending

that *ba'mithkeha* with the preposition *an* cannot mean "faithfulness," but "truth." This is a mistake; the preposition might alter the significance of the verb it follows, but not that of the noun it governs. The truth is that the word here is extended to its fullest meaning, "God's supreme reality." God's being God implies necessarily that every word he utters of promise or threatening is true; veracity and faithfulness are equally involved in Jehovah being God. At the same time, from the connection it is the evil—the judgments—he had threatened that bulk most largely in the prophet's mind.

Ver. 14.—Therefore hath the Lord watched upon the evil, and brought it upon us: for the Lord our God is righteous in all his works which he doeth: for we obeyed not his voice. The Greek versions agree with this, save that the LXX. has "Lord God" in the first case as well as the second. The Peshitta, when one remembers the different division of the verses, is also identical. There is an obvious resemblance here to Jer. xlv. 27, "Behold, I am watching over you for evil, and not for good." The verb *shaqad* is somewhat rare, occurring only twelve times in Scripture, and five of these times in Jeremiah. It is not always an evil watching; in Jer. xxxi. 28 the two meanings are contrasted. Then follows an acknowledgment of the righteousness of God in so dealing with them. Bar ii. 9 is really a version of this verse; the original Hebrew would be almost identical. There are few indications which, did this verse stand alone, would enable one to decide which is the more primitive.

Ver. 15.—And now, O Lord our God, that hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand, and hast gotten thee renown, as at this day; we have sinned, we have done wickedly. The versions are in agreement with the Massoretic text. This verse also has many resemblances to Jer. xxxii. 20, 21. *Hast brought thy people forth out of the land of Egypt with a mighty hand.* In Jeremiah we have, "Hast brought forth thy people Israel with signs and with wonders and with a strong hand." In Jeremiah it is fuller, in Daniel we have only a condensed reference. *Hast gotten thee renown, as at this day.* This is an exact quotation from Jeremiah. The exactness is obscured in our Authorized Version, in which Jer. xxxii. 20 is given, "Hast made thee a name, as at this day:" the words rendered, "made thee a name," in Jeremiah, are precisely the same as those rendered above, "gotten thee renown." The last clause is very much a repetition of the opening of ver. 5, "we have sinned," missed the mark; "we have done wickedly," violently transgressed.

Ver. 16.—O Lord, according to all thy righteousness, I beseech thee, let thine anger and thy fury be turned away from thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain: because for our sins, and for the iniquities of our fathers, Jerusalem and thy people are become a reproach to all that are about us. The Septuagint rendering here is in close agreement with the Massoretic. The only point to be noted in regard to Theodotion is that he gives the late, and in this case inapplicable, meaning to "righteousness" of ἐλεησύνῃ, "almsgiving." The Peshitta, imagining a certain want of completeness in the last clause, inserted after "Jerusalem" "is scattered into all lands." The appeal is made to God's righteousness, because now the seventy years were nearing their end, and God's righteousness was involved in the time not being exceeded. "Righteousness" here signifies the fair dealing (*wohlverhalten*) of God to his people in reference to the fulfilment of his promises" (Behrman). "Righteousness" is really *righteousnesses*, in the plural, the reference being to the many proofs God has given in the past of his benevolence (Keil). "Thy city Jerusalem, thy holy mountain," forms a further argument: "The mountain of thy holiness" (Ps. ii. 6). *A reproach to all that are about us.* There is a striking resemblance here to Jeremiah; repeatedly in his prophecies are the Jews threatened that they will become a reproach (*herpa*). Especially is there a resemblance here to Jer. xxix. 18, the letter of Jeremiah, to which reference is made in the beginning of the chapter. This whole prayer is saturated with phrases borrowed from Jeremiah. The apocryphal Book of Baruch, which has expanded on this prayer, has also drawn from Jeremiah.

Ver. 17.—Now therefore, O our God, hear the prayer of thy servant, and his supplications, and cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary that is desolate, for the Lord's sake. The Septuagint differs here, "Now give ear, O Lord, to the prayer of thy servant, and to my supplications; for thy servant's sake lift up thy countenance upon thy holy mountain which is desolate, O Lord." The omission of the *van* in *tahnoonayit* would occasion the LXX. rendering, "my supplications." They had read אָרַב before נָדָב. Certainly the Septuagint rendering gives better sense than the violent change to the third person from the second. Keil would escape the difficulty by translating, "because thou art the Lord"—a translation that is independent of Hebrew grammar. The conjunction would not naturally be *le'ma'an* (לְמַעַן), but possibly 'egab 'aker (אָקַב אָכֵר). Further, the covenant name would certainly have been used in such a connection, and it would necessarily have been followed by

"thou." As it stands, it really asserts that the desolations are on account of the Lord—an assertion which would not be germane to the tenor of the prayer. The reading of the LXX. is thus better here. Theodotion is closer to the Massoretic text, but instead of "O our God," reads, "O Lord our God," and avoids the change of person in the last clause by reading אָרַב as a vocative, and inserting סֻב. The Peshitta has, "our supplication," and avoids the awkward change of person by reading, "for thy Name's sake." Jerome gives a fairly accurate rendering of the Massoretic, only in the last clause he omits "Lord" and renders *temet ipsum*. The influence of the Psalter is to be seen in this verse. The first clause is a slightly altered and condensed version of Ps. cxliii. 1. The verb that ought to open the second member is omitted. The word *tahnoonem* is not a very common one. *Cause thy face to shine upon thy sanctuary* has a close resemblance to Ps. lxxx. 3, 7, 19. As they had no temple sacrifices in Babylon, the captive Jews would have only the psalms of the sanctuary to keep the sense of worship alive in their hearts.

Vers. 18, 19.—O my God, incline thine ear, and hear; open thine eyes, and behold our desolations, and the city which is called by thy Name: for we do not present our supplications before thee for our righteousnesses, but for thy great mercies. O Lord, hear; O Lord, forgive; O Lord, hearken and do; defer not, for thine own sake, O my God; for thy city and thy people are called by thy Name. The version of the Seventy differs but little from the Massoretic; they read "hear me" instead of simply "hear." The translator also connects the "desolation" with the city, against grammar. The LXX. adds, "Be propitious to us (*συλάτρευσον*)." The repetition of the vocative in the nineteenth verse is omitted, but "Zion" and "Israel" are inserted after "city" and "people" respectively. Theodotion is in yet closer agreement with the received text. The Peshitta is very close, but adds "ruin" to "desolation." The Vulgate affords no cause of remark. *Our desolations.* The word used here occurs in Lamentations. In the prophecies of Jeremiah a cognate word is used, differing from that before us only in vocalization (comp. Jer. xxv. 12, where it is applied to Babylon after the seventy years of Babylonian rule are ended). *Which is called by thy Name.* This phrase is used repeatedly in Jer. vii. of the temple. *Present our supplications.* The words used suggest the posture in presenting a petition—falling down before the person to whom it is addressed. It is one frequently used in Jeremiah, sometimes of persons (Jer. xxxviii. 26), of God (Jer. xlii. 9). *Not on account of*

our righteousness. There is a marked advance in spiritual insight exhibited by this. The old position was reward according to righteousness, and mercy because of it. The Jews before the Captivity had very much the heathen idea of paying God by sacrifice for benefits received or asked: but the long cessation of sacrifice raised them above this. *But for thy great mercies.* This plea to God because in the past he has multiplied his mercies, is in the same elevated plane. We find a similar line in Neb. ix., only as an occasion of thanksgiving. It is remarked by Professor Fuller that the repetition of the word *Adonai*, and the short sentences, give a feeling of intensity to the prayer suitable to the circumstances. The words used are all echoes of Jeremiah: e.g. "forgive," "hearken," are used in connections that would suit Daniel's study of Jeremiah. It is impossible not to observe to how great an extent this prayer is coloured by Jeremiah.

Excursus on Baruch and Daniel.

Professor Ewald, in his 'History of Israel' (v. 206), and afterwards in his 'Prophets of Israel,' emphasizes the resemblance between the opening chapters of the apocryphal Book of Baruch and the ninth chapter of Daniel. After, in the first place, arbitrarily assigning Baruch to the Persian period, he assumes a tendency to rebel against the Persians—a thing of which we have no evidence. Certainly we have no proof against this, because we have no history of the period at all. He assumes that there was constant communication between the Jewish community in Jerusalem and that in Babylon during this period, which, though possible, is not certain. The further assumption, however, that the Babylonian Jewish community would take such a cumbrous device as the apocryphal Book of Baruch to convey their advice to the Jews of Jerusalem, to avoid rebellion, is a strange one for a man of Ewald's acuteness. By the introductory hypothesis in the Book of Baruch, the Jewish community of Babylon send a letter by Baruch to the remnant of the Jews in Jerusalem. If that were so, then it is in Jerusalem, not in Babylon, that this letter, or a copy of it, might be supposed to turn up. Therefore the *falsarius* is to be looked for among the Jews of Jerusalem, not among those of Babylon. In Jerusalem would, of necessity, the farce of finding this epistle be enacted. Altogether, there seems no support for the date or origin assigned by Ewald to this book. Of course, if we could have assumed the conclusion of

Ewald in regard to the date of Baruch to be correct, it would have been of advantage in our further argument.

Ewald further assumes that the opening portion of Baruch has been the original from which the prayer in the ninth chapter of Daniel has been imitated. The resemblance cannot be denied, the question to be decided is—Which is the original and which the imitation? It is a general rule, and one of almost universal application, that the shorter form of a poetical composition—and the prayer in Daniel and in Baruch has that character—is the more original. Unquestionably, if we apply this test, the prayer in the Book of Baruch is later than the parallel prayer in Dan. ix. In Baruch the prayer occupies at least sixty verses, in Daniel only sixteen. We would not press the mere fact of brevity, did this stand alone as evidence for the priority of Daniel, as it is possible, but we think little more than barely possible, that the version in Daniel might be a summary of that in Baruch, though summaries are much rarer in poetic literature than expansions. The nature of the differences seem more naturally to be due to expansion than to summarizing.

Thus if we compare two closely parallel passages (Bar. ii. 9—12 and Dan. ix. 14, 15), we find the differences are all due to expansions in Baruch on changes that might appear to make the succession of thought easier. Of the latter, an example is "works which he has commanded us," compared with "works which he doeth." The former makes the transition to the thought of disobedience easier. It is possible this change may have been due to the translator misreading the Hebrew before him. The expansions are more obviously additions to the text—they have the invariable character of such things, additions to the words of a passage without being any real addition to the sense. Thus the last clause of Dan. ix. 14, "For we obeyed not his voice," is expanded into "Yet we have not hearkened unto his voice to walk in the commandments of the Lord, which he hath set before us." After the first eight words, which may be regarded as exactly equivalent to the six in Daniel, the rest is mere expansion. Again, the last clause of Dan. ix. 15, "we have sinned, we have done wickedly," is expanded into "O Lord our God, we have sinned, we have done ungodly, we have dealt unrighteously in all thine ordinances." Any one can see that here the differences are mere expansion, without any addition to the thought. We might carry our investigation further, and would only make our point clearer; but this would be mere loss of time. This expansion and paraphrasing prove the dependence of

Baruch upon Daniel, and therefore the priority of the latter.

More important is the utter failure of the writer of Baruch to comprehend the condition of matters at the time he supposes himself writing. In Bar. i. 2 we are told that the Chaldeans "had taken Jerusalem, and burned it with fire." Jerusalem thereafter ceased to be inhabited, for Gedaliah stayed in Mizpah. Yet (Bar. i. 10) the Babylonian Jews say they have sent money "to buy you burnt offerings, and sin offerings," which it would be impossible to present before God as the temple was a mass of ruins. Jer. xli. 5 cannot be quoted against this, because the Shechemites and Samaritans there mentioned are carrying an unbloody sacrifice, which might be offered to the Lord at the ruins; but there is no word of burnt offerings or sin offerings. And in harmony with this there is no stress laid in the prayer in Baruch, as there is in the prayer in Daniel, on the absoluteness of the desolation of Zion. On the supposition in the Book of Baruch, Jerusalem had still inhabitants, and there was still a high priest, a state of matters utterly at variance with that implied in the Book of Ezra. No such anachronism can be detected in Daniel; his whole prayer speaks consistently of the desolation of Jerusalem. We do but mention the fact that the high priest "Jochim, son of Chelcias, son of Salom" (Bar. i. 7) has no existence in the list of the priests we find in Chronicles and Nehemiah. In 1 Chron. vi. 15 we are told that Jehozadak "went into captivity," and we know that Joshua was his son. We shall lay no stress on the otherwise unheard-of return to the land of Judah of the vessels "which Sedecias, the son of Josias, king of Judah had made" (Bar. i. 8), nor on the date in the first verse, "the fifth year in the seventh day of the month;" they are in perfect harmony with the general non-historical tone of the whole book. The Book of Daniel has nothing like them.

Another historical blunder must be noted—one that proves the dependence of Baruch on Daniel, and disproves the opposite view. The Babylonian Jews declare their intention (Bar. i. 12) to live "under the shadow of Nebuchodonosor King of Babylon, and under the shadow of Balthasar his son." This makes Belshazzar the son of Nebuchadnezzar, and his associate on the throne, in contradiction of history as we know it now. We know now that Belshazzar was not the son of Nebuchadnezzar, but of Nabunahid. He may have been the grandson of the great conqueror, but not his actual son. The statements in Daniel, while liable to be interpreted in the sense in which the author of Baruch has taken

them, do not necessitate this sense, as we have shown above. In Daniel Belshazzar is never described as the son of Nebuchadnezzar in the same way as Darius is called the son of Ahasuerus. It is true Nebuchadnezzar is called his father, and he himself, according to the Massoretic text, speaks of him as his father; but this means no more, in the court language of Assyria, than that he was his predecessor and was famous. As there is no note of chronological succession in Daniel, Belshazzar's occupation of the throne as representative of his father Nabunahid might be any number of years after the death of Nebuchadnezzar, without contradicting anything in it. A writer acquainted with Daniel, and living long after the events, would naturally drop into the blunder of the writer of Baruch, and make Belshazzar the son of Nebuchadnezzar. On the other hand, it is difficult to imagine the writer of Daniel—if he were a novelist—having Baruch in his hand, and not introducing Belshazzar alongside of Nebuchadnezzar. The artistic possibilities of the situation would have been too great to be resisted. We then feel ourselves necessitated to place Baruch long posterior to Daniel.

It is difficult to settle the date of Baruch. The latter two chapters, which are certainly by a hand other than the first three, and probably later, have signs in them that make them late. Bar. v. is an imitation of the Psalter of Solomon xi. The utter inability to comprehend the cessation of burnt offering and sin offering, implied in Bar. i. 10, shows that it was written before the destruction of the temple under Vespasian. It is scarcely possible that it could have been written after the desolation of the temple by Epiphanes. This definitely overthrows the theory of Kneucker, that Baruch was written in Rome after the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. One who had seen the desolation of Jerusalem under the Romans would not have been under the hallucination of the writer of Baruch, or imagined that burnt sacrifices could have been offered by a high priest in Jerusalem after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar. Not unlikely the first three chapters were composed in the reign of the Lagid princes, and had for their object to reconcile the Jews to subjection to the foreign yoke.¹ Israel certainly was still scattered among the countries. The huge Jewish communities in Egypt and Babylon, not to speak of the smaller communities scattered over every city round the basin of the Mediterranean, amply proved that. They were no longer an independent nation, they were always subject to some power, and that was a cause of humiliation. If we are

¹ See note on page 350.

right in our idea of the date of the Book of Baruch, and of the relation between it and the Book of Daniel, we have proved that Daniel must have existed long prior to the Maccabean struggle.

Vers. 20, 21.—And while I was speaking, and praying, and confessing my sin and the sin of my people Israel, and presenting my supplication before the Lord my God for the holy mountain of my God; yea, while I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel, whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning, being caused to fly swiftly, touched me about the time of the evening oblation. All the versions are practically in agreement with the Massoretic text, save that none of them gives the hophal meaning, "caused to fly swiftly;" the nearest approach being in the Septuagint, in which we have *ταχει φερόμενος*. All, however, derive the word from *qyp*, "to fly;" another etymology is possible from *qy*. As to the meaning of this word, there is a difference of opinion, Gesenius holding that it means "weariest out"—a meaning unsuited to the subject or to the context, though in accordance with the use of the word elsewhere. Meinhold would connect this word with the preceding clause, and refer it to Daniel, "when I was faint." The main difficulty is the succeeding word. Fürst suggests that it means "shining in splendour"—a meaning perfectly suited to the circumstances, but for which there seems little justification in etymology from cognate tongues. Fürst suggests a transposal from *qyp*. Winer gives it, "celeriter ivit, cucurrit." This view is taken by Hitzig, von Lengerke, and Hävernick. Ver. 20 is largely an expansion of the first clause of ver. 21. *While I was speaking, and praying* (comp. Gen. xxiv. 15, "And it came to pass, before he had done speaking"). This shows the rapidity of the Divine answer to prayer; even before we ask, "our Father knows what things we have need of." *The man Gabriel*. The name Gabriel, as mentioned above, means "Hero of God;" and the word here translated "man" is the ordinary word for "man," *'ish*. It may be remarked that in Scripture angels are always "men;" never, as in modern art and poetry, "women." *Whom I had seen in the vision at the beginning*. This really means "whom I had seen previously in vision," the reference being to ch. viii. 16. *Being caused to fly swiftly*. As above mentioned, there is considerable difficulty in deciding which meaning is to be taken as the correct. Kliefoth's and Meinhold's view would be the simplest, if there were any certainty that *qy* means "faintness." *Touched*

me about the time of the evening oblation. Daniel is so absorbed in his devotions that not till Gabriel touched him did he recognize the presence of an angel-visitant. The time of the evening offering does not imply that those offerings were made in Babylon, but simply that, through the half-century that had intervened since the capture of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar the sacred hour had been kept in remembrance, not impossibly as being one consecrated to prayer. Daniel had been using this season to make known his request and petition to God. "Oblation," *minhah*, the bloodless meat offering (Lev. ii. 1, 4, 14).

Ver. 22.—And he informed me, and talked with me, and said, O Daniel, I am now come forth to give thee skill and understanding. The LXX. and Peshitta render the first clause, "And he approached and talked with me." It is difficult to understand how that reading could have arisen from the Massoretic text, or how, on the other hand, the Massoretic text could have arisen from that behind the Septuagint. The rendering of the Septuagint in the last clause is better than that in our Authorized Version, and is in accordance with our Revised, "to make thee skilful of understanding." Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic. Although Daniel was highly endowed, and although he had before him the inspired words of Jeremiah, he had need of yet higher endowments to understand the secrets of the Divine plan. He knew that if he reckoned seventy years from the time when he himself had been carried captive, then the period was drawing to a close; but the sins of the people were still there. It might be that God would restrain the fulfilment of his promise; the more so that, if the prophecy of Jeremiah were reckoned from the fall of Jerusalem, twenty years would yet have to run. Daniel is concerned about the sins of his people, knowing that, unless they were removed, renewed punishment would befall them.

Ver. 23.—At the beginning of thy supplications the commandment came forth, and I am come to show thee; for thou art greatly beloved: therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. The version of the LXX. differs somewhat from this, "In the beginning of thy prayer a commandment came from the Lord, and I came to show thee, because thou art merciful, and do thou understand (*διανοήσῃς*) the command." The other versions do not present much worthy of remark. *At the beginning of thy supplications*. This affords a reason why it was while Daniel "was yet speaking," that Gabriel came to him; the moment the desire was strong enough to shape itself in words, the answer was on

the way. The commandment came forth. The word translated "commandment" is the very common Hebrew word, דָּבָר (*dabar*), "a word," "a thing," "a matter," in which sense it occurs in the penultimate clause of this verse. And I am come to show thee. The angel Gabriel is the messenger sent forth to interpret to Daniel the ways of God with his people. The angel Gabriel is sent to give Daniel an explanatory oracle or word that he may be comforted concerning his people. The reason of this is, "for thou art greatly beloved." This phrase has caused considerable difference of opinion. The LXX. renders, *ἀγαπῶν*; Theodotion, *ἀνὴρ ἐνδοξοῦν*; the Peshitta, *ῥῳῳ*; Jerome, *vir desideriorum*; Hitzig's rendering is "darling" (*lieblich*); Ewald, "dearly beloved one." *Hmoodōth* means "desires," "loves;" hence may either be understood subjectively or objectively; in this case, most probably the latter, "a man, the object of love." Therefore understand the matter, and consider the vision. The reader will have observed that the last clause is omitted from the LXX. There is a false succession here. Daniel is first commanded "to understand the matter," and then "to consider the vision." Another rendering of the Massoretic avoids this by neglecting the *ethnach*, and connecting כִּן with the preceding clause, gives, "thou art greatly beloved and understanding in the matter."

Ver. 24.—Seventy weeks are determined upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to finish the transgression, and to make an end of sins, and to make reconciliation for iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the Most Holy. The LXX. here differs from the above, "Seventy weeks are determined (*ἐκρίθησαν*) upon thy people and the city Zion, to make an end of sin, to make unrighteousnesses rare (*σπανίσαι*), and to wipe out the unrighteousnesses, and to understand the vision, and to give (appoint) (*δοθῆναι*) everlasting righteousness, and to end the visions and the prophet, and to rejoice the holy of holies." There seem here to be some instances of doublet: *τὰς ἀδικίας σπανίσαι* and *ἀπαλεῖψαι τὰς ἀδικίας* are different renderings of חַטֹּאת; (*hathaym hataath*), or as it is in the Q'r'i, *hathaym hataath* (חַטֹּאת הַתְּהִימָה). Neither of these seems to be the original of the Greek. Schleusner suggests to read *σπαρῖσαι*. Against this is the fact that Paulus Tellensis renders *l'maz'or*, "to bring to nothing" (Jer. x. 24, Peshitta). How Wolf ('*Schizigwochen*,' p. 26) can say the LXX. confirms the Massoretic K'th'ib, is difficult to see. The author of the first rendering of this phrase seems to have read חַטֹּאת (*ha-*

thath) instead of *hatham*; the other translator must have read *maḥah* (מַחָה). The phrase, *διανοηθῆναι τὸ ὄραμα*, "to understand the vision," seems a doublet of the clause, "to seal up the vision." There seems to have been in one of the manuscripts used by the LXX. translator a transposition of words; for one of them must have read לְהָחִי (l'hoothan) instead of לְהָחִי, since he renders *δοθῆναι*. This is an impossible change, but the mistaking of לְהָחִי for לְהָחִי is perfectly easy to imagine, if לְהָחִי had been written in place of לְהָחִי, and it transferred to the place in the Massoretic text occupied by לְהָחִי, then we can easily understand לְהָחִי. In the last clause the LXX. translator must have read *σῶν* instead of *σῶν*, a clearly inferior reading. The impression conveyed to one is that the translators were able to put no intelligible meaning on the passage, and rendered the words successively as nearly as they could without attempting to make them sense. We must admit, however, that the phenomena that cause this impression may be due to corruption of the text. Theodotion renders, "Seventy weeks are determined (*συμετρίθησαν*) upon thy people and on the holy city, to seal sins and wipe away unrighteousness, and to atone for sin, and to bring the everlasting righteousness, and to seal the vision and the prophet, and to anoint the holy of holies." Theodotion, it will be seen, as the LXX., has "prophet" instead of "prophecy," which certainly is more verbally accurate than our version; he omits "to finish transgression," having instead, "to seal sins." The Peshitta has followed the K'th'ib and renders, "finish transgressions," and instead of "prophecy" has the "prophets." The text of the Vetus, as preserved to us by Tertullian, is, "Seventy weeks are shortened (*breuiatæ*) upon thy people, and upon the holy city, until sin shall grow old, and iniquities be marked (*signetur*), and righteousnesses rise up, and eternal righteousness be brought in, and that the vision and the prophet should be marked (*signetur*), and the holy of holies (*sanctus sanctorum*) be anointed." Jerome renders, "Seventy weeks are shortened (*abbreviatæ sunt*) upon thy people and upon thy holy city, to end falsehood (*prevaricatio*), to end sin, to wipe out iniquity, to bring in the everlasting righteousness, to fulfil the vision and prophecy, and to anoint the holy of holies (*sanctus sanctorum*)." The Hebrew here is peculiar; the word for "weeks" is in the masculine, which is unexampled elsewhere in the plural. The singular masculine is found, e.g. Gen. xxix. 27; there is no case of feminine singular. Mr. Galloway ('*Shudow on the Sundial*,' p. 51) would read חַטֹּאת

בָּשָׁבָי, and would render, "by weeks it is determined." There seems little evidence for this reading; against a few late manuscripts is the consensus of versions. "Determined" is also a word that occurs only here; it is Aramaic, but not common even in that language. It means "to cut off." It may thus refer to these weeks being "cut off" from time generally; hence "determined." It is singular, and its nominative is plural. "To finish" also causes difficulty; so translated, it implies that the word should be written נָקַץ; but it is written נָשָׂא, which means "to restrain," "to enclose," "to separate off" (Fürst). Hence if we translate as it stands, it should be "restrain transgression." "To make an end of" is also "cause transgression to cease." This is a rendering of the Massoretic Q'r'i; if the K'thib had been taken, the translation should rather have been "to seal." "Sins:" this word is plural in the K'thib, but singular in the Q'r'i. A large number of manuscripts write the word plural; the Greek versions give the plural; the Peshitta and Vulgate, Aquila and Paulus Tellenis, singular. "The prophecy" it is clearly as it stands "the prophet." Jerome is the only one of the versions that takes the word in the sense in which it is taken in our versions. Professor Bevan renders it "prophet" (so Hitzig and Hengstenberg). One is tempted to adopt the reading of Michaelis מִיכָאֵל, "the vision of the prophet," which has some manuscript authority (Wolf, 'Siebzigwochen,' p. 15). The overwhelming mass of evidence is in favour of the present consonantal text. *Seventy weeks.* "Week," while generally a week of days (ch. x. 2), was occasionally week of years, as Gen. xxix. 27, "fulfil the week of this," i.e. the seven years of service. Among the later Jews this became a recognized mode of reckoning, as in the Book of Jubilees, each jubilee is divided into successive weeks. From what follows it is necessary that the weeks here are sevens of years. "Are determined," as already indicated, means "cut off" not "shortened," which does not seem to be the meaning of the word in any case. "Upon thy people and upon thy holy city." Daniel has been praying long and earnestly for his people; so there would be no inability to see what was meant by "his city and his people." "To finish transgression" is equivalent to "to restrain transgression." Transgression is apt to become bold and imperious; it is a great deal when it is even somewhat "restrained." It is to be noted that, as Daniel's prayer was groatly confession of the sins of the people and prayer for forgiveness, the promises here

are largely moral; but still the Messianic period even was not to be expected to be one in which there will be no sin—it is to be restrained. "To make an end of sins"—though "to seal sins" seems the better reading diplomatically—it is the K'thib, and that of some of the versions. It is difficult to give the phrase an intelligible meaning. Moreover, the occurrence of חַטָּאת so immediately after is against it. Something may be said for חַטָּאת, which occurs in a similar connection with חַטָּאת that this does in Lam. iv. 22. This is the reading of one of the translators in the LXX., ἀπαλειψάς—the spirit of lawlessness would be restrained and the past iniquities and their guilt wiped away. "To make reconciliation"—"to make an atonement." The verb used is the technical word, "the offering of an atoning sacrifice." In this sense it occurs some fifty times in Leviticus. This might apply to the renewal of sacrificial offerings in the temple after the fifty years' cessation during the Babylonian captivity, or to the renewal after the shorter cessation under the oppression inflicted on the Jews under Epiphanes. The next clause implies a wider application and a loftier sacrifice. Professor Bevan is right in maintaining that, despite the accents, this clause is to be connected with the next. *To bring in everlasting righteousness.* This is more than merely the termination of the suit of God against his people (Isa. xxvii. 9). The phrase occurs in Ps. cxix. 142, and is applied to the righteousness of God. These two, "atonement for sin" and "the everlasting righteousness," are found in Christ—his atoning death and the righteousness which he brings into the world. It is true that when Daniel heard these words spoken by Gabriel he might not put any very distinct meaning on them—in that he was but like other prophets; the prophets did not know the meaning of their own prophecies. *To seal up the vision and prophecy;* more correctly, *to seal vision and prophet*—to set to them the seal of fulfilment (von Lengerke, Hitzig, Bevan). This does not refer to Jeremiah, because his prophecy referred merely to the return from Babylon, and this refers to a period which is to continue long after that. Jeremiah's prophecy was about to be verified. This new prophecy required four hundred and ninety years ere it received its verification. Some event to happen nearly half a millenium after Daniel is to prove the prophecy God has given him to be true. *And to anoint the Most Holy.* This phrase, קֹדֶשׁ קֳדָשִׁים (*qodesh qodasheem*), is used some forty times in Scripture, but almost always of things, as the altar and the innermost sanctuary (Bevan, 155). Hengstenberg ('Christ,' iii. 119) points out that the phrase for "sancti-

tuary" is "קֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשׁ, with the article. He appeals to 1 Chron. xxiii. 13 as a case where, without the article, the phrase applies to an individual, "וַיִּבְרָךְ אֶת־אֶהֱרֹן לְקֹדֶשׁ קֹדֶשׁ" (*wayibbadayl Aheron l'heqdeesho qod'sh qadasheem*), "And he separated Aaron to sanctify him as a holy of holies." This seems almost the necessary translation, despite the versions; for the prenominal suffix must be the object, and "holy of holies" must be in apposition to it. The act of anointing as a sign of consecration, though applied to the tabernacle (Exod. xxx. 26; xl. 9), to the altar (xl. 10), the laver (xl. 11), is never applied to the holy of holies. It is applied most frequently to persons; as to Aaron (Exod. xl. 13), to Saul (1 Sam. x. 1), to David (1 Sam. xvi. 3). The words of Gabriel thus point forward to a time when all iniquity shall be restrained, sin atoned for, and a priest anointed.

Ver. 25.—Know therefore and understand, that from the going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem unto the Messiah the Prince shall be seven weeks, and three score and two weeks: the street shall be built again, and the wall, even in troublous times. The version of the LXX. is widely different from this, "And thou shalt know and shalt understand and shalt discover that the commandments are determined, and thou shalt build Jerusalem a city of the Lord." The change in the first clause is due to a doublet reading—*tishmah* being also read as well as *tishkayl*, which may have become confluent in the Hebrew text before the Septuagint translator wrote. Instead of *min-motza*, he must have read *v'timiza*, deriving this, not from *מָצָא* (*gatzá*), "to go forth," but from *מָצָא* (*matzá*), "to find"—a reading that is opposed by the fact that many manuscripts write the word *plerum*, מְרַב. *Dabar* must have been in the plural, and some such word as *neh-ratzeem* must have been supplied instead of *hasheeb*. The fact, however, that the same change occurs in Theodotion might render it at least possible that this was the word in the text, but Paulus Tellensis must have had a different reading, "Thou shalt find the precepts for answering;" a marginal reading adds, "and for the understanding the weeks." In the next clause, וְיִבְנֶה (*osva-neetha*) instead of לְבִנוּה (*lib-noth*), and instead of עָר (*adh*) עָר (*eer*), must have been read, and "Messiah the Prince" has been paraphrased into *Kupik*. The last clause may be regarded as omitted. Not improbably this may have resulted from the end of the one verse being so like the beginning of the next. Theodotion's rendering is much more in agreement with the

received text, "And thou shalt know and understand, from the going forth of the word to determine and build Jerusalem, until the anointed leader, is seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, and he shall return, and the broad places and the wall shall be built, and the times shall be distressful." As above remarked, *harootz* is read instead of *hasheeb*. The Peshitta differs considerably from the received text, "Thou shalt know and understand from the decreeing of the word to restore and build Jerusalem, to the coming of the anointed king, is seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, to restore and build Jerusalem, its wall, and its palaces, at the end of the time." The rendering of the *Vetus*, as preserved to us in Tertullian, runs thus, "And thou shalt know and perceive and understand from the going forth of the speech (*sermo*) for the restoring and rebuilding of Jerusalem, even to Christ the Leader, are sixty-two weeks and a half; and he shall return and build in joy, and the wall (*convallationem*), and times shall be renewed." Jerome's rendering is, "Know and understand from the going forth of the word that Jerusalem should be again built, even to Christ the Leader, shall be seven weeks and sixty-two weeks, and the squares shall be again built and the walls in hard times." What cannot fail to impress one is the confusion that exists as to the original text. Of necessity conjectural emendations have been resorted to, with not much advantage. The most plausible is the suggestion of Professor Bevan to read *l'hosheeb*, "to repeople," instead of *l'hasheeb*, "to restore;" but there is no sign in the versions of such a reading being accepted. On the whole, a reading not far removed from the received has probability in its favour. *Going forth of the commandment to restore and to build Jerusalem*. To what does this refer? Hengstenberg ('*Christology*,' iii. 128) says, "There can be no doubt that *motza dabar* signifies the issue of the decree." This view has the advantage that in ver. 23 we have the same combination, יָצָא דָבָר (*yatzá dabar*), "a command went forth." The probability is always in favour of holding a word not to change its meaning in contiguous verses, unless there is some indication that a change has taken place. Other commentators assume as strongly that the word must be the word of the Lord to Jeremiah; hence Bevan renders *dabar*, "promise," without so much as a hint that there can be any doubt in the matter. Behrmann takes the $\frac{1}{2}$, the sign of the infinitive, as being equivalent to *ut*, and that hence this is a case of indirect speech—a usage gravely to be suspected, as certainly unexampled elsewhere in Biblical Hebrew.

He refers to Ewald's 'Grammar,' but at his reference Ewald says that נ is the sign of the semi-oblique narrative used in Hebrew. In a note Ewald refers to נאמל as introducing speeches; but that is not in point here. If *dabar* had meant "promise" or "prophecy" here, it would have been followed with the words in which the prophecy was announced. If, on the other hand, *dabar* is taken as "a decree," the infinitive is natural. The question, then, arises, "Whose decree is it that is here referred to?" Daniel was hoping for a decree being issued by Cyrus; of this he would naturally think, but what he thought is not to be taken as necessarily true. The prophets did not always know the meaning of their own prophecies. We must examine the record, and see what decree suits best with the words of our text. Many commentators think the reference here is to a Divine decree (Hengstenberg, Wolf, etc.). The difficulty of this view is that there is in appearance a definite starting-point given for the period named to begin. Now, a decree of God has no visible time-relation. This view, when maintained by those who hold that the prophecy of Jeremiah is referred to, may have some justification, only that a prophecy is never regarded as a decree, rendering certain its fulfilment. It must be, then, a human decree. The decree of Cyrus did not involve any rebuilding of the city of Jerusalem. The altar was set up—that was all; the temple, even, was not built. The terms of the decree of Cyrus, as we have it in Ezra i. 2, are, "The Lord God of heaven . . . hath charged me to build him an house in Jerusalem." This clearly is not the decree intended. When Darius Hystaspis founded his permission to build the temple on the decree of Cyrus, there was no word of permitting them to rebuild the city walls. When, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, Ezra and his companions left Babylon and came to Jerusalem, still, though there was no command given to build again the walls of Jerusalem, there is more nearly implied a restoration of Jerusalem as a city. We may, then, start from B.C. 458. To Nehemiah, in the twentieth year of the reign of Artaxerxes, was there a positive command given to build the wall of Jerusalem. This date brings us to B.C. 445. Starting from the first date, the end of the 490 years is A.D. 32, and the end of the 69 weeks (equivalent to 483 years) is A.D. 25. If, again, we start from the latter of these dates, the termination of the 490 years is A.D. 45, and of the 483 years A.D. 38. No one can fail to be struck with the fact that these dates are very near the most sacred date of all history—that of the crucifixion of our Lord. We know there is considerable

diversity of opinion as to the date at which that event occurred. But, further, we are not to expect that prophecy shall have the accuracy we have in astronomical ephemerides. We admit there are great difficulties. We admit, further, that seven weeks mark, with wonderful precision, the time which elapsed from the capture of Jerusalem to the accession of Cyrus to the throne of Babylon. The interval was really fifty years. We do not know the occurrences that marked the relation of the Jewish people to their Persian masters during the century and more which elapsed between this twentieth year of Artaxerxes and the overthrow of the Persian Empire by Alexander the Great. The city walls and internal buildings of Jerusalem may have taken fifty years to erect—we simply cannot tell. It is, at all events, a singular thing that the date of our Lord's crucifixion so nearly coincides with the termination of the 483 years. What is the result of starting from the date at which the prophecy was given? Assuming that the writer lived in the reign of Epiphanes, and meant to indicate the date of some event near his own period by the end of the 490 or the 483 years, let us see what follows. If we take the Massoretic date of the prophecy, it was given in the year of the accession of Nebuchadnezzar, or the next year—his first year, according to Babylonian chronology, that is to say, B.C. 606 or B.C. 605. Subtract 483 from either of these, and we have the utterly inconspicuous years B.C. 122 and B.C. 123, that is to say, twelve or thirteen years after the death of Simon the Maccabee. If three years and a half are added, to reach the middle of the week, we have B.C. 119, an equally inconspicuous year. Professor Bevan, however, follows Ewald, and begins with the destruction of Jerusalem. That the statement contradicts the text, which dates "from the going forth of a promise to people and build again Jerusalem," according to Professor Bevan's own translation, not from the destruction of Jerusalem, is looked upon evidently as of no importance. Of course, the refuge is the ignorance of the author of Daniel, notwithstanding that Jeremiah (xxv. 1) dates his first prophecy "the fourth year of Jehoiakim," and his letter (xxix. 2), after the captivity of Jeconiah, and immediately after. Moreover, something more than ignorance is needed to explain the author of Daniel confounding the going forth of a prophecy to rebuild Jerusalem with the destruction of it. If we take the date of the destruction of Jerusalem, B.C. 588, and add 483 years, we reach B.C. 105—a year conspicuous only for the death of John Hyrcanus. This is so obvious, that many

devices have been tried to square matters. Ewald drops out seventy years. Professor Bevan justly characterizes this device as fantastic. Hitzig would make the first seven years run parallel with the first seven weeks of the sixty-two. Professor Bevan rejects this as "highly artificial, and scarcely reconcilable with the text." So, again, in company with Graf and Cornill, he takes refuge in the author's ignorance. If, again, we take B.C. 164, the date the critics wish to make the *terminus ad quem*, which is chosen because it is the year of the purification of the temple; if four hundred and eighty-three years are added to that date, we have B.C. 647—a date that falls within the reign of Manasseh. As, however, the point of time is the anointing of a holy one, and there is reference also to an anointed prince in this verse, a more plausible date would be B.C. 153, the year when Jonathan the brother of Judas the Maccabee assumed the high priesthood (1 Macc. x. 21); to this add 483, and 636 is the result—a date during Josiah's reign. Of course, the refuge is the ignorance of our author; he didn't know any better. The difficulty is to understand, if he was so ignorant as to what was so comparatively near his own time, how he was so well informed as to Babylonian affairs. The critics cannot make the author of Daniel at once exceptionally ignorant and exceptionally well-informed. If, however, we take Mr. Galloway's reading ('Shadow on the Sundial,' p. 48) of the LXX. Version of this verse, we have "seven and seventy weeks" or five hundred and thirty-nine years. If we reckon these years from the decree of Cyrus, B.C. 538, we reach A.D. 2. *Messiah the Prince*; "the anointed prince." Both priests and kings were anointed, as a sign of consecration to their office. Very rarely are priests referred to as "anointed," and never without a distinct statement that they are priests, whereas "the Lord's anointed" always applies to kings. Priests are sometimes called "rulers," מְשִׁיחִים (*me'shechim*), but only in relation to the temple. Never is priesthood and the anointing combined in regard to priest. These ideas are connected in regard to Solomon (1 Chron. xxix. 22). We do not deny that this title would apply to the later Maccabees, like Alexander Jannæus, who was at once high priest and king. We also note, however, that it applies to our Lord, who claimed to be anointed "to preach good tidings" (Luke iv. 18). *The street shall be built again.* רְחֹב, "street," is really "broad place." Instead of the heaps of confused rubbish, the city was once more to be laid off in orderly streets and squares, so that Zechariah's prophecy might be fulfilled (viii. 5), "The streets of the city shall be full of boys and

girls playing." *And the wall, even in troublous times.* This was certainly fulfilled in the days of Nehemiah; one has only to read the Book of Nehemiah to see that. The word *harootz*, translated "wall," is of somewhat doubtful significance. It means (Isa. x. 22) "a determination." In Job xli. 22 (30) it is translated "a threshing-wain," whereas in Prov. iii. 14 it means "fine gold." Fürst would make it mean here "a marked-off quarter of a city." Gesenius makes it mean here "a ditch"—a view that Winer also holds. Cornill ('Siebzig Jahrwochen,' p. 5) says most interpreters explain *harootz*, from the Targumic, as "ditches." It would seem that a better rendering would be "a palisade;" the ruling idea of all meanings, save the last, as pointed out by Winer, is "sharpness." "A ditch" or "a wall" conveys no suggestion of sharpness, but "a palisade" does. Not impossibly, before the wall was erected, the city was protected by "a palisade," and would certainly be set up in troublous times. It is to be observed that the events referred to in these two last clauses have no distinct temporal relation to the weeks. We might surmise that it referred to the time during which the city was being rebuilt—street and palisade—but we are destitute of information which might enable us either to confirm or contradict that view. This period may be during the Maccabean struggle; we cannot tell.

Ver 26.—And after three score and two weeks shall Messiah be set off, but not for himself; and the people of the princes that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary; and the end thereof shall be with a flood, and unto the end of the war desolations are determined. The version of the LXX. is nearly unintelligible as it stands, though the genesis of each separate clause from a text akin to the Massoretic can be easily understood, "And after seven and seventy and sixty-two, the anointing shall be taken away, and shall not be, and the kingdom of the heathen shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the Messiah, and his end shall come with wrath, and it shall be warred with war till the time of the end." The first clause has strayed from the end of the preceding verse, and שִׁבְעִים (*shiv'eam*), "seventy," is confused with שָׁבָע (*shivoo'eam*), "weeks." It is a possible thing that the Kabbalistic use of numbers had something to do with this number, for if these numbers are expressed in letters, and the letters taken as initials, we have the initials of this sentence וְכֵן עַד זְמַן הַתְּהוֹמוֹת בָּבֶל, "The time until the overthrow of Babylon." They must have read נִשְׁחָה instead of שָׁחָה. It is difficult to under-

stand how "the people of the prince that shall come" could be read, "the kingdom of the Gentiles," save by supposing a somewhat arbitrary paraphrase. The last clause has probably assumed the present shape through the insertion of some part of the verb *mrʾ*, and the omission of the end of the verse. Theodotion's rendering is in closer agreement with the Massoretic text, yet is wide from it too, "After the sixty-two weeks anointing shall be utterly destroyed, and judgment is not in it (or 'him,' *abrʾ*), and he (it) shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the leader that cometh; they shall be cut off with a flood, even until the end of the war, having been arranged by disappearances in order." The introduction of *κρῖμα* is difficult to explain, except as an explanatory addition from Isa. liii. 8. Still more difficult is it to understand the genesis of the last clause. The Peshitta, though considerably closer to the Massoretic in the beginning of the verse, is as far apart in the last clause, "And after the sixty-two weeks, the anointed shall be killed, and there was not to him, and the city of the holy shall be destroyed with the king that cometh, and his end is with a flood, even until the end of the war of the fragments of destruction." The Vetus, as represented by the quotation in Tertullian, is not so close to the LXX. as it usually is, "And after the sixty-two weeks, even the anointing shall be destroyed, and shall not be, and with the coming leader he shall destroy the holy city, and thus shall be destroyed in the end of the war, because he shall be destroyed even to death." This version agrees neither with the LXX. nor with Theodotion. Jerome translates into an eminently Christian sense, "And after sixty-two weeks Christ shall be slain, and his people who will deny him will not be. And his people with a leader about to come, will destroy the city and sanctuary, its end wasting, and after the end of the war desolation determined." *And after three score and two weeks shall the Messiah be cut off.* The period of sixty-two weeks must begin after the seven weeks have ended, as the completed period to Messiah the prince is seven weeks and sixty-two weeks. *The Messiah*: the word has no article, and, therefore, it is argued, it ought to be rendered "an anointed one;" but the use of the article is not so rigid. It is omitted in poetic and semi-poetic passages: e.g. the first word in the Hebrew Bible is anarthrous, although we are obliged to translate it with the article. Further, the Messiah the Prince has already been mentioned, and, therefore, comes somewhat into the region of proper names, as Amos vii. 12, "the sanctuary of *king*," instead of "the king:"

so 1 Kings xxi. 13, "curse God and king." We take "Messiah" here as equivalent to "the Messiah" above mentioned. Who is it that is here referred to? The common critical position assuming, without reason assigned, that "anointed" without any subject may refer to a priest, asserts that the reference here is to Onias III. The account of his murder is given in 2 Macc. iv. 39. He had succeeded his father, Simon II., as high priest, B.C. 198. In connection with his high-priesthood is the legendary story told (2 Macc. iii.) of the attempt of Heliodorus to spoil the temple. On the accession of Epiphanes, Jason, the brother of Onias, endeavoured to undermine him with the king, and succeeded; Onias, displaced, in favour of Jason, retired to Antioch. Three years after Jason, in turn, was superseded by Menelaus, who, according to 2 Maccabees, was a Benjamite. Onias rebuked Menelaus for selling some of the sacred vessels; Menelaus bribed Andronicus to put Onias to death, which he did, alluring him from the sanctuary of Daphne, in which he had taken refuge. Josephus gives a different account of matters (*Ant.* xii. 5), "About this time, Onias having died, he (Epiphanes) gives the high-priesthood to his brother Jesus, for the son whom Onias left was only a child. This Jesus, who was brother of Onias, was deprived of the high-priesthood. The king, being angry with him, gave it to his youngest brother Onias." Josephus adds, "These two brothers changed their names—Jesus became Jason, and Onias Menelaus. After a little, Onias (Menelaus) was expelled from Jerusalem, and retired to Antioch and abjured his religion." In 1 Maccabees there is no reference to the death of Onias at all. Certainly the First Book of Maccabees does not take up this part of the history, but if this Onias was murdered, and his murder so affected Jewish feeling, that it became a date of superlative interest in Jewish history—the writer would at least have referred to it. The whole story, as told in 2 Maccabees, has a doubtful look. Even if we disregard the Heliodorus legend altogether, and the suspicion of the whole history which it engenders, we have Menelaus, a man who, according to 2 Maccabees, is a Benjamite, intruded into an office for which only Aaronites were eligible, without a hint that the writer thought it an additional element in the guilt of the usurper. Josephus mentions it as a point against Alcimus, that he was not of the high-priestly family (*Ant.* xi. 9. 5), yet Alcimus was a descendant of Aaron (1 Macc. vii. 13). We have, further, a zealous Jew retiring to Antioch, and, when in danger, betaking himself for safety to the heathen

sanctuary of Daphne. We know the orgies that consecrated the groves of Daphne. These would make Daphne the last place in which a Jewish high priest would seek refuge; if his very presence in the sanctuary would not be held by the Greeks as polluting it. Thus, even though we had not the express evidence of Josephus against it, the narrative is self-condemned. The whole story is baseless, and, whether true or false, did not affect Jewish imagination in the way assumed by critics. Had the story been that, while high priest, he was allured from the sacred precincts of the temple at Jerusalem and been murdered, then the legend, even if untrue, might well have affected the Jews deeply. But a high priest who had surrendered his office and retired into a heathen city was a less sacred person, and his allurement from a heathen sanctuary and his murder was a less heinous crime. The whole notion that Onias III. can be thought of here is an absurdity that would have been scouted at once by these critics, had any necessity of argument required it. The origin of this legend of the murder of Onias III. is to be sought in the murder or execution of Onias Menelaus by order of Antiochus Eupator (Jos., *Ant.*, xii. 9. 5; 2 Macc. xiii. 5). Is the anointed one Seleucus Philopator? Bleek, von Lengerke, Maurer, and Ewald hold this view. Seleucus is alleged to have been murdered by Heliodorus: this rests on the sole authority of Appian, in a narrative in which there is evidence of confusion. Even if it be granted, it is difficult to imagine a heathen prince called "Messiah." Certainly Cyrus is called so in the Second Isaiah, but this is because of the work he is to do for Israel. There seems a necessity to maintain that it was some one who was to be the anointed prince of the Jewish people, who should thus be cut off. *But not for himself.* Great difference of opinion exists as to the precise meaning of this phrase. The meaning expressed by the Authorized Version would have required at least in normal Hebrew, not *ל' עמ' (l' ayin lo)*, but *ל' עמ' (l' lo' lo)*. The Revised Version is preferable, "and shall have nothing." It may mean "he shall not be," but that is not so natural. The Revised, however, is vague, and one is inclined to seek for an explanation in a parallel passage in ch. xi. 45, *ל' עמ' (l' ayin lo)*, "And there was no helper to him." It is no sufficient answer to say, as does Professor Bevan, that ch. xi. 45 applies to Epiphanes, and this does not. The same statement might be made of two different persons. It seems to be a more condensed expression of what we find in Isa. lxiii. 3, "Of the people there was none with me."

Behrmann's translation is indefensible, "No one remains to him, i.e. follows him;" he gives no particular reference. This view assumes Onias III. to be the Messiah. He was, according to Josephus, on his death succeeded by first one and then the other of his two brothers, because his son was too young for the office. The further assumption has to be made that, in the opinion of the pious, they were not successors of Onias. The pious of that time have left no record of their opinions. *And the people of the prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary.* The word translated "prince" is rarely to be rendered "king." The only cases are those of Solomon (1 Chron. xxix. 22) and Hezekiah (2 Kings xx. 5). The former was anointed, *מָלַךְ*, while his father was still living; the latter occurs in a poetical passage. Priests are sometimes called "princes," or "rulers," but that is simply in regard to the house of God and the sacerdotal arrangements. If the verse stood by itself, there would seem little possible difficulty in regard to accepting the old Jewish interpretation which made "the prince" Titus, who was left to carry on the siege of Jerusalem while his father was in Rome, busied with the duties incumbent on the occupant of the imperial throne. Certainly the Romans, the people of the prince, did destroy the city and the sanctuary in a more thorough way than any one since Nebuchadnezzar. *And the end thereof shall be with a flood.* It is difficult to decide the reference of "thereof" here. The reference grammatically seems to be restricted to "the people," as that is the nominative of the preceding verb. It may, however, without much grammatical strain, refer to the prince. In regard to prophecy, especially apocalyptic prophecy, grammar cannot be regarded as affording a final canon for interpretation. The main subject of the verse is the Messiah who shall be cut off. There might, therefore, be a reference to him, "his end" being the vengeance that came upon the people for deserting him. This is the interpretation of the Septuagint, "The kingdom of the heathen shall destroy the city and the sanctuary with the Messiah," identifying "prince" with "Messiah," and his end shall come with wrath." Theodotion refers to the city and the sanctuary, for he has, "They shall be cut off with a flood." The Peshitta refers to the king that cometh. The Vetus has *finem belli*. Jerome has *finis ejus vastitas*, his reference being to the city. The idea of Hitzig, that the prenominal suffix refers to the campaign, seems the most natural one. Of course, Hitzig refers it to the campaign of Antiochus, but the interpretation does not necessitate that.

With a flood; not a literal flood. This word does not elsewhere refer to a number of men, save in the eleventh chapter of this book; that chapter, however, is of doubtful authenticity. All that we draw from the use of *shateph*, "a flood," for "a multitude of men," and of *shataph*, "to overflow," "to overrun," is that, in the opinion of the author of the eleventh chapter, the phrase here means "a multitude of men." "Wrath," or "devastation," seems to be the best meaning of the word. The latter seems, on the whole, the more natural rendering here. If so, no one can fail to see how apt a description it gives of the state of Judæa, and especially of Jerusalem, after the war which was concluded by the capture of the city by Titus. *And unto the end of the war desolations are determined.* Rather it should be rendered, "until the end was the decree of desolations," viz. the end of this campaign above referred to, and until that end is reached, war, which is itself a decree of desolations, is determined. Taken thus, this clause explains that which has gone before. The text here, however, is evidently in such a corrupt state that no decision can be made with any feeling of confidence. The Septuagint appears to have read *yillahaym* instead of *nehresheth*, and has omitted the last word altogether. Theodotus has, "by order in disappearances," but one cannot tell what Hebrew words these represent. The Vetus, which usually stands closely related to the Septuagint, omits a number of words. The uncertainty of the text renders one chary of suggesting meanings.

Ver. 27.—And he shall confirm the covenant with many for one week; and in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease, and for the overspreading of abominations he shall make it desolate, even until the consummation, and that determined shall be poured upon the desolate. The verse in the Septuagint corresponding to this is evidently mixed up with confluent readings and notes as to earlier verses, "And the covenant shall be strong upon many, and again he shall turn ('repent'?) ἐπιστρέψει), and it shall be built in breadth and length, and according to the end of times until the end of the war, and after seven and seventy times and sixty-two years until the end of the war; and the desolation shall be taken away in confirming (or 'when he shall confirm') the covenant to many weeks; and in the end of the week the sacrifice and the oblation shall be taken away, and upon the temple shall be the abomination of desolation until the end, and an end shall be given to the desolation." In this mass of confusion this much is clear—the clause, "the covenant shall be strong (δυναστεύσει)

upon many," is a doublet of the clause, "when he shall confirm the covenant to many weeks." The clause, "and after seven and seventy times and sixty-two years," is a doublet of the beginning of the twenty-sixth verse; "Till the end of the war, and the desolation shall be taken away," is an alternative version of the last clause of the twenty-sixth verse. When those extraneous elements are got rid of, we have left a rendering of the twenty-seventh verse, which may afford us light as to the text. "The covenant shall be strong upon many" is a possible rendering of the Hebrew (see Ps. xii. 5). The alternative reading, "when he shall confirm (ἐν τῷ καταρχῶσαι) the covenant during many weeks," implies the infinitive with the preposition *ἕως*, and "weeks" in the plural, and "one" omitted—the latter is omitted, indeed, by both. "And in the end of the week"—reading קָץ (*qaytz*) instead of קָרָץ (*h'atzee*)—"sacrifice and offering shall be taken away, and upon the temple shall be the abomination of desolation"—reading קֹדֶשׁ (*qodesh*), "holy," instead of כְּנָפִים (*kenaph*), "wing," "outspreading," or it may be rendered "wing of temple"—"until the end, and an end be given to desolation"—reading לְטוֹטָן (*tooltan*), "is given," or "appointed," instead of לְטִיטָק (*tittak*), "poured out." Theodotus is closer to the Massoretic, "And one week shall confirm (δυναστεύσει) a covenant to many, and in the middle (ἡμίσει) of the week my sacrifice and offering shall be taken away"—reading זֶבַח (*zeb'hee*) instead of זֶבַח (*zebah*), and possibly *min'hath*, instead of *min'hah*—"and upon the temple (shall be) the abomination of desolations, and till (at) the end of the time an end is set (given) to the desolation." It will be observed that Theodotus agrees with the LXX. in reading קֹדֶשׁ (*qodesh*) instead of כְּנָפִים (*kenaph*), and לְטוֹטָן (*tooltan*) instead of לְטִיטָק (*tittak*).¹ The Peshitta is closer still to the Massoretic, but the last verb the translator seems to have read as *tanaah*, "shall rest." Tertullian, in his quotation from the Vetus, shows that in this verse it follows Theodotus, or rather the version which he made his basis. He, however, connects "half a week" with "one week." The Vulgate rendering is, "One week also shall confirm the covenant to

¹ The Vatican² and ³ and the Alexandrian have a singular addition. After "the middle of the week" they add, "he shall cause to cease altar and sacrifice, even until the wing of desolation, and until completion (συντελείας) and diligence, he shall arrange to disappearance;" then they repeat the first clause. This is probably a case of confluence of readings.

many, and in the middle of the week sacrifice and offering shall cease"—reading *עֲבָרָה* (*yishbath*)—"and in the temple shall be the abomination of desolation"—therefore reading with the Greek versions and the Vetus, *עָבָרָה* instead of *עֲבָרָה*—"and even to the consummation and end shall the desolation continue"—reading, therefore, *עָבָרָה* instead of *עֲבָרָה*, and omitting the preposition *עַל* (*ad*), "upon"—the latter is not a probable reading. From this examination of the versions one thing is clear—we must accept, with all its difficulties, "confirms." Grätz would change one letter, and translate, "he shall cause many to transgress the covenant." The wilder supposition of Professor Bevan, which would change two letters, and translate, "the covenant shall be annulled for many," is equally out of court. The next point is *kenaph*, "expansion." Here the Greek and Latin versions, including that in Matt. xxiv. 15, but excluding the doublet mixed up in the text of the Vatican and Alexandrian Codices, have read *עָבָרָה*. The Peshitta and the author of the reading intruded into the Alexandrian Codex have read *קִנָּפָה* (*kenaph*). However, these two are not agreed as to the interpretation. The Peshitta renders "wings," the Vatican and Alexandrian scribes render *ἑπτάγων*, the word used (Matt. iv. 5) for a pinnacle of the temple. There is, whichever is preferred, not the slightest justification for the suggestion of Kuenen, that we should read *נֶפֶשׁ* instead of *קִנָּפָה*. Professor Bevan thinks "this emendation is well-nigh certain." If that is so, any suggestion of any critic may be equally commended. We have practically four Greek versions here, two Syriac if we include Paulus Tellensis, two Latin, and not one of them gives the slightest hint that this "well-nigh certain" reading was in existence. The balance of evidence is decidedly in favour of *עָבָרָה* (*qodesh*), especially so in the light of our Lord's words. Had the text with which his hearers were familiar contained the suggestive word *קִנָּפָה*, "wing," it was impossible, speaking as he did of the setting up of the Roman eagles in the temple, to have avoided remarking on the word used. Our Lord in this case must have had the Hebrew before him, as he does not render as the Greek versions do, *ἐν τῷ ἱερὸν*, but *ἐν τόπῳ ἁγίῳ*. We must thus hold *עָבָרָה* to have been the original text. *And he shall confirm the covenant with many.* What is the subject of the verb here? Hengstenberg, Hitzig, and von Lengerke make the one week the nominative of the verb. Professor Bevan objects that to represent a week making a

covenant, or making it burdensome, is without analogy. Both Hitzig and Hengstenberg appeal to Mal. iii. 19; Isa. xxii. 5; Job iii. 3, where a "day" is represented as acting. Theodotion translates thus. The natural meaning, according to the Hebrew, if we do not pass beyond the clause before us for the subject of the verb, is *בְּרִית* (*b'reeth*), "covenant." Thus we ought naturally to render either—taking the hiphil in its causative sense—"a covenant," or "the covenant shall confirm;" i.e. secure "one week to many," or—and this is better, as supported by Ps. xii. 5 (4), in the sense given to the hiphil of *גָּבַר* (*gabar*)—"the covenant shall prevail for many during one week." This agrees with the first version we find in the Septuagint, The covenant—God's covenant with Israel, and this it must be here—"prevails with many;" his covenant to send a Messiah, a part of the eternal covenant with Israel, would prevail with the hearts of many of Israel during one week. If we reckon our Lord's ministry to have begun in the year A.D. 30, and the conversion of St. Paul A.D. 37, we have the interval required. After the conversion of St. Paul, the Gentiles more than the Jews were brought into the Church. Another theory is that it is the coming prince who is referred to. This is assumed by critics to be Antiochus; e.g. Ewald. Moses Stuart, who adopts this view, refers to the covenant made with Antiochus by many of the Jews. But *b'reeth* thus absolute, is used not of alliances, but of the Divine covenant. The theory that the coming prince is Jason the brother of Onias does not suit with the idea of confirming the Divine covenant, so the interpreters that hold this view—e.g. Bevan—do not make "the prince" the subject of the verb. If *b'reeth* is the Divine covenant, as by usage it is, then the prince whose people were to lay waste the temple and city cannot be he that confirms the covenant. We might take the last clause of ver. 26 as in a parenthesis, and regard the subject of the verb "confirm" as the Messiah who was cut off. It seems, however, preferable to take the construction as we have done above, and make *b'reeth* the subject of the verb. *And in the midst of the week he shall cause the sacrifice and the oblation to cease.* In accordance with our interpretation of the previous clause, we would interpret this, "The covenant shall cause offering and oblation to cease." What covenant is this? The new Messianic covenant promised in Jer. xxxi. 31. The author of the Epistle to the Hebrews (viii. 8) quotes this passage as Messianic, and as proving that sacrifice and offering had ceased with Christ's sacrifice of himself. Interpreters of the critical

school are reduced to considerable difficulties in their endeavours to square this passage with their preconceived notions. Bevan admits that the natural subject of the verb *yashbeeth* is the "prince who shall come;" but having come to the conclusion that this coming prince is Jason, he could not be said to make sacrifice and offering cease. Professor Bevan is constrained to change the reading from *hiphil* into the *kāl*. He has certainly the justification that the Septuagint and Theodotion both make the word passive. Ewald regards the coming prince as Epiphanes. If so, then he must be the subject all through. In that case we are obliged to contradict usage and maintain that the covenant confirmed refers to an alliance made with apostate Jews; but this, as we have said, contradicts the usage in regard to "covenant" in this absolute position. Further, we have, in the end of ver. 26, the "end of the war" referred to. Yet, according to this interpretation, after the war is over the prince is making sacrifice and offering to cease. Ewald, recognizing the difficulties of his interpretation, declares, "As soon as the discourse touches upon the man and his projects, it is at once agitated with the profoundest disorder." *The midst of the week*. On the ordinary Christian interpretation, this applies to the crucifixion of our Lord, which took place, according to the received calculation, during the fourth year after his baptism by John, and the consequent opening of his ministry. Hitzig and many critical commentators see a reference in the half-week to the time, times, and half a time, and they identify that with the time during which Antiochus had set up the heathen altar in the temple. It is to be observed that this view has the support of 1 Mac. i. 54, which applies the next clause to Antiochus. If the traditional view is correct—that the prophecy published in the days of Cyrus applied to the coming Romans—then it was but natural that a writer in the days of John Hyrcanus should be prone to interpret the prophecy of events in his own time. As we have already seen, the reference cannot be to Antiochus. The extreme popularity of Daniel by the time 1 Maccabees was written, probably about B.C. 100, is to be observed. *For the overspreading of abominations, he shall make it desolate*. This is rendered in the Revised Version, "And upon the wing of abominations shall come one that maketh desolate;" in the margin the rendering is, "upon the pinnacle of abominations." We have seen that the great balance of evidence was in favour of inserting *שֶׁבֶט*, "holy place," instead of *כֶּנָף*, "wing." Even if we take the Massoretic reading, and render it according either to

the text or the margin, we have difficulties. We have no instance of a bird supporting itself by one wing. If *כֶּנָף* (*kenaph*), "wing," is retained, the reference to the Roman eagles can scarcely be resisted. The word has several derivative meanings: "The edge" of the earth, as Isa. xxiv. 16; from this is derived the rendering in the Revised. In the present passage, Gesenius, Fürst, and Winer regard it as equivalent to *πτερόν*; but no such meaning is elsewhere found in Hebrew. "He shall make it desolate." In Hebrew, this is only one word, *m'shomaym*, the participle. The word occurs twice in Ezra ix. 1, 4, and there means "astonished," "stupefied." It is imitated in ch. xi. 31, but the preceding word, *שִׁיּוּט* (*shiqqootz*), is in the singular, and agrees with *m'shomaym*. Here we have the noun *shiqqootzem* in the plural while the participle is in the singular. In ch. xii. 11 we have another variation, *שִׁיּוּט* *שִׁיּוּט*. The versions translate as if the word had been in the singular; hence we may doubt whether the noun was not originally singular, all the more that in the parallel passage (ch. xi. 31) we have the singular used. An accidental reduplication of the *ש*, which begins *שִׁיּוּט*, would explain the present reading. Professor Bevan suggests that we read *שִׁיּוּט*, the *hophal* participle plural from *שָׁבַט*, "to sit;" but the evidence of the versions is decisive against this. The rendering of the clause would be thus, "and upon the temple the abomination of desolation is set." The usage of *shiqqootz* leads us to think of heathen idols, as 1 Kings xi. 1, Chemosh, the abomination of Moab; Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon, 2 Kings xxiii. 13; Ash-toreth, the abomination of the Zidonians. More important is Jer. xxxii. 34, "They set their abominations in the house that is called by my name, to defile it." We have here the combination suggested by Professor Bevan. From the fact that Daniel seems to have been saturated with Jeremiah, his suggestion might have had weight; but the utter want of any hint in the versions that the reading was even doubtful, compels us to be against this view. There is no case where *shiqqootz* means "altar," but many where it means "idol." So the setting up of a heathen altar is not what would naturally be thought of in this connection. The traditional opinion, that this refers to the Roman eagle standards, which were in a sense "idols," and were regarded especially as such by the Jews, is certainly at least plausible on grammatical grounds, and may be regarded as certain from other reasons; e.g. its suitability to the meaning of the other verses. *Even until the con-*

summation, and that determined shall be poured out upon the desolate. The Revised Version is very different here, "And even unto the consummation, and that determined, shall wrath be poured out upon the desolator." We have already seen that *qan* (*tittak*), "poured out," must be abandoned, as not present in any of the versions. Most of them have read *qan*. We must, in the first instance, assume the nominative in the sentence to be the subject of the verb. In that case we should render in accordance with the rendering of the two Greek versions, "Until an end and a limit be set to the desolation." The reading of Jerome in the Vulgate, as we have seen, seems to have been *qan* (*layshayb*), "to dwell," "to remain," for he renders *perseverabit*; and must not have had the preposition *al*, ("al"), "upon," for he makes *desolation* the nominative of the verb. Jerome's interpretation points to the end of the world, and the reading we adopt points also to the same *terminus ad quem*, the more indefinitely. The end set to the desolation may be the

end of time, but it may be some earlier period; but that is not revealed. The meaning of *kalah* is assumed to be "end," not "ruin," as asserted by many commentators. Where the word does mean "destruction," it is simply as an utter end of a person or nation—it is that person's or nation's destruction; but it never does mean "destruction" apart from this. In connection with this question, two passages in Isaiah have to be considered (Isa. x. 23; xxviii. 23), where *kalah* and *neh'etzelh* occur in connection. Our interpretation implies that we take *ay* as a conjunction, and not as a preposition. Professor Bevan would make it absolute, that when *ay* introduces a verbal clause, the verb takes the precedence of the subject, and would therefore point *ay*, not *ay*; but in opposition to this dictum is 1 Sam. ii. 15. The generality of the phenomenon is due to the normal structure of the Hebrew clause. An end shall be set some time to the desolation of Zion, although that end may coincide with the end of all things.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 3—8.—*Confession of sin.* I. THE DUTY OF CONFESSION. This implies, first, a recognition of guilt in our own consciousness; and second, an admission of it in the presence of God. 1. If we have sinned, it is *wrong to ignore* the fact or to forget it, till we have repented and have been forgiven. To do so will foster insincerity and self-deception, and will harden the heart in sin. We must first admit our guilt to ourselves. 2. If we have sinned, we are required to *declare our guilt before God*. The guilt must not be hidden in the secret darkness of our own consciousness. It must be confessed. Though we may confess our sins one to another, the supreme duty is to confess them to God, because (1) we have sinned against *him*; (2) he is our Judge; (3) he is our Father; (4) he only can deliver us from the consequences and power of sin.

II. THE TESTS OF SINCERE CONFESSION. No duty is more often obeyed only in outward form, and yet there is no duty in which unreality and superficiality are more fatal. 1. One test of sincerity is the presence of *real grief* (ver. 3). There may be a bald admission of guilt without any feeling of compunction. This is of no value. 2. Another test is the feeling of *shame*: "confusion of faces." There is a confession which glories in wickedness. True confession is self-humiliating (Gen. iii. 7—10).

III. THE GROUNDS OF CONFESSION. 1. A consideration of our conduct in the light of the *nature and character of God*. (1) We shall realize our guilt by comparison with God's righteousness, which is the standard of perfection. It is the daylight of God's presence which reveals the defects of our work. (2) We shall be prompted to confess our sin to God when we see his greatness, which cannot endure sin; his faithfulness, which is true to his side of the covenant, though we are false to ours (ver. 4); and his mercy, which pardons the penitent (ver. 9). 2. A consideration of our conduct in the light of *our obligations*. (1) We are subjects of the great King; therefore our sin is treason: "we have rebelled." (2) We live under spiritual government, and are not left to our own inclination to shape our conduct; therefore our wickedness is the breach of law: we have "departed from God's precepts and judgments." (3) We have been enlightened by Divine revelation. We cannot plead ignorance. Even the heathen have some light of conscience and nature (Rom. i. 18—20). We have the clearer light of prophecy, and our guilt is that "we have not hearkened to God's servants the prophets."

IV. THE PERSONAL APPLICATION OF THE DUTY OF CONFESSION. 1. It is *universal*. Daniel includes men of all classes and in all situations. We cannot shake off our guilt by leaving the scenes of our sins. We carry this burden with us (ver. 7). The rich and great are not exempt (ver. 8). 2. It is *personal*. The prophet writes in the first person—"we." Confession must be individual. (1) We should acknowledge and confess our special sins, our besetting sins, the sins which are particularly our own characteristic defects, the different kinds of sin, the separate acts of sin. Confession of general guilt is often vague, and does not associate itself closely with our experience. (2) We should recognize the sinful condition of the heart of which these special sins are symptoms, and confess our sin as well as our sins (Ps. li. 5).

V. THE ENDS OF CONFESSION. 1. It is right on its own account, as an evidence of sincerity (1 John i. 8). 2. It is a necessary condition of forgiveness (1 John i. 9). 3. It is the first step towards a better life. As we admit the evil of the past we are more able to do better for the future (Ps. li. 7—10).

VERS. 16—19.—*Prayer for pardon*. In its tone and character, the ends it seeks and the pleas it urges, this prayer of Daniel's may be regarded as a model prayer for the forgiveness of sins.

I. ITS CHARACTER. The very atmosphere of this prayer is purifying and inspiring. It is marked by several important characteristics. 1. *Contrition*. It follows a confession of sin (vers. 5—8), and frankly admits that the present calamities are the merited consequences of sin (ver. 16). Forgiveness is only possible after repentance (Acts iii. 19) and confession (1 John i. 9). 2. *Earnestness*. This is the most striking feature of the prayer. Its short passionate phrases, its repetitions, its direct practical aims, are proofs of reality and intensity of desire. We may expect that God will attend to our prayers in proportion to our earnestness in offering them. Reverent importunity is expected by God, and attains its end, as with Abraham (Gen. xviii. 23—33), Jacob (Gen. xxxii. 26), Moses (Exod. xxxii. 7—14), and in our Lord's parable of the importunate widow (Luke xviii. 1—7). 3. *Faith*. In his distress the prophet seeks his God, though it is against his God that the sin has been committed. Faith confesses that there is no help but in God. Faith persists in pleading with God, and relies on his mercy.

II. ITS OBJECT. The object of this prayer is the pardon of sin. All our greatest evil comes from sin, and can only be removed when our sin is forgiven. Forgiveness brings in its train all the best blessings. 1. *The turning away of God's anger*. (Ver. 16.) The worst effect of our sin is seen in the changed relations between our souls and God. God is angry with us. The essence of forgiveness is not the remission of penalties, but the restoration of friendly relations between God and man. It is personal reconciliation rather than legal acquittal. 2. *The awakening of God's sympathy*. The prophet prays, "Incline thine ear and hear; open thine eyes." Forgiveness is not merely the negative cessation of God's anger. It is the positive restoration of his sympathy. 3. *The practical help of God*. "Cause thy face to shine;" "hearken and do;" "defer not," are earnest practical petitions. After the spiritual reconciliation, we may naturally ask for help in the external calamities which our sins have brought upon us. Forgiveness is the preface to active help.

III. ITS PLEAS. The prophet has no plea of merit. We can ask for nothing for our own righteousness. All our pleas must be found, as Daniel found his, in the character and actions of God. 1. *God's righteousness*. This is a plea, (1) because it implies his faithfulness to his promises of pardon to the penitent (Lev. xxvi. 40—44); and (2) because righteousness is more honoured by the forgiveness which destroys sin than by the anger which only punishes it (Isa. xlv. 21). 2. *God's honour*. Jerusalem is "God's holy mountain;" the city is "called by his name." God is dishonoured in the humiliation of his people, and he is glorified in their restoration (Numb. xiv. 13—16). 3. *God's mercy*. (Ver. 18.) All prayer depends on the free grace of God. Prayer for pardon rests on that grace which pities misery and overlooks offences—the grace which we call mercy. This plea is expressed by the Christian phrase, "for Christ's sake," because Christ is both the Revelation of God's mercy and the Sacrifice by which it becomes attainable.

VERS. 20—23.—*Prayer answered*. We have here a lifting of the veil which commonly

hides from our view the processes which connect our prayers with God's replies. The revelation thus made of the unseen world should confirm our faith in the necessity and power of prayer, and help us to understand in some way the manner in which God answers it.

I. GOD GIVES SOME BLESSINGS ONLY IN RESPONSE TO PRAYER. The blessing was given to Daniel immediately he prayed, but not till then. Probably if the prayer had been offered sooner, the response also would have been enjoyed sooner. There are many good things which we lose simply because we do not pray for them (Jas. iv. 2). 1. *This is not contrary to the idea of the universality and unchangeable character of natural law.* (1) Because prayer itself is a factor among spiritual forces which have influences upon the future; and (2) because God must have at least no less freedom of action in arranging the forces of his universe than he has accorded to us, and so may act with special purposes as we also do, without breaking one of his laws. 2. *This is not contrary to the wisdom and goodness of God.* God knows what we need before we ask him (Matt. vi. 8). Yet there may be things which it is wise and right for God to give after we have asked for them, but which it is not right or wise for him to give before we have prayed, because our recognition of the need of them and our trust to God for them, may be important conditions for the right reception of them (Matt. vii. 7—11).

II. GOD ANSWERS PRAYER ACTIVELY AND PROMPTLY. Prayer is not merely a subjective act soothing and relieving the soul. Even the subjective influence of it depends on our faith in its real efficacy. We should not be comforted by prayer if we did not believe that God heard and answered it. 1. *God hears prayer.* Prayer is not only the breathing out of our souls. It is talking to a God who hears, attends, and sympathizes (Isa. xli. 17). 2. *God acts in response to prayer.* Gabriel is sent by God, and Daniel receives new light. We may find, especially in spiritual matters, that there is a real exertion of energy on God's side in response to prayer. He is not a passive hearer of prayer. His answers are not the mere echoes of sympathy. They carry active aid (Ps. xci. 15). 3. *God answers prayer promptly.* Daniel prays, "Defer not." God does not defer. The answer is sent at the very beginning of the supplication, and Gabriel is "caused to fly swiftly." God is too powerful to need to delay, and too merciful to be willing to delay. If we do not receive the answers to our prayers quickly, it is not because God is slow, but because the time at which the blessing is to be given is one of the conditions of its utility. Still, the decree goes forth at once, and begins to be accomplished in due time (Hab. ii. 3).

III. GOD'S RESPONSE TO PRAYER IS IN ACCORDANCE WITH HIS WILL AND PROVIDENTIAL ORDER. 1. *The manner in which the answer is made does not imply any breach in the order of providence.* The angel is sent to communicate knowledge to Daniel. This, according to Scripture, is the normal method of spiritual help (Heb. i. 14). 2. *The substance of the answer is in harmony with God's will and the order of his providence.* Daniel prays for the restoration of his people. God answers the prayer by revealing the already settled purpose of this restoration. God often answers prayer in a different way from our expectation. Sometimes he opens our eyes to blessings already given, but not recognized (Gen. xxi. 19). Sometimes he changes our desires, and inclines our hearts to rest in his will by showing us that it is better than our will. The best prayer is that in which we seek to be reconciled to the will of God (Matt. xxvi. 39).

Ver. 24.—*Redemption promised.* I. THE ASSURANCE OF REDEMPTION. 1. *It comes from God.* We have sinned against God; yet it is he who purifies and renews us. God sends the calamities which are the chastisement of sin; but God also removes them, and restores his penitent people to his favour (Ps. ciii. 3, 4). 2. *It was determined long before it was accomplished.* From the Fall the restoration was determined (Gen. iii. 15). Old Testament saints were comforted by the hope of it. All previous history prepared the way for it. Though "grace and truth came by Jesus Christ" (John i. 17), they were not created at his advent. The gospel is not a revelation of new mercy, but a new revelation of God's eternal mercy (Ps. cxxxvi. 1). 3. *The time of its accomplishment was fixed beforehand.* Though Christ did not come till long after sin had entered the world, he came at the most suitable time. He came when the world was prepared for his advent, and when men most needed him (Gal. iv. 4).

II. THE CHARACTERISTICS OF REDEMPTION. 1. *As regards the evil of the past.* (1) The old life of sin is completed and forsaken. The "old man is put off" (Col. iii. 9). "The transgression is finished." (2) A check is put on the indwelling power of sin to prevent it from again rising up and ruling over our souls (1 John iii. 6). An end is made to sins, and they are "sealed up" to prevent them from breaking out again. This is completely accomplished with "the spirits of just men made perfect." It begins with each Christian when his redemption begins. Though sin still lingers in the Christian, it no longer rules. (3) The old sins are atoned for and forgiven. They are "covered." God will remember them no more (Isa. xliii. 25). This is regarded as accomplished in the act of redemption only predicted to Daniel. Therefore we must understand that the forgiveness of sins depends on the accomplishment of the great work of Christ. 2. *As regards the blessings of the future.* (1) "Everlasting righteousness" is brought in. The essence of redemption is not deliverance from misery, but restoration to righteousness. The first and chief aim of the work of Christ is not to secure peace in this life and happiness in the life to come, but to make us righteous (Rom. iii. 21, 22). The new righteousness is different from primitive innocence, which rested on the unstable basis of ignorance (Gen. iii. 5). This rests on the broad and solid foundation of intelligent principles accepted with love and confirmed by the indwelling Spirit of God (Jer. xxxi. 33, 34). Therefore it is everlasting. (2) The sources of confidence are no longer vague hopes of a future redemption, but the clear knowledge of the accomplished fact. Judaism lived upon prophecy, Christianity lives upon history. (3) The shame and humiliation of sin is abolished; the desolation which it produced is done away with; the world is again joyous in the love of God; worship is glad and deep and real, and all life made sacred by its influence; the "most holy place is anointed" and reconsecrated.

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—21.—*The nation's advocate at God's bar.* "Whiles I was speaking in prayer, even the man Gabriel . . . touched me" (ver. 21). Our subject is the prayer of Daniel, and the following points will demand full and careful consideration.

I. THE MOMENT IN TIME. This was most critical; for: 1. *The moment had been anticipated in prophecy.* (Jer. xxv. 11, 12; xxix. 10—14.) How Daniel reckoned the seventy years, and how others did so, must be carefully observed. The deportation to Babylon extended over twenty years; hence different men took a different starting-date whence to reckon the seventy. Daniel reckons from the first siege, the date of his own going into captivity (B.C. 606). Zechariah from the third siege, (1) from the beginning of it, B.C. 590 (Zech. i. 12); (2) from its close, B.C. 588 (Zech. vii. 1, 5). The prophets wrote each from his own standpoint, and there are no discrepancies, though the critical school tries to create them. 2. *It was immediately after the fall of Babylon.* (Ver. 1.) 3. *The Cyrus of prophecy was on the throne of Persia.* Darius was only vicegerent in Babylon (Isa. xlv. 24—xlv. 7). In the very next year Cyrus issued his decree (Ezra ii. 1, 2). 4. It was offered at the exact moment of evening sacrifice. (Ver. 21.)

II. THE FOUNDATION OF THE PRAYER. The Word of God, as contained in "the Scriptures." We should read ver. 2 thus: "I Daniel understood by the Scriptures the number of the years." The expression is, indeed, most remarkable, and has been laid hold of to impugn Daniel's authorship. This is said in substance: The expression shows that the Old Testament was, when the Book of Daniel was written, complete. It must then have been written after the close of the Old Testament canon; not then by Daniel, but by some one very much later. The author, whoever he was, has inadvertently betrayed himself. The answer would be best given by showing historically the gradual formation of the canon all the way down from Moses, and particularly that from his time even "the Scriptures" had an acknowledged existence. (See Westcott, on 'The Canon,' specially p. 251, in Dr. Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible.' See also Pusey on Jonah i. 1.) Enough for us here to note that Daniel's prayer was founded on the prophecy and promise of Daniel's G.d. Enough for practical purposes.

III. ITS SOLEMN AND DELIBERATE CHARACTER. Imagine vividly the crisis. *The first great world-power had already gone down.* How long the second and third might last, who could tell? Then would appear the fourth, during whose existence "one like a Son of man" would come "with the clouds of heaven." *The deliverer from captivity (Cyrus) had already appeared*—was on the throne of power. 1. Such a prayer could not be breathed amidst life's business. Retirement, leisure, deliberateness, solemnity, were all essential. 2. *There had been preparation for it.* "Fasting, and sackcloth, and ashes," i.e. the withdrawal of the spirit from the realm of the sensuous, the assumption of the mourner's garb, the sign of abasement and grief, viz. casting ashes on the head. 3. *Daniel's mode of speaking implies deliberation and solemnity.* "I set my face," etc. "Unto the Lord God," with perhaps the lattice open "toward Jerusalem."

IV. ITS CONTENTS. In a sense we would analyze it; but not so as to dissipate the aroma of its sweetly plaintive devotional spirit. 1. *The invocation.* (Ver. 4.) In these words we have: (1) *Some of the glorious attributes of God* referred to. And: (a) *His majesty.* All great in him. (b) *Fidelity to covenant.* Whether the terms be written in the ordinances of heaven, the social constitution of man, the development of providence, the book of the Law, or the gospel of his Son. But "the covenant" specially. (c) *Mercy.* (2) *An answering feeling.* Dread. Not the abjectness of fear, but the prostration of reverent love. 2. *The confession.* In it there are the following specialities: The iniquity of the nation is set forth: (1) *In its greatness.* Terms that to us are almost synonymous in Daniel's Hebrew set forth the nation's sin as failure, perversity, disturbance, rebellion, departure from all that is holiest and best, disobedience to the one supreme voice. (2) *In its aggravations.* The Law disregarded. Prophets unheeded. See the history (2 Chron. xxxvi. 14—16). Divine judgments in vain. (3) *In its universality.* The ten tribes "afar off," and the two "near." (4) *In its effects.* The fulfilment of oath and curse—in the desolations of temple and city, Church and nation. 3. *The vindication of God.* (Vers. 7, 8, 11—14.) 4. *Complaint.* The reproach of the people and the ruin of the sanctuary were the prophet's mighty griefs (vers. 16, 17, 18). "Our desolations." 5. *The petition.* (1) *The plea.* It is for: (a) *The cherishing of anger.* (Ver. 16.) (b) *The recognition of the desolation.* (Ver. 18.) (c) *The favouring smile of God.* (Ver. 17.) (d) *Pardon.* (Ver. 19.) (e) *Divine action.* (Ver. 19.) (f) *Instant and speedy relief.* (Ver. 19.) (2) *Its ground.* Observe: (a) Daniel has never forgotten for a moment the covenant relation of God. Note: "The Lord my God;" "The Lord our God;" (b) Toward the close all the argument is fetched, not from what man is, but from what God is. "According to all thy righteousness;" "For the Lord's sake;" "The city which is called by thy name;" "For thy great mercies;" "For thine own sake;" "Thy city and thy people are called by thy name."

V. THE ANSWER. 1. *Instantaneous.* 2. *Most marked.* 3. *By angelic envoy.*

In conclusion, observe: 1. *The noble unselfishness of the prayer.* All intercessory. 2. *Its consequent prevalence.* Every word was answered. Next year out came the edict of Cyrus for the restoration.—B.

Ver. 24.—*A section in time.* "Seventy weeks are determined upon thy holy city," etc. (ver. 24). The inner connection between this brilliant prophecy and Daniel's prayer is to be carefully observed. At the end of seventy years of captivity he prayed for the averting of the Divine anger, etc. (see preceding homily, ch. iv. 5 (1)). The answer passed on to the next critical event in the developments of God—to the anointing of the Redeemer. It responded to the soul of Daniel's prayer, but went far beyond it. *Divine answers go far beyond "all that we ask or think"* (Eph. iii. 20, 21). We had best here anticipate our homiletic line of march by indicating how we read the passage. Literally thus: "Hebdomads [sc. of days or years] seventy is cut off in regard to thy people and thy holy city, to close the defection, and to seal up sins, and to cover iniquity, and to bring in everlasting righteousness, and to seal up vision and prophet, and to anoint the holy of holies."

I. THE SECTION, i.e. of time, here said to be "cut off." But what section of time was cut off—seventy hebdomads of days or of years? It might be said of days, but then we think each day stands for a year. For our part we think the year-day

theory very doubtful. We say, therefore, "seventy hebdomads of years;" and for the following reasons: 1. *The Law had made hebdomads of years familiar.* (Lev. xxv. 1-4, 8-10.) 2. *The magnitude of the events required years.* Seventy weeks of days would be only one year and four months—too short a time for the restoration of the city, the advent of Messiah, and the overthrow of the city and nation. 3. *To the consolation of Daniel.* What comfort for him, pining for the restoration, if all were to be in ruin again within a year or so!

II. ITS PREDICTION. In the substance and form of this prediction of "the seventy sevens" are several specialities. 1. The length of the section is *mystically given*. "Seventy sevens" is itself mystical. But when we ask—*From what moment reckoned, to what moment?* a haze of uncertainty envelops the whole subject. The date of Daniel's prayer is about B.C. 538. Four hundred and ninety years on leads to B.C. 48. We believe the four hundred and ninety years are not to be reckoned from the moment of Daniel's prayer; but why this haze and mystery? Because: (1) *Prophecy must not be too explicit.* Explicit enough to lead to expectation of the event; but not so explicit as either to suggest its own fulfilment or contribute to its own defeat. Prophecy must not usurp the place of history. Man's moral relations must not be hopelessly entangled by premature and too sharply defined revelations. (2) *Mercy was to be contrasted strongly with judgment.* Of desolation seventy years; of comfort and further probation, seventy times seven. (3) *The perfection of the cycle was to be suggested.* By the use of sacred numbers. "Seven" has a place peculiar in Scripture, based possibly on facts yet undiscovered in the universe. It is suggestive of perfection. The following sevens form a remarkable accumulation: The prismatic colours; the notes of the octave; Shakespeare's "seven ages;" a man's "seven senses," though the vulgar make them five, the scientific more; the week of creation; our week of days; the week of years; the seven sevens, and then the jubilee year; the branches of the candlestick; at Jericho, trumpets, priests, and days of perambulation; "purified seven times;" "seven times a day do I praise thee;" at the bringing up the ark from the house of Obed-edom, they offered "seven bullocks and seven rams;" in the New Testament, seven Churches, candlesticks, angels, stars, horns, eyes, lamps, spirits of God, trumpets, vials, and seals. 2. The length of the section is *very exactly given*, however. (1) *Exact enough* to excite a general expectation of the Messiah. That Daniel's prophecy did so is notorious. (2) But also with *literal numerical exactness*. From the arrival of Ezra to restore Jerusalem (B.C. 457) to A.D. 26,¹ the year of the Lord's baptism is 483. 483 is equivalent to seven sevens, and sixty-two sevens. Another half-week of years brings us to the Crucifixion; and consider another three and a half years occupied by the confirmation of the covenant. 3. The section is regarded as *one whole*. Hence the singular verb with plural noun: "Seventy sevens is cut off." 4. And *insulated*. "Cut off." A distinct portion of history, like the antediluvian age, the era of Egyptian bondage, the forty years of the desert, the seventy of the Captivity. 5. In the prediction we can see *God's fellowship with Daniel*. In his prayer, Daniel recognized God's sympathy with Jerusalem; in the answer, God recognizes Daniel's. Daniel had said, "Thy city Jerusalem . . . thy holy mountain . . . thy people . . . thy city and thy people, called by thy name." God now says, "Upon thy people, and upon thy holy city." Thine as well as mine.

III. ITS CLOSE. The majestic events which were to signalize it. 1. *The termination of sin.* By: (1) *The conclusion of the great rebellion.* "To close the defection"—the great falling away of the race from God; to close it, not actually, but potentially. The history of rebellion draws near the finish; and the history of restoration begins. (2) *The limitation of sins.* "To seal up sins," to incarcerate them, and to place on the door of the dungeon the king's seal. The *breaking the power* of sin; the *limitation of the number* of sins; their *entire oblivion*,—are all ideas which may well be included here. (3) *The covering of iniquity.* "To cover iniquity." Note: In the Old Testament usage "cover" is used in one sense of God, in quite another of man, in relation to sin (see the use of *כָּסָה* in the Hebrew concordance). (a) *God "covers" sin by forgiving it.* (b) *Man, by atoning for it.* Now, in this prophecy nothing is said of who "covers;" but history declares it to be Christ. But he is God-Man; and therefore "covers" in the double sense—atones and forgives. He acts as man and as

¹ Jesus was really born B.C. 4.

God. 2. *The advent of righteousness.* "To bring in everlasting righteousness." Many Christians overlook this, are content with pardon, forget that the end of the gospel is righteousness in heart and life. Note, then: (1) *The fact* that this great crisis was to be signalized by the advent of righteousness. (2) *The agent.* Not named here; but the Christ. (3) *The mode.* (a) By Divine example. (b) Elevated precept. (c) Loving persuasion. (d) Placing morals on a better foundation. (e) Inaugurating a government of unprecedented character, viz. mediatorial. (f) A grand act of self-sacrifice, which should awake for virtue the enthusiasm of mankind. (g) Atonement. (h) *The coming of the Holy Ghost.* (4) *Its attributes.* "Everlasting." (a) *The method* of making men righteous, once introduced, should be unchangeable and perpetual. (b) *The righteousness itself* should be one that no change could affect, and no physical dissolution impair or decay. 3. *The close of prophecy.* "To seal up vision and prophet." Four hundred and ninety years passing before the ending of sin, and the advent of righteousness shows the greatness of these events. The sin of all people and of all time was to be effectually dealt with. This was the aspiration of prophecy—prophecy fulfilled, might cease. (Explain from Oriental usage the significance of the sealing.) Christ's words illustrate, "The things concerning me have an end." When once vision and prophet are accomplished by the manifestation of the Son of God, though prophecy still remains in some respects immensely important, the adoring gaze of the Church is fixed on the Life and Light of men. 4. *The anointing of the Lord Jesus.* "And to anoint the holy of holies." Outline of the argument for applying this phrase to the consecration of the Messiah. (1) "Holy of holies" is an indefinite phrase. Therefore examine context and whole field of revelation to determine its application here. (2) *The grammatical gender is uncertain.* May be masculine or neuter. But even if neuter, may apply to Christ (Luke i. 35). A certain grandeur of indefiniteness about the neuter. (3) *The name is appropriate to Jesus.* (Acts iii. 14; iv. 27; 1 John ii. 20; Mark i. 24.) (4) *The preceding clauses of this prophecy lead up naturally to the Messiah.* (5) *The "Anointed" must be the same in vers. 24, 25.* "And to anoint the Most Holy . . . unto the Anointed, the Prince," etc. (6) *The chronology favours, demands this conclusion.* The "sevens seventy" terminated with the advent of the Lord, and the confirmation of the Divinity of his mission. (7) *Scripture use of the word "anoint," and its application to the Redeemer.* (Summarize Scripture teaching on literal anointing; its spiritual significance; and on Jesus as "the Messiah" of the Old Testament and "the Christ" of the New.) A very powerful appeal might well be made to both believer and unbeliever at the close on the following grounds: The great rebellion is broken; limitation has been put upon sin; atonement has been made; everlasting righteousness has been brought in; attention has been concentrated on the Light and Life of men; the Saviour-King has been anointed. Have we broken with the rebellion? Is limitation being put upon our sin? Have we accepted the atonement? Are we putting on the garment of righteousness? Is our gaze on the Life and Light? Is the Anointed our Saviour and King?—R.

Ver. 25.—*Times as evidence.* "Know therefore and understand," etc.

I. THE STATE OF MIND DEMANDED FROM THE STUDENT OF PROPHECY. 1. *A certain temper.* "Know and understand." The angel anticipates difficulties of interpretation. A skilled and spiritual mind necessary. So also industry, pains, care. The worst temper would be the proud, self-sufficient, and dogmatic. Compare words of Jesus, "Whoso readeth, let him understand;" "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear." 2. *Spiritual insight.* "The going forth of the word to restore." Whose? (1) *God's.* To see a truth like this demands insight of a spiritual kind. The sovereign word of the Eternal King! (2) But given through the edict of *Cyrus*.

II. THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE PASSAGE. We might study separately the prophecy, and then the fulfilment in history. But take them together—study the prophecy in the light of its historical development. But consider the kind of agreement we may expect between the prediction and the history. No greater than the circumstances admit of. Chronological exactness is only to be looked for when the event is defined and limited to some moment in time. But some events develop slowly; e.g. the restoration of a city, the confirmation of a covenant. If events are not defined, prophecy must be indefinite. We suggest the following outline for the preacher, to make all

clear (for detail, see the histories, secular and sacred): 1. *Before the time-section of four hundred and ninety years.* Eighty years from the time of Daniel's prayer to "the restoration," the moment whence the four hundred and ninety are to be reckoned. Here the principal events are: Jerusalem a desolation; the first migration at the decree of Cyrus; the building of the temple only; interruption; Jeshua and Zerubbabel; finished in eighteen years, B.C. 534—516. Then fifty-eight years, of which history is silent. The temple standing, but no wall; no city. 2. *Commencement of the four hundred and ninety* (B.C. 457). The coming of Ezra, the restoration and rebuilding of the city. "From the going forth of the word to restore," etc. 3. *The forty-nine years.* "Hebdomads seven and," etc. These are made up thus: Ezra at work alone about twelve or thirteen years; first visit of Nehemiah about twelve years; Nehemiah's return to Persia, and second visit to the time of Joiada becoming high priest (his father, Eliashib, died in B.C. 413), about nineteen or twenty years. This accounts for forty-five out of the forty nine. The other four may be reckoned to the death of Nehemiah, but the date of his death is lost. 4. *The four hundred and thirty-four years.* "Hebdomads sixty and two." This period extends to the baptism of Jesus; i.e. to the public manifestation of "Messiah-Prince." This could be none other than the Redeemer. (Prove this in detail.) 5. *The seven years.* Three and a half to the Crucifixion; three and a half to establishment of Christianity and the Church.

III. THE ARGUMENT FROM CHRONOLOGY FOR THE DIVINITY OF THE GOSPEL. 1. *Its place.* Strange that both sceptic and Christian should object to this kind of evidence. The sceptic: "Faith cannot depend on chronology." The Christian: "Questions of events and times do not become the spiritually minded." But the evidences for revelation are *not all of one kind, nor all for the same class of mind* (see Hengstenberg's 'Christology,' vol. iii. 199, Clark's edit.). 2. *Its value.* On this we had better quote Preiswerk: "We ought not, considering the uncertainty of ancient chronology, to lay much stress in calculating the exact year. For, though the calculation be very successful, yet so soon as another interpreter follows, another chronological system, what has been so laboriously reared up is apparently thrown down. But if we grant, from the outset, that ancient chronology is uncertain, and be content to point out a general coincidence of the historical with the prophetic time; if we show that possibly even a minute coincidence took place, and at least that no one can prove the contrary, we shall have done enough to prove the truth of the ancient prophecy, and our work cannot be overthrown by others." 3. *Its availability;* i.e. to ordinary readers of Scripture. Before Christ, the Jews knew about when to reckon from, and so when to expect Messiah. And now, though learned chronological arguments may not be within reach of the many, yet plain people may come to that simple knowledge of history which shall teach that prophecy has been fulfilled in Christ.—R.

Vers. 26, 27.—*The close of the Jewish economy.* "And after three score and two weeks," etc. (vers. 26, 27). The angel passed from the restoration of the city to the coming of Messiah and the close of the Judaic dispensation. This is the manner of prophecy to seize on the great epochs in the history of the Divine dealings with man.

I. THE DEATH OF THE CHRIST. 1. *It was to be violent.* "Messiah was to be cut off." An ominous and portentous phrase to every Jewish mind. Ever used of the close of the career of the wicked (Exod. xxxi. 14; Ps. xxxvii. 9; Prov. ii. 21, 22). The phrase implies a supernatural agent too; so in this case (Acts ii. 23). 2. *Without cause.* In Hebrew, literally, "There is nothing to him." The Septuagint gives the meaning doubtless: *Kal klpa ouk estin en, autō,* "In him was no sin;" he "did no sin;" he "knew no sin." Pilate's verdict: "I find in him no fault at all."

II. THE DESTRUCTION OF THE JEWISH POLITY. 1. *The instruments.* "And the people of a prince that shall come shall destroy the city and the sanctuary." That the prince is not the Christ is evident: (1) Because of his designation—simply "a prince." (2) He is to "come" clearly from without the Jewish state. (3) His invasion was to be after the death of Messiah. So the context indicates. History shows that the prince was Titus. 2. *The mode.* "And its end with inundation, and to the end, war; decree of desolations." The foreign army should sweep everything before it. The war was to be exterminating. No intermission of calamity until no city was left on which calamity could fall. 3. *The reason.* Note the inner connection of the

passage between the cutting off of Messiah and the fall of the city and polity—between Calvary and the coming of Titus (Luke xix. 41—44). When Christ wept over the city, the nation in heart had rejected him. Formally, and in so many words, in the course of a few days they discarded their only Saviour. For that rejection, city and nation descended into the abyss. As it was at the end of the Jewish economy, so shall it be at the close of the Christian. *The condemnation will not be sin, but rejection, or neglect of the sinner's Saviour* (John iii. 18).

III. **THE CONFIRMATION OF THE COVENANT.** 1. *The Confirmer.* The Lord Jesus. His august Personality has been prominent throughout. The actions described in ver. 24 are his. In Isa. xlii. 1—7, specially in ver. 6, Christ is described as Divine Covenant incarnate. 2. *The covenant.* Neither the old nor the new, but that one comprehensive covenant of salvation, of which they were transcripts. 3. *Its confirmation* was by the Redeemer's words of grace, miracles, and death; by the Pentecostal effusion; by the first preaching of the gospel, especially to the Jews. 4. *The time.* From the commencement of the Lord's ministry to about the time of the death of Stephen and the scattering of the Jewish Church—about seven years. By that time the nation rejected both the Messiah and that Spirit who came with Pentecostal power and grace. Then was the nation dead, waiting for the fire of the Divine judgments. The "hebdomads seventy" were ended. Henceforth the history in the Acts of the Apostles turns to the Gentiles. 5. *With whom.* "With many." But all showed the nation's sin.

IV. **THE CESSATION OF SACRIFICE.** "*He shall cause the sacrifice,*" etc., that is, Christ the Lord. 1. *In mercy.* The sacrifices might cease: (1) either *literally*; (2) or, *their object accomplished*, they might become *useless*, and *in time disappear*. In the latter sense they were made to cease. No need of the finger of the type, when the glory of the Antitype filled the world. Herein mercy. He offered up sacrifice for the people's sins "once, when he offered up himself." "Once in the end of the world" he "put away sin by the sacrifice of himself." 2. *In judgment.* Not long was it ere in judgment they ceased literally. 3. *In permanence.* Ceasing, they cease for ever, and no power of man can ever restore what has been doomed by God. (See description of the signal attempts of Julian the Apostate to restore the sacrifices, and its remarkable failure, in Dr. Smith's 'Dict. of the Bible,' art. "Jerusalem," by James Fergusson, vol. i. 1015, b.) "The Word of our God stands for ever."

V. **THE CONSUMMATION.** We read, "And upon the wing of abominations, a desolator; even until destruction, and that determined, shall be poured upon the desolate." The passage would be difficult before the events, intentionally so, but not so difficult after. The design was, perhaps, to throw out fragments of thought rather than give a continuous idea; to light up with lightning rather than with sunshine. After speaking of the cessation of sacrifice, attention is fixed on the temple, some high point of it, soaring portion, "wing." A "wing of abominations," the temple hateful on account of its corruptions. *The temple must become detestable* (1) *by corruption*; (2) *from within, ere any desolator is allowed to touch it.* Note the lesson well. But having become abominable, look! watch! behold the desolator, *i.e.* the Roman! But how long shall the Roman eagle look down upon the temple threateningly? "Until destruction, and that which is decreed, shall be passed upon the desolate." Daniel's prayer was offered in sight of a desolate Jerusalem; the vision opened by the angel ends with a desolation more appalling. "How unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out!"—R.

Vers. 1—19.—*The omnipotence of prayer.* The man of prayer exerts a greater influence over national affairs than even crowned heads. "Prayer moves the hand that moves the world." Daniel on his knees was a mightier man than Darius on his throne. Daniel was in the service of the King of kings; was admitted to the audience-chamber of the Most High; and received the announcements of the Divine will. Darius *now* mainly serves as a landmark on the course of time to indicate a date; Daniel is still the teacher and moulder of men.

I. **TRUE PRAYER IS FOUNDED ON KNOWLEDGE OF GOD'S WILL.** The reason why Daniel prayed so earnestly for this special blessing was that he knew from Jeremiah's prophecies God's purpose concerning Israel. This knowledge, instead of rendering prayer needless, made it more necessary. For God is no fatalist. He does not

absolutely fix a date for certain events without good reason, nor is the fixture made regardless of other events. That date for the termination of Israel's bondage took into account, through the Divine presence, the temper and feeling prevalent among the Jews—took into account even this very prayer of Daniel. Speaking after the manner of men, Daniel's intercession was a foreseen link in the chain of events, and could not be spared. Daniel possibly did not realize the full extent of his responsibility; still, he felt that a turn in the tide of Israel's fortunes was due, that the Divine promise awaited fulfilment, and that much depended on earnest prayer. Hope liberates the tongue of prayer. If God has purposed to bless, we can plead with confident expectation.

II. PRAYER DERIVES ITS INSPIRATION FROM THE CHARACTER AND ATTRIBUTES OF GOD. It is very instructive to note how in this prayer Daniel fastens his eye upon God, contemplates his manifold perfections, and finds in them the fuel with which to feed the fires within his soul. He delights to think on God's greatness—his vast resources of good. He reposes with confidence on the unchanging faithfulness of him who had stooped to make a covenant with Israel. If the nation's sins depress his hopes, the mercy of God far more elates him. He is pleased to contemplate God's infinite righteousness; for that righteousness he *can* and *will* convey to his suppliant people. He extracts hope even from the inviolable justice of Jehovah, inasmuch as this attribute secures to men the fullest benefit of every gracious promise. He pleads that anger may be diverted from Jerusalem, "according to the righteousness" of God. Once and again Daniel urges his request "for the Lord's sake"—"for thine own sake, O my God." This is the inexhaustible well of human comfort, viz. that God is *what he is*. It does not hinder success in prayer that we are so needy and so unworthy. The highest good is accessible, because the Fountain is so vast and so unfailing.

III. PRAYER EMPTIES THE SUPPLIANT OF SELF. The more men pray the more they part with self-confidence, self-righteousness, self-importance, self-seeking. They lose themselves in God. Every form of sin that Daniel could find in his consciousness or in his memory was confessed, and confessed with genuine sorrow. He acknowledges personal and public sins in every variety of language. Positive wickedness, deafness to the Divine voice, neglect of plain commandments, disregard of special messengers, contempt of God's sovereign authority,—all is confessed in a spirit of candour and humility. The axe is laid to the utmost root of pride. His soul is mantled in just shame. There is a complete emptying of self—a needful preparation to be filled with God.

IV. PRAYER IDENTIFIES THE SUPPLIANT WITH OTHERS—'TIS A VICARIOUS ACT. In prayer we take the place of others, bear their burdens, and make intercession for them. Daniel here pleads for the whole nation. He regards as *his own* the sins of rulers, kings, priests, and judges. The whole nation is represented in his person. As upon a later occasion, the lives of passengers and crew in the Egyptian ship were saved for Paul's sake, so now the restoration of Israel was due instrumentally to the advocacy of Daniel. A self-righteous man would have repudiated the idea that he was as guilty as others; he would have plumed himself on his superior virtues. Not so Daniel. The sins of the nation he attaches to himself—felt himself, in a sense, responsible for the whole; and seeks Divine favour, not for himself individually, but for the commonwealth of Israel.

V. PRAYER, TO BE SUCCESSFUL, MUST CONSIST IN EARNEST PLEADING. Sensible that so much hung upon his successful suit, Daniel put his whole soul into it, and resolved that he would not fail for want of earnestness. He had risen to the height of the great emergency. He knew that the "set time to favour Zion was now come." Other hindrances were now removed. God waited to be gracious—waited for human prayer as the last link in the chain; and Daniel was chosen to complete the series of preparations. Every possible argument Daniel could conceive or elaborate he employs in his siege of the heavenly citadel. And God permitted this, not on his own account, but to elicit fervent desire and to develop heroic faith. If a man clearly sees the evil which follows from non-success, he will use the most fervid appeal. Or, if he discerns the magnitude of the boon which is in view, he will strain every nerve of his soul to obtain it. Languor in prayer is the offspring of ignorance. Earnestness is only sober wisdom.—D,

Vers. 20—27.—*Prayer opens wider horizons of God's kingdom.* We have here a signal instance of the fact that God not only answers human prayer, but gives "more than we ask" or conceive. The thing which Daniel asked was small compared with what God bestowed. Compared with contemporary men, Daniel stood above them head and shoulders. Compared with God, he was but a pigmy.

I. PRAYER IS THE BEST PREPARATION FOR RECEIVING LARGER REVELATION. The exercise of real prayer develops humility, dependence, self-forgetfulness; and these states of mind are favourable to ingress of light. "The meek will God show his way;" "To that man will he look, who is of humble and contrite heart." Prayer brings the soul near to God; it lifts us up to heavenly elevations; it clears the eye from mist and darkness. The Apostle John was engaged in lonely worship, when the final revelation of Scripture was made to him. Our Lord was in the act of prayer when heaven came down to earth, and his whole Person was enwrapped in glory. The response to Daniel's prayer was immediate. He had not ceased to pray when the answer came. Swifter than the electric current came the oracle's response.

II. LARGER REVELATION COMES BY A PURE AND PERSONAL SPIRIT. We may fairly conclude that angels have larger knowledge of God's will than have we, because they are free from the darkness and the doubt which sin generates. If they are not counsellors in the heavenly court, they are heralds, ambassadors, couriers. What God wills should happen they know is wise and right and good. In their estimation it is an incomparable honour to be engaged on Divine errands. Swift as their natures will allow, they fly to convey instruction or help to men. It is consonant, no less with reason than with Scripture, that there are ranks and orders of intelligent beings with natures more ethereal than ours, and that communication between us and them is possible. Every form of service is attributed to the angels. An angel ministered to our Saviour's bodily hunger. An angel strengthened him in the garden. An angel rolled the stone from his sepulchre. An angel released Peter from prison. Gabriel interpreted the vision to Daniel. Gabriel announced to Zacharias and to Mary the approaching advent of a Saviour.

III. LARGER REVELATION IS AN EVIDENCE OF GOD'S SPECIAL LOVE. The despatch of a special messenger from the court of heaven was in itself a signal token of God's favour. Not often in the history of our race had such a favour been shown. Further, Gabriel was well pleased to assure the man of prayer that, in heaven, he was "greatly beloved." Every act of devotion to God's cause had been graven on the memory of God. His character was an object of God's complacency. On account of God's great love for Daniel he gave him larger understanding, and disclosed to him the purposes and plans for man's redemption. God's intention was that Daniel should enlarge the area of his vision, and look with solicitude, not on Israel after the flesh, but on the true Israel of God. Yet all revelation is a mark of God's love to men. Because men are "greatly beloved" of God, therefore he has given them this complete canon of Scripture, therefore he gives them understanding to discern the meaning, therefore he leads them further into the truth.

IV. LARGER REVELATION IS FOUNDED UPON A TYPICAL PAST. The thoughtful love of God adapted this new revelation to the capacity and mood of Daniel's spirit. Daniel had been dwelling on the seventy years which Jeremiah had declared to be the full period of Israel's captivity. His hope was resting on the fact that the seventy years were accomplished, and that God was faithful to his word. Gabriel was charged to assure the prophet that restoration was nigh at hand, but that other epochs of "seventies" were opening. The desolation of Jerusalem in the past was a type of a sadder desolation yet to come. The visible reconciliation between God and Israel (implied in the restoration of the Jews) was a type of a more complete reconciliation when sin should be purged away. By identifying himself with the nation, and confessing *its* sins as *his own*, Daniel himself had become a type of that Deliverer who should "bear our sins" and "make intercession for the transgressors." Time is reckoned in weeks, to remind Israel of the perpetual obligation of the sabbath. After each cycle of desolation rest shall follow, until the world shall enter into the enjoyment of Jehovah's rest. The mind of Daniel is thus carried onward from the consummation he so much desired to a grander consummation still—the appearance of Israel's Messiah; and this vital truth is impressed upon his soul,

that no triumph is real or enduring which is not the triumph of righteousness over sin.

V. LARGER REVELATION CENTRES IN THE PERSON AND WORK OF MESSIAH. If now and then God should lift us up to some spiritual height, and give us a wider vision of human destiny, we should be amused and saddened at the littleness of our petitions. Often do we pray and plead for some good, which seems to us a very consummation of blessing; but when we have gained it, we find that there are far larger possessions awaiting us. The desires of Daniel's soul were concentrated on Israel's return to Palestine; yet, at the best, this was only a temporal advantage. Change of place and resumption of worldly power would not *in themselves* secure nobleness of character or purification of soul. The best blessings of God can be enjoyed anywhere, and amid any outward conditions. But God is too wise and too beneficent to confine his gifts within the limits of human request. "His thoughts are not as our thoughts;" and from inferior restoration to outward privilege, as a starting-point, he leads our expectations onward to a nobler restoration of character and of life. The centre of the world's hope (whether the world so regards it or not) is Jesus the Messiah. Before Gabriel had satisfied Daniel with respect to Israel's earthly fortune, he poured into Daniel's ear what was uppermost in his own mind—the advent of the Son of God. The grandeur, the value, the triumphant issues of Messiah's work,—these were the tidings which he delighted to convey. The revelation which, in any age, man most needs is revelation respecting the removal of sin—knowledge how the great redemption can be accomplished. No tidings from heaven can ever be so joyous as *these*, viz. that sin shall meet with final destruction, and that reconciliation between God and man is made secure. Such a revelation embraces an enormous sweep of blessing, and comprises every possible interest of humanity. The possession of the earthly Canaan is a very short-lived benefit; the inheritance of heaven is an eternal good.

VI. THE LARGER REVELATION EMBRACES THE FINAL TRIUMPH OF RIGHTEOUSNESS. For the present the outlook of Israel is flecked with light and shade. Like an April day, our present experience is an alternation of blustering storm and bright sunshine. The defences of Jerusalem, Daniel was assured, would be rebuilt, but would be rebuilt amid harassing trouble. Messiah the Prince should in due time appear; but Messiah should be cut off. The city and the sanctuary should rise from the reproach of present ruin, but they would again be destroyed—desolation, like a flood, would sweep over them. Sacrifice should be restored in the temple, but sacrifice and oblation should again cease. These were but temporary arrangements to prepare the world for a real atonement. But the final upshot shall be the destruction of abomination. Upon the desolater there shall be desolation. "All that defileth" shall be exterminated. Death shall die, "Captivity shall be led captive;" "God shall be all in all"—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER X.

Vers. 1—21.—THE ANGELS OF THE NATIONS.

The three chapters (x., xi., and xii.) form a section apart from the rest of Daniel. One marked peculiarity is the long and very old interpolation which occupies nearly the whole of ch. xi. Not improbably something has dropped out, and not a few things have been modified in consequence of this interpolation.

Ver. 1.—In the third year of Cyrus King of Persia a thing was revealed unto Daniel, whose name was called Belteshazzar; and

the thing was true, but the time appointed was long; and he understood the thing, and had understanding of the vision. The Septuagint rendering is, "In the first year of Cyrus King of the Persians." This is at variance with all other versions. As, however, these other versions are derived from the Palestinian recension, they unitedly do not much more than counterbalance the LXX., "A decree (*πρόσταγμα*) was revealed to Daniel who was called Belshazzar, and the vision is true and the decree." This is a case of doublet. Evidently some Egyptian manuscripts read *הָזֶן* (*hazon*) instead of *הָדָר* (*haddabar*), and this, or the rendering of it, has slipped into the text from the margin. "And a strong multitude understood the decree." The translator here has had *בְּנֵי*,

not בְּנִי , before him. Aquila has the same reading; here טָבָא (*taba*) is taken in its usual sense of "host," "And I understood it in vision." Here the LXX. has ὁ instead of ἐν . From the fact that the first person appears in the next verse, there is at least a probability in favour of this reading. Theodotion is, as usual, closer to the Massoretic. טָבָא is rendered *divinus*. The text before him has had בְּנִי , the hophal, instead of בְּנִי , which is possibly the kal. The Peshitta seems to have used a text practically identical with that of the Massorettes; the same is true of the Vulgate. The Peshitta renders טָבָא by *heel*, and the Vulgate by *fortitudo*. In the third year of Cyrus. The various reading of the Septuagint is of value. It is not to be dismissed as due to a desire to harmonize this date with that in ch. i. 21, for the numeral "third" might easily be an accidental mistake present in some few Palestinian manuscripts due to the beginning of the eighth chapter. The first chapter, as we have seen, has many traces that it is at once an epitome and a compilation. It is evident that the writer in the first chapter would have the rest of the book before him, and would mean to harmonize his statements with that of the chapter before us. It seems difficult to imagine that the compiler of the first chapter could have this statement before him, and yet write as he did. We should therefore be inclined to leave the question doubtful. Even if it should be admitted that the Massoretic date is correct, as we have already seen, the difficulties created are by no means insuperable. Hitzig has made it a difficulty that Daniel did not avail himself of the permission to return to his own country, granted by Cyrus. Professor Bevan says, "For those who believe Daniel to be an ideal figure, no explanation is necessary." In that assertion he is mistaken. If Daniel were presented as an ideal Jew, why does he not conform to the ideal of Judaism? The statement that Daniel was a man of nearly ninety years of age at the date of Cyrus's proclamation is a sufficient answer to this difficulty. Hitzig thinks he rebuts this answer of Hävernicks by referring to the old men (Ezra iii. 12) who remembered the former temple; but these might have been children of ten or twelve when they were carried away captive eighteen years after Daniel, and thus might not be more than sixty when Cyrus's decree came. Further, we know that only a very limited number of Jews returned, and that so many of the best of the Jews remained that it was declared that the chaff came to Jerusalem, but that the finest of the wheat remained in Babylon.

A thing was revealed unto Daniel whose name was called Belteshazzar. "Thing" is the general term *dabar*, which means sometimes "decree," sometimes "word," or sometimes, as rendered by the Authorized, "thing." As Professor Fuller remarks, this is to be taken as the title of the rest of the remaining sections. The recurrence of the Babylonian name "Belteshazzar" may be due to the recency of the overthrow of the Babylonian monarchy. *And the thing was true, but the time appointed was long.* Hitzig thinks that in the first clause the author betrays his standpoint, as he would not know the thing was true till fact had proved it so. But, besides that an editor might have added this clause, a man might well be certain of the truth of a thing he had got from God; he might wish to impress this upon his hearers. The last clause here is certainly mistranslated in the Authorized. *The time appointed was long.* טָבָא (*taba*) never means "appointed time," although it is twice translated so in Job, as here; but in all these cases the Revisers, with greater accuracy, render "warfare." With this sense is to be compared the use we find in Numb. xv. 23-43, where the Levites' service in the sanctuary is called טָבָא (*taba*). If we are to keep to the Massoretic reading, then the rendering of the Revised is really the only one to be thought of. Professor Bevan, following Ewald, thinking that *taba* means in ch. viii. 13 "temple service," would apply this meaning here. As we saw, in considering that verse, the word there was of very doubtful authenticity, we need not apply that meaning here, as it would only suit by being twisted into "obligation." Hitzig, Kranichfeld, Zöckler, Keil, and others regard this word as meaning "difficulty," "oppression." Something may, however, be said for the Septuagint rendering, all the more that it was adopted by Aquila. According to these renderings, we conjoin these words, "great hosts," טָבָא קְדוֹשׁ , with the next, which they understand read as third person singular imperfect kal, or omit the conjunction, "And a great multitude understood the decree." "The host" in this interpretation would here naturally mean "the host of heaven." We find that throughout this chapter, and in the twelfth, we have to do with the angels, so it is natural that in this title and summary of what is to follow the fact that the great host of heaven understood this mystery should be stated. Theodotion's rendering, "power," though supported by Jerome in the Vulgate, need not detain us. The view of Jephth-ibn-Ali is that the host may be of Edom, probably meaning by this Rome. *And he understood the thing, and had understanding of the*

vision. This is a fairly correct rendering of the Hebrew. Von Lengerke would make the verbs imperative, which certainly they might be, so far as form goes, but the intrusion of imperatives here into the title of a section seems violent. The main difficulty, moreover, is not touched. As they stand, these two clauses assert the same thing, and if with Von Lengerke we make them both imperatives, we have the difficulty still present with us. It may be a case of "doublet." This is an hypothesis we scarcely would adopt except in necessity, since the Septuagint has both clauses. Theodotion, however, has only one of them. We feel ourselves inclined to follow the reading of the Septuagint. The angels understood the matter, and he—Daniel—understood it also by the vision.

Ver. 2.—In those days I Daniel was mourning three full weeks. The versions are close to the Massoretic, only the Septuagint, and, following it, the Vetus, as quoted by Tertullian, omit "days," in the literal rendering of the Hebrew phrase, "weeks of days." *Mourning.* Zöckler and Fuller think this mourning due to the difficulties the released captives had in carrying out their desire of rebuilding the temple. It may have been that he was grieved that so few of the people were willing to avail themselves of the privilege. We are here assuming that the chronology of this passage reckons from the overthrow of Nabunahid, that is, from Cyrus's accession to the throne of Babylon; but, as we have seen, this "third year" may be reckoned from his assumption of the title King of Persia, *Sar Parsua*, in which case it may be the same year with that vision narrated in the previous chapter. *Three full weeks*; literally, *three weeks of days*—to mark off the duration of Daniel's fast from the weeks of years referred to in the ninth chapter. Keil objects to this interpretation, but assigns no reason. At the same time, it is to be observed that "year of days" means a full year, but a week is such a short period that the necessity of saying that it was complete by defining it a "week of days" is not so obvious, and is unexceptionable.

Ver. 3.—I ate no pleasant bread, neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth, neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled. The versions are in perfect agreement with the Massoretic text. *Pleasant bread*; "bread of desires" is the rendering of the Septuagint and of Theodotion; the word is the same in Hebrew and Greek as that applied to Daniel. *Neither came flesh nor wine in my mouth.* This shows that the practice adopted by Daniel and his fellows during their training was not regarded by Daniel, at least as incon-

bent on him after he could regulate his own affairs. His ordinary habit was to eat flesh and to drink wine; but during these weeks of fast, he denied himself these dainties. *Neither did I anoint myself at all, till three whole weeks were fulfilled.* The pleasure of anointing the body with oil was highly esteemed among the ancients. It is impossible to fail to recognize, in this passage, the origin of the Essenian discipline. The Essenes abstained, from flesh, from wine, and from anointing themselves. Daniel thus abstained, as a sign of sorrow for the sin of his people; they made this fast a perpetual discipline. They waited for the salvation of Israel, and endeavoured, by fasting, to hasten the coming of the Lord. The converse of this, that Daniel's fast is derived from the Essene discipline, is not to be thought of. It is a sign of a later development, when such practices of self-denial, from being the incidents of a life which occur on special occasions, become its rule. As early as A.C. 106 an Essene is mentioned teaching in the temple, and mentioned with no evidence that his sect was a thing of recent origin. The limits are narrow between the critical date of Daniel and this date that within them so prominent a sect as the Essenes should spring up.

Ver. 4.—And in the four and twentieth day of the first month, as I was by the side of the great river, which is Hiddekel. The LXX. differs from this only in rendering Hiddekel by its Greek name "Tigris." Theodotion subjoins to Tigris *Eddekel*, on the same principle that we have on the margin of our Bibles different renderings from those in the text. The Peshitta makes the river the Euphrates. The Vulgate follows the Septuagint. There seems no reasonable doubt that Behrmann is right in regarding the *Phrat* of the Syriac as a gloss. It certainly was a natural suggestion, that, as Babylon was on the Euphrates, Daniel should rather be found walking there at the termination of his fast, than forty or fifty miles off. *The four and twentieth day of the first month*; that is, the month Nisan or Abib—the month in which the Passover was celebrated in every Jewish home. It would seem that Daniel did not join in this festival at this time. It is noted that, from the days of Saul, the two first days of every month were devoted to a feast, and hence, that Daniel's fast could only begin on the third day. Since he must have refrained from partaking of the Paschal lamb, we cannot deduce that he might not occupy the opening days of the month with sadness rather than feasting. If Daniel is an ideal figure, intended to represent the model Jew resident in a

foreign land, why is he thus represented as not partaking of the Paschal feast? It is true that, with the temple in ruins, the Paschal lamb could not be slain in the way enjoined in the Law; but the modern Jew keeps the Passover without the lamb. *I was by the side of the great river, which is Hiddekel.* The name is a transference of the Assyrian name *Iddiklat*. It would seem that Daniel was then on the banks of the Tigris, not in vision, but in actual person, as here there is no reference, as in ch. viii. 2, to his being there in vision; the mention of attendants also renders it unlikely that it was only in vision that Daniel was on the banks of the Tigris. His purpose in being there was probably governmental, as he had attendants with him.

Vers. 5, 6.—Then I lifted up mine eyes, and looked, and behold a certain man clothed in linen, whose loins were girded with fine gold of Uphaz: his body also was like the beryl, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, and his arms and his feet like in colour to polished brass, and the voice of his words like the voice of a multitude. The version given by the Septuagint exhibits traces of confluence, "And it was [apparently reading *וַיֵּרָא* (*vayyir'ee*)] on the four and twentieth day of the first month, I was upon the bank of the great river Tigris, and I lifted up mine eyes, and saw, and behold a man clothed in fine linen (*βύσσινον*), and girt about the loins with fine linen (*βύσσινον*), and from his middle there was light, and his mouth was as the sea, and his face as the appearance of lightning, and his eyes as lamps of fire, his arms and feet as gleaming brass, and the voice (*φωνή*) of his speech as the voice of a multitude." It would seem that the translator had read *וַיֵּרָא* twice; that might be due to blunder, or may be a case of doublet—a phenomenon so frequent. The difficult word *Uphaz*, which only occurs elsewhere in Jer. x. 9, is omitted; "from his middle there was light" is probably an effort to render this clause, which the translator seems to have read *mithaq 'or*. Possibly the mysterious clause, "and his mouth was like the sea," may be another attempt to render these unaccustomed words. Theodotion merely transliterates *וַיֵּרָא* into *Sabbir*, and *וַיֵּרָא* into *hapris*, and regards *Uphaz* as a garment, which, in the case before us, was golden (*χρυσινον*). In the Syriac of the Peshitta, the translator escapes the difficulty of *baddeen* by rendering it "glory." The next clause is also paraphrastic, "the girdle of his loins (back) was of splendid magnificence:" this last is his rendering of *Uphaz*. The next verse does not call for remark. Jerome, in the Vulgate, renders *tar-*

sheesh as *chrysolithus*—an interpretation very generally followed now. In the Massoretic text, the use of the numeral "one," almost as our indefinite article, has to be noted. *Baddeen* is the plural of a word used mainly for the material of which the garments of the priests were made; it occurs also in the vision of Ezekiel. The singularity is that in Ezekiel, as in Daniel, the word is always plural, whereas in the rest of Scripture it is always singular. *Uphaz* occurs, as above mentioned, only in Jer. x. 9; it is by some supposed to be a variation on Ophir. As here, it is connected in Jeremiah with Tarshish. Fürst suggests *paz*, "fine gold" (Job xxviii. 17), and *u* = *u*, "coast or island," thus making it equivalent to "Gold Coast." *Kethem*, "fine gold," is associated in Isa. xlii. 12 with "Ophir," as here with "Uphaz;" this might hint at the identity of the two places. That, however, is an uncertain basis. The fact that Tarshish and Uphaz are brought together, would indicate that, like Tarshish, it was in Spain. Kneucker, in Schenkel's 'Bibelllexikon,' decides for Hypaphis, South Arabia, on the uncertain ground of the sound of the name. Bochart would place it in Ceylon, because Ptolemy mentions a harbour and river of the name of Phasis. Tarshish is the Tartessus of the Greeks and the modern Tharsis; here the chrysolite or topaz, as brought from thence. *Marglothay*, "his feet," is the most common rendering; but von Lengerke would render, "the place where his feet rested"—a rendering which, while it suits the form of the word, does not suit the context. It occurs four times in Ruth in one connection, and not elsewhere, save here. "Like in colour to polished brass" is a phrase which occurs in Ezek. i. 7. Professor Bevan says, "What meaning the author attached to *גָּלַי* (*galai*), 'polished,' it is impossible to say." All the versions render "gleaming," in both passages; there seems no need to suggest a corruption of the text. The vision here has a great resemblance, though with many points of contrast, to Ezek. i. 4—25; viii. 2; ix. 2; x. 1—22. Many passages in the Apocalypse show traces of its influence: thus i. 14, 15, the appearance of our Lord; also x. 1—3. The vision in Ezek. i. is a theophany; this, however, is not the appearance of a direct symbol of God, but the appearance of one of his angels. The whole aspect is one of terror and splendour. It has been noted that the yellow gleam of the topaz suits well the tint of the Oriental complexion. When we compare this with Ezekiel's vision, we find a reticence in Ezekiel's description; he does not affirm (i. 27) that it is a man he sees, but only one in human likeness. Whereas Daniel dis-

tinctly says that it was a man. In the case of Ezekiel, it was a theophany which he saw; it was an angelophany which appeared to Daniel. "The voice of a multitude" refers to the sound of the shout of a multitude; the effect it produces is not merely the volume of sound, but the difference of tones and the difference of moment of utterance give a sense of vastness and multitudinousness, always impressive, and indeed awe-inspiring.

Ver. 7.—And I Daniel alone saw the vision; for the men that were with me saw not the vision; but a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves. The LXX. in the main agrees with this, but seems to have read *l'mahar*, "in haste," instead of *b'hayhabay*. Theodotion renders the last word *ἐν φόβῳ*, implying that he read *b'haga*. The reading of the Massoretic is superior, as being less expected. The Peshitta renders in accordance with Theodotion. Jerome agrees very exactly with the Massoretic text. And I Daniel alone saw the vision (comp. Acts. ix. 7; xxii. 9). The Apostle Paul was solitary in hearing intelligible words and seeing Christ; his attendants saw the bright light and heard a voice, but neither saw the speaker nor were able to distinguish the purport of the words. *For the men that were with me saw not the vision.* Who those were that were with Daniel we cannot tell; probably they were the ordinary attendants of an officer of rank in the court of the great king. Rashi's idea that they were Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, has no probability in favour of it. As little has Professor Fuller's hint that they were Hananiah, Mishael, and Azariah. *But a great quaking fell upon them, so that they fled to hide themselves* (comp. Exod. xx. 18; Gen. iii. 8). A yet finer parallel is Job iv. 12-16. Eliphaz there describes a spirit passing before him, although invisible; yet in the horror of contact with the spiritual, all his bones shook and the hair of his flesh stood up. There is a difference to be noted here between the conduct of the attendants of Daniel and those of the Apostle Paul. As we read here, the attendants of Daniel flee to hide themselves, those of the apostle are first struck to the earth and then stand stupefied.

Ver. 8.—Therefore I was left alone, and saw this great vision, and there remained no strength in me; for my comeliness was turned in me into corruption, and I retained no strength. The versions do not call for much remark. The LXX. renders "glory" by "spirit" or "breath;" and the Peshitta renders it by "body." The Massoretic is superior, as more difficult and more likely to be the source of the other two than either

of them. Theodotion's rendering, *δύναμις*, confirms this. Daniel explains how he alone had seen the vision, and narrates the effects contact with the spiritual had on him, "There remained no strength in me;" "And I retained no strength"—a redoubled statement of weakness not necessarily meaning, as Jephthah-ibn-Ali would have it, that the one refers to his inability to flee like his attendants, and the other to his inability to stand upright. It is probably due merely to the great impression this sudden powerlessness made on him. *For my comeliness was turned in me into corruption.* From the natural brightness of the skin in life the face assumed the yellow pallor of death (comp. ch. vii. 28). "And my countenance was changed in me;" comp. also Hab. iii. 16, "When I heard, my belly trembled; my lips quivered at the voice: rottenness entered into my bones." While the ideas here are the same, the parallelism is made more striking by the difference of the terms.

Ver. 9.—Yet heard I the voice of his words; and when I heard the voice of his words, then was I in a deep sleep on my face, and my face toward the ground. The Septuagint rendering here is briefer than the Massoretic, "And I heard the sound of his speech (*λαλιᾶς*, 'talking'), and I was fallen upon my face upon the earth." The Septuagint translator seems to have read *נִרְדָּם* (*n'phalts*) instead of *נִרְדָּם* (*nir'dam*). Theodotion is somewhat nearer the Massoretic text, but renders *nirdam* by "stupefied." The Peshitta is an accurate rendering of the text behind the Septuagint. Jerome agrees with Theodotion, rendering *nirdam* by *conservatus*; he strengthens the phrase, "my face toward the ground," by inserting *hærebat*. It would seem that *nirdam* is of doubtful authenticity. It may be said this was omitted because of the difficulty of imagining the prophet seeing while in a deep sleep. But a state of sleep does not preclude the possibility of seeing a vision. In the parallel passage (ch. viii. 18) the LXX. has no difficulty in translating *ἐκοιμήθη*. By assuming the reading of the LXX. and the Peshitta to be correct, we make the process of events more natural; according to the Massoretic reading, though we have an account of his sense of weakness, we have no record that he fell to the ground, and yet we are told that he was "in a deep sleep, with his face toward the ground." The resemblance is very great to Job iv. 12, "A thing was secretly brought to me, and mine ear received a little thereof in thoughts from the vision of the night, when sleep falleth on men (*תַּרְדֵּמָה*, *tardaymah*)." If there has been imitation, the originality and beauty of the

passage in Job render it certain that it is the original. It seems more likely to be a change introduced to bring the revelation to Daniel in line with other prophetic revelations. The attitude Daniel assumed was one which implied the deepest abasement—the envy of the great king kisses the ground at the feet of the envoy of the King of kings. Even the revelation given while sleep had fallen on the subject of the revelation, seems paralleled with what took place at the Transfiguration (Luke ix. 32, “And Peter and those that were with him were heavy with sleep,” yet it was when they were awaked that they saw the glory). So with Gethsemane. The Hebrew word is the same as that used when Eve was taken out of the side of Adam; he then was asleep—a deep sleep had fallen on him, *תַּרְדֵּמָה* (*tardaymah*.)” (For further illustrations, see Ezek. i. 28; iii. 23; Zech. iv. 1; Rev. i. 17.)

Ver. 10.—*And, behold, an hand touched me, which set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands.* The LXX. agrees with this, but does not bring out any more than this the pregnant sense of the Hebrew. This is given in the margin of the Revised, “Set me tottering on my knees,” etc. Strangely enough, the LXX. renders, “soles of my feet”—an impossible attitude; that this is the true reading of the LXX. is confirmed by Paulus Tellenius. Theodotion omits “the palms of the hands.” The Peshitta renders as the LXX. The Vulgate renders *manu* by *articulos*, “joints.” *An hand touched me.* The hand of him that appeared to him—though Daniel does not say. It is needless to multiply angelic agencies. A discussion has been raised on the question whether this is Gabriel who appeared to Daniel in the eighth chapter, or Michael, or the angel of the presence. It is not a matter of importance, but Michael is excluded by ver. 13, and also, to our thinking, “the angel of the presence,” if by that title the Second Person of the Trinity is indicated. *Which set me upon my knees and upon the palms of my hands.* Although the touch communicated to Daniel some strength, yet he was unable to raise himself so as to look up—his face was still to the ground, his attitude was still one of abasement, and he was trembling.

Ver. 11.—*And he said unto me, O Daniel, a man greatly beloved, understand the words that I speak unto thee, and stand upright: for unto thee am I now sent. And when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling.* The versions do not afford cause for remark. *O Daniel, a man greatly beloved.* This is the same term as that applied to Daniel (ch. ix. 23), “man of

desires” (which see). *Understand the words that I speak unto thee;* “have understanding in the words,” or better, “matters, which I am speaking or telling to thee.” As the language used was one intelligible to Daniel, it was needless to command him to understand the words, but the “matters” communicated by the words might require a special effort of attention to comprehend. *Dbareem* means “matters” as well as “words.” *And stand upright;* “stand upon thy standing.” Gesenius would render this word when it occurs before (ch. viii. 18), “place;” but both here and there the contrast is in the attitude. From being absolutely prone, as in the eighth chapter, or on hands and knees as here, he is to be upright, and, taking his previous attitude into account, this is not merely to stand where he is, and neither approach nor depart. The LXX. renders, *τόρως*; Theodotion, *ὀρθῶς*; the Vulgate has *gradu*. *For unto thee am I now sent.* This assigns a reason for the command to stand upon his feet. In the Assyrian marbles, however lowly the obeisance made to the monarch by any one admitted to his presence, he stands when he receives the monarch’s commands. Standing implies attention. *And when he had spoken this word unto me, I stood trembling.* He obeyed the command, but still trembling took hold of him in the angelic presence.

Ver. 12.—*Then said he unto me, Fear not, Daniel: for from the first day that thou didst set thine heart to understand, and to hasten thyself before thy God, thy words were heard, and I am come for thy words.* Both the LXX. and Theodotion insert *Κύριος* before *Θεοῦ*. This is the more remarkable as *Κύριος* stands for “Jehovah” usually in the Greek versions—a title rarely occurring in Daniel, in, and only in, the prayer of the preceding chapter. This addition does not occur in the Peshitta or Vulgate. *He said unto me, Fear not, Daniel.* Still the signs of terror were manifest in Daniel, and the angel spoke encouragingly to him. *For from the first day, etc.* When Daniel had begun his petition to God and his effort to understand God’s purpose concerning his people, then God had commissioned Gabriel. The whole process of humiliation, fasting, and prayer was allowed to go on to its completion before Gabriel came, in order to deepen in Daniel the desire for the hoped-for revelation, and thus enhance the joy of it when it came, and, perchance, also to justify to higher intelligences the giving of this special communication (comp. ch. ix. 20) as to the answer being ready even while the petition was being put up. *And I am come for thy words.* Professor Fuller sees in this an additional

tenderness. Zöckler sees in it that in the Divine counsel Gabriel was commissioned, but was hindered for reasons assigned in the next verse.

Ver. 18.—But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days: but, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me; and I remained there with the kings of Persia. The rendering of the LXX. is, "And the general (στρατηγός) of the King of the Persians withstood me one and twenty days, and behold Michael, one of the first princes, came to help me, and I left him there with the general of the King of the Persians." The sense of Theodotion is nearly the same as the LXX., only he has βασιλέας Περσῶν instead of βασιλέως. Like the LXX., Theodotion declares that Michael was left with the Prince of Persia. The Peshitta agrees more with the Massoretic, but, like the LXX. and Theodotion, it is with the "Prince" of Persia that there is some one remaining. The Peshitta here, in opposition to the Greek versions, has the statement that Gabriel remained, not Michael. The Vulgate agrees still further with the Massoretic, only instead of the plural "kings," it has "king." The most important differences are in the last clause, where the LXX. and Theodotion must have had the hiphil of נָתַן where the Massoretic has the niphil. Grätz adopts this reading, which certainly has the advantage of making sense of an otherwise unintelligible passage. Professor Bevan, in his easy way, suggests this to be probably a mere guess, the insertion of *avrov* and the substitution of a transitive for an intransitive verb are quite in the manner of the LXX. translators. He forgets that Theodotion also has this variation, and also that, without any justification from the versions, he himself has suggested various readings. He does not observe that this interpretation affords a reason for Gabriel's presence with Daniel. Michael relieved him in his opposition to the Prince of Persia. The other variant, "prince" instead of "king," has the support of all the versions. *But the prince of the kingdom of Persia withstood me one and twenty days.* That is to say, during the whole of Daniel's fast. The angelology of later Judaism is a very complicated, not to say confused, subject. The angelology of one age is not that of another; and the angelology of the Jews in one country is not that of the Jews in another. The Jews themselves understood that the Babylonian captivity did a great deal to develop the doctrine of the angels; the Jewish tradition was that they brought back from Babylon the names of the angels. Not only had their residence in Babylon

defined the Jewish ideas as to the names of the angels, they began to have clearer ideas of their functions. They reached the idea that every race had its guardian angel. This view is expressed in Deut. xxxii. 8, according to the Septuagint, "He set bounds for the nations according to the number of the angels of God." To a similar purport is Ecclus. xvii. 17, "To each of the nations he appointed a leader, and Israel is the portion of the Lord." There seems, however, a preparation for this in Isa. xxiv. 21 (comp. also Pss. xix. 1; cvi. 9). As independent of revelation there is a strong inherent probability that there are races of beings of intelligence and might vastly superior to man, there is nothing inherently improbable in these intelligences being employed by the Almighty in furthering his providential scheme. Men are instruments of God; is it not at least not improbable that, if there are angels, they, too, co-operate with God in the working out of his great purpose? That every nation should have an angelic prince over it is not more extraordinary than that every Church should have a special angel over it (Rev. i. 20; ii. 2, etc.). That there should be conflicts between these angelic princes is simply to say they are finite. Hitzig's reference to Rev. xii. 7 is not to the point, for there is no indication of warlike opposition here. By the indications here, we might judge that the opposition of the Prince of Persia was to the coming of Gabriel to reveal to Daniel the purpose of God. We know nothing of the means employed in the opposition, or of the reason of it. Keil and Kliefoth have the idea that Gabriel was striving to influence the King of Persia, but was hindered in his efforts by the "Prince of Persia;" this is scarcely borne out by the context. *But, lo, Michael, one of the chief princes, came to help me.* Michael ("Who is like God?") is, in the twenty-first verse, declared to be the "prince" of the Jewish people, therefore equivalent to "the captain of the host of the Lord" (Josh. v. 14). He is referred to in Rev. xii. 7 and Jude 9. Where he is called one of "the chief princes," there is reference to an angelic hierarchy, whether the same as that we find developed in the Book of Enoch or not cannot be decided certainly. In the Book of Tobit xii. 15 Raphael declares himself "one of the seven holy angels who present the prayers of the saints, and who go in and out before the glory of the Holy One." The Book of Tobit seems to have been written about B.C. 400; hence this is an indication of opinion before the Books of Enoch. In the Enoch books not only are the great

angels mentioned, but their names are given, and functions are assigned to them; but they are numbered as four, not seven. Enoch is posterior to Tobit, and finds a place for Michael, Raphael, and Gabriel. We have no means of testing whether the number of the chief angelic princes, of whom Michael was one, was four or seven, according to the opinion of Daniel. From the fact that Enoch is, so to speak, in the direct line of apocalyptic descent from Daniel, and Tobit is not, and, moreover, as the angelology of Tobit is in close connection with the Persian hierarchy of *amhaspentas*, of which there were seven,—we may regard four as the more genuinely Jewish number. The later Jewish angelology has many Persian elements, as shown by Dr. Kohut, in his 'Angelologie und Demonologie.' Whether the number of the archangels be made four or seven, both Gabriel and Michael are of the number, whereas Gabriel's words would rather indicate that, though Michael belonged to the rank of chief prince, he did not. As we cannot tell the nature of the opposition, we cannot tell the nature of the help afforded. *And I remained there with the kings of Persia.* It is very difficult to interpret this if we retain the Massoretic reading. In the first place, the sense given to *nothartee* in the Authorized and Revised is unsuitable. The angel is explaining how, after having delayed three whole weeks, he has now come. The sentence, as interpreted above, would have explained why he could not come at all to Daniel. It is attempted to get over this by explaining that Gabriel had beaten off the "Prince" of Persia, and that Michael remained with the King of Persia instead of him. This view, however, contradicts the function assigned to angels of nations, and implies a quasi-omnipresence on the part of Gabriel, and would render his explanation no explanation. The explanation of Gesenius, Hävernicks, and von Lengerke, that *nothartee* is to be taken as meaning "I received the pre-eminence," as Winer, "superior discessi apud reges Persarum," has no justification in usage. Gesenius would bring in the Syriac use of the *hithpael* of this verb, but though both Castell and Brockelmann assign meanings suitable, none of their quotations represents a sense precisely similar to that assigned to the verb here. Hitzig's interpretation, "I was delayed," fails to explain his coming. Ewald's explanation, "I was superfluous," is logical, but has no grammatical justification. Professor Bevan's explanation, which would take this last clause as parenthetical, is untenable, as it supplies no reason for the presence of Gabriel with Daniel. We must

follow the LXX. and Theodotion in reading, either as Meinhold and Bohrmann, מְהִירָהּ or better, as Grätz, מְהִירָהּ, as the *vav* in the former case would naturally be read conversively. Besides, Grätz's reading explains the needlessly emphatic מְהִירָהּ. Further, it seems needful to accept the reading of the two Greek versions and the Peshitta, and instead of מְהִירָהּ read מְהִירָהּ. None of the old versions support the Massoretic; the Vulgate is the nearest; and all of them have either read מְהִירָהּ or regarded מְהִירָהּ as a form of the construct state, and so vocalized differently. Further, the later context here implies the continuance of the conflict or controversy (vers. 20, 21). We must understand, then, that Gabriel left Michael to maintain the conflict against the angelic "Prince" of Persia, while he came in obedience to Daniel's prayer. We can have but little idea of what is meant by this conflict in the heavenlies between angelic beings.

Ver. 14.—Now I am come to make thee understand what shall befall thy people in the latter days: for yet the vision is for many days. None of the versions call for remark. The Peshitta inserts *l'nooph*, "at the end," before "days." The Massoretic Hebrew has a peculiarity unsupported by the earlier versions: it has "for the days." Of course, these versions may simply have neglected the article, as have our English versions, Authorized and Revised. In the latter days. Kranichfeld holds that this refers to the latter portion of the vision in ch. viii., not at the end of time. *For yet the vision is for many days.* Professor Bevan would translate, "since there is yet a vision for the days," i.e. for the days already referred to in the eighth chapter. This would make both clauses have practically the same meaning, which this logical connection implies. There seems no need to take the "end of days," as the end of the world.

Ver. 15.—And when he had spoken such words unto me, I set my face toward the ground, and I became dumb. The versions agree with the above. *I set my face toward the ground* does not mean that Daniel again fell prostrate, but that his eyes naturally sought the ground. *And I became dumb.* Not to be regarded as equivalent to "I remained silent," though there is nothing in the narrative to indicate that Daniel had been speaking; he may have had the sensation of paralyzed vocal cords. Certainly the verb *alam* means "to be dumb," although, as with ourselves, this phrase does not mean always physiological dumbness, but simply a silence which, from shyness or fear, one is unable to break. This is the

meaning the versions attach to it. The opinion we indicate finds support in the dumbness of Zacharias, the father of John Baptist, after Gabriel appeared to him, and, still more, in what is related in the following verse.

Ver. 16.—And, behold, one like the similitude of the sons of men touched my lips: then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me, O my lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength. The LXX. rendering differs from this, "And behold, as the likeness of the hand of a man"—due, more likely to explanatory paraphrase than to various reading of ר' for כ'; still the phrase, "a likeness of sons of man," is somewhat violent, and not to be paralleled by Ps. xiv. 3 (2)—"touched my lips, and I opened my mouth, and spake, and I said to him who stood before me, Lord, even when the vision was turned upon my side to me." Clearly צרר (*tzeezee*) has been read by mistake for צרר (*tzeezee*). The sense of the Massoretic is difficult; but this is nonsense. "And there was no strength in me," reading אולי instead of צרר. Theodotion renders, "And behold, as the likeness of a son of man touched my lips, and I opened my mouth, and spake, and said to him that stood before me, In thy appearance my bowels (*ἐν τῷ εὐδὲς μου*) were turned in me, and I had no strength." Theodotion has evidently had the singular בן instead of בני, or perhaps regarded it as a survival of the old form of the construct. It is probably not due to a different reading, but to a different meaning given to צרר, that we have *εὐδὲς*. The Peshitta resembles Theodotion very closely, having, however, *enosh*, "man," instead of "son of man." We have also *go*, "body," or "viscera," as the translation of *tzeezeem*. The Vulgate renders to the same purport; the last portion of the verse runs thus: *In visione tua dissolute sunt compages mea et nihil in me remansit virium*. It also has, in the first clause, *similitudo filii hominis*. It seems difficult to avoid the conclusion that we should read "son of man" instead of "sons of man." Were there any diplomatic or other evidence in favour of the reading of the LXX., it would be much preferable to any other, as we have the description of the visitant whose hand touched Daniel, in vers. 5 and 6. Hence the assertion here, that the likeness of a son of man touched him, does not harmonize with this, as it seems to introduce a new person. There is no reference to hands in the description in vers. 5 and 6, "the hand as of a man" there would not be the introduction of something already mentioned. *Touched my lips*. In

the previous chapter, ver. 21, the angel Gabriel "touches" Daniel. The emphasis of the act, in the present instance, does not lie in the fact of touching, but in this—that it was the lips that were touched. In Isa. vi. 6 and 7 one of the seraphim touches the lips of the prophet with "a live coal from off the altar." In Isaiah the object is purification; in the case before us it is the restoration of the power of speech. *Then I opened my mouth, and spake, and said unto him that stood before me*. This is the result of the touch of the angelic hand. *O my lord, by the vision my sorrows are turned upon me, and I have retained no strength*. "Lord" here is not "Jehovah," but "Adonai"—a title of respect, certainly, but not necessarily of adoration. Theodotion and the Vulgate render "thy vision," understanding by that "thy appearance." The meaning is the same as that of the ordinary reading. Hence it is probably due to a desire to emphasize this rather than to any difference of reading. "My sorrows are turned upon me." This is a term that involves great difficulty. The term is used of the pangs of childbirth (1 Sam. iv. 19), and transferred to sorrows (Isa. xlii. 8). And this is the sense in which it has generally been taken here; the more readily that in 1 Sam. iv. 19 the same phrase is used as here. But the sense does not seem very good; the appearance of the angel was not an occasion of sorrow, however much of awe there might be in it. The word has a number of meanings, which it is certainly difficult to bring into relationship with each other. Thus in Prov. xxvi. 14 it means a "hinge;" in Prov. xxv. 13 it means "messenger," and this is the meaning it most frequently bears (Prov. xlii. 17; Isa. xlii. 2; Jer. xlix. 14; Obad. 1). Neither of these meanings is at all suitable. In Ps. xlix. 16 we have the word appearing in the K'thib, and translated "beauty;" hence it would be equivalent to הודע (*hodee*) of ver. 8. The LXX. is out of court. Theodotion, the Peshitta, and the Vulgate differ from each other, so that nothing is to be drawn from them. We would, then, take this phrase as equivalent to that in the eighth verse, "I have retained no strength." This fitly follows up what has been already stated.

Ver. 17.—For how can the servant of this my lord talk with this my lord? for as for me, straightway there remained no strength in me, neither is there breath left in me. The LXX. does not preserve the peculiar use of the demonstrative which we have here. Theodotion has it in the second case only; the Peshitta retains it; but the Vulgate omits it altogether. The rendering of *shama* by πνεῦμα in the Greek versions may be noted. Jerome

renders, *halitus*. The Aramaic influence is seen in חַי (haych) instead of חַיִּי ('aych). "How can the servant," etc., exhibits respect and humility. *For as for me*, etc. This seems not to be part of Daniel's address to the angel, but a note which he has added to indicate his condition while he was speaking. *Neither is there breath left in me*. There is no certainty whether this is to be taken in the physical or metaphysical sense; whether we should regard the prophet as declaring that awe deprived him of the power of breath, or he felt his consciousness so numbed as that he seemed to be without it.

Ver. 18.—*Then there came again and touched me one like the appearance of a man, and he strengthened me*. The versions here call for no remark. The prophet still stood, but trembling and powerless, unable to comprehend fully the revelation; but now again the strengthening hand touches him. It cannot be regarded as a strain put upon the meaning here, if we see in this repeated presence of one in the form of man a symbol of Christ, who took upon him the form of a servant, and was found in fashion as a man.

Ver. 19.—*And said, O man greatly beloved, fear not: peace be unto thee, be strong, yea, be strong. And when he had spoken unto me, I was strengthened, and said, Let my lord speak; for thou hast strengthened me*. The LXX. has its ordinary translation of the phrase rendered, "man greatly beloved (*ἀγαπητός ἀρεῶνς εἰ*). They give three words for the repetition of the command, "be strong:" *ὀψίαυε*, "be in good health;" *ἀνδρίζου*, "play the man;" *ἰσχυε*, "be strong." In the last clause the third person is retained, "Let my lord speak, for he strengthened me"—a change made for symmetry. Theodotion is much closer to the Massoretic text, only he, too, varies the words in the command, and has *ἀνδρίζου καὶ ἰσχυε*. The Peshitta, like Theodotion, varies the word in the command. In the last clause the verb is put in the passive, "and I was strengthened." For the command the Vulgate has, *confortare et esto robustus*; but the last clause is in strict agreement with the Massoretic. It is to be noted that the repetition of the imperative, united by *et*, is unexampled; the various renderings in the versions point to this being felt a difficulty, but do not suggest any variations of reading. Not only is the strengthening touch given, but consoling words are added, "Be strong, yea, be strong." Daniel was called upon to put forth energy, to summon his forces mental and spiritual. He had received the strengthening touch, but his own volition must go along with the aid divinely afforded. It

is the combination which we find in our Lord's life; without faith even the miraculous power of our Lord could not be put forth. As we have noted, there is some uncertainty as to the reading, but no change would alter the sense of the passage, "And when he had spoken unto me, I was strengthened." The words spoken called forth the power that was latent, and had been imparted to Daniel. *And said, Let my lord speak, for thou hast strengthened me*. Even to hold converse with angelic beings, entailed expenditure of vital energy. The overpowering sense of the spiritual has to be resisted, at least so far, in order that mental action may go on. Had strength not been imparted, the revelations bestowed would not have produced any permanent impression on the mind.

Ver. 20.—*Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee? and now will I return to fight with the Prince of Persia: and when I am gone forth, lo, the Prince of Grecia shall come*. The versions here are in close agreement with the Massoretic text. Theodotion, since he begins the speech of the angel with *ei*, may have read חַי (hayn), "if," instead of חַי (ha), the sign of interrogation. The Peshitta has, "to make war," instead of "fight," indicating a beginning of hostilities, not a continuance of them. *Then said he, Knowest thou wherefore I come unto thee?* This question appears to be abruptly put, and to be put without awaiting an answer. Probably the meaning would be better brought out by rendering, somewhat colloquially, "You know, don't you? After I have revealed the future to you, I must return." In considering this whole subject, we must beware of taking everything literally. We may not deduce, because of the statement here, that angels are under the limitations of time and space, or that there is actual warfare. We must regard the matter as, to a large extent, figurative. *And now will I return to fight with the Prince of Persia*. Every one who studies history in a philosophic spirit must see that the progress of the race, the evolution of that ultimate ideal state—the kingdom of heaven among men—is accomplished by successive steps, and over each step a nationality presides. This nationality represents the special moment of spiritual force necessary to secure the new step the race is required to take. While in the lower plane of history the nations themselves do these things; in the higher sphere it is their angels who are the actors. A nation has in it much of the characteristics of a living organism, and the angel of the nation is the life of that organism. As a finite being, the angel of any nation of necessity is imperfect; his

knowledge of the Divine plan only limited. His instrument—the nation committed to his charge—is yet more imperfect. Let an imperfect being, however holy, have a piece of work to do, that work must assume, to him, an exaggerated importance; let him be associated as patron with sentient beings, and his affections must go forth to these beings in a special way. He will resist any attempt to limit in any way the function of that race which is specially his, and will be apt to interpret too widely this function, and be loth to recognize that its time is past, or this or that region is beyond its province. If we regard Gabriel as an angel—not of Egypt, as Hitzig, but of the kingdom of heaven, and by this the angel of prophecy (Ewald)—then he must exercise a watchful care over the actions of each nationality, and therefore of its angel, lest the ultimate purpose of God be in any way hindered. The angel of Persia might regard the national semi-independence allowed to the Jews as hindering the evolution of the idea exhibited by the Persian race. The Persian rule allowed races a good deal of licence if tribute were paid. It was required to specialize its treatment of the Jews; to convey them back from Babylon to Palestine; to protect them in Palestine; to assist them to set up a *quasi*-independence. All this was contrary to the negative character of the Persian rule, in contradiction to its spirit, and therefore opposed by its angel, who represented this spirit. Michael, the special angel of the Jews, naturally came to assist Gabriel. What a conflict between angelic spirits may mean, what may be the weapons of their warfare, we know not; we do know that, though not carnal, they are mighty. *And when I am gone forth.* To this phrase several meanings have been attached. Hävernicks, Maurer, and Ewald take it as meaning “going forth to war.” Ewald renders, “I will return to contend against the Prince of Persia; so, while I am going forth, the Prince of Javan will come.” In this connection it is very doubtful whether *yaṭza'* (yatza') can mean “going forth to battle.” Motion to the field of battle is indicated by “return.” *Yatza'* simply means to go *from* a given place; the purpose may be indicated by some other word. Another view is that of Hitzig, Hofmann, and Bertheau, “to go out,” not *to*, but *from* “a conflict.” This meaning is possible; it would certainly need some determinant to fix this meaning on it, but this may be supplied from the preceding clause. This view, though suiting admirably with the otherwise untenable supposition that the “prince” speaking with Daniel is the angel of Egypt, does not suit with the view that Gabriel,

the “prince” talking with Daniel, is the angel of prophecy, and therefore of the ideal kingdom. Keil would take the first meaning of *yaṭza'*, and would paraphrase thus, “Now shall I return to resume and continue the war with the Prince of Persia; but while I thus go forth to war—while I continue the conflict, the prince of Javan shall come, and then there shall be a new conflict.” *Yatza'* never does mean “to continue a conflict;” it means to begin either a war, a battle, or a campaign. A great deal of the difficulty is due to maintaining that angels are under the time-relation of human beings. The matter is clearer if we take it as meaning simply that when Gabriel went out from the presence of Daniel, the “Prince of Grecia” would come. *Lo, the Prince of Grecia shall come.* This does not refer to Alexander the Great, or the overthrow of the Persian Empire, still less to the Seleucids and their persecutions. Before his Babylonian reign, Cyrus encountered the Greeks, and roused their opposition. The angel, then, of the Greek nation began to stir up his people. Then came the Ionian revolt, and the successive invasions of Greece, which compelled the Persians to leave the “holy people” alone. The angelic Prince of Grecia appears first as an instrument of the angel of prophecy, to limit the power of Persia. When, after prolonged conflicts, the empire of Persia gives place to that of Greece, the conflict of the people of God must be renewed in a fiercer form.

Ver. 21.—But I will show thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth: and there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince. The LXX. rendering is, “And in very truth (*μὲν*) I will show thee the first things in the writing of truth: and there was no one helping with me against these, but Michael the angel.” The Septuagint translator read *ἡρασῆμ* (*hara'sheem*), “the heads,” instead of *ἡρασῆμ* (*harashoom*), written with *κ* inserted as *mater lectionis*. Theodotion is in accordance with our English Version. The Peshitta renders, “Yet will I show thee something noted in the writing of truth; and there was none in all these who helped me but Michael your prince.” The Vulgate agrees with the Massoretic and the English. *But I will show thee that which is noted in the scripture of truth.* *אֲבָל* (*abal*) is a strongly adversative conjunction. The use of it is explained by Kranichfeld and Zöckler as due to the fears for the theocracy aroused by the thought that the Greek power was rising against Israel. If

the idea had been that Gabriel was called to hurry back to his post because of the threatened approach of the Prince of Grecia, then it might be defended; only even then either the fact of the necessity for speedy return to the Persian court would have been emphasized, or the fact that he is delaying to make known the contents of the writing of truth. It is, perhaps, better rendered by "nevertheless," as it is in 2 Chron. xix. 3. We can see the force of this particle by turning to ver. 7, "I Daniel alone saw the vision, for the men that were with me saw not the vision, but (equivalent to 'nevertheless') a great quaking fell upon them." This clause, we see, then, has all the appearance of being intruded violently into the text; it interrupts the progress of thought, and does not suit the context. There is no indication that he, Gabriel, will have to hasten back to the court of Persia with such rapidity as would necessitate the introduction of *לָכֵן* (*'aba'*), "nevertheless." But even so, why revert in the next clause to the contents of ver. 20, without the slightest indication that the line of thought in the past clause was dropped as soon as taken up? The last clause of this verse reads much better in connection with ver. 20 than with ver. 21a. Behrmann transposes the clauses in this verse, so as to get over this difficulty, and Professor M. Stuart puts the first clause in brackets. "The scripture of truth" is a phrase that might have been suggested by Ps. cxxxix. 16, "In thy book were all my members written." It is in line with a great number of phrases in apocalyptic literature; thus Enoch xciii. 1, "And after that Enoch began to recount from the books;" the Book of Jubilees, i. 24; iv. 31; v. 15, etc., "the tablets of the heavens." The idea was that all the events that were to happen in the world's history were recorded beforehand in the books or tablets of the heavens. It is from failing to notice this that the late Professor Fuller was led to say "the scripture of truth" is the title for the ensuing section. Against this view is the preposition "in;" it is *in* the scripture of truth, among other

matters, that these things are noted which form the succeeding section. At the same time, the form the representation of the heavenly books, which note beforehand what was to happen, assumes here is simpler than that in Enoch or the Book of Jubilees. *And there is none that holdeth with me in these things, but Michael your prince.* As we have above said, this clause is closely connected with ver. 20. *In these things.* This is rendered in the Revised Version "against these," in accordance with the majority of recent commentators, Ewald, Hitzig, Fuller, Zöckler, Bevan, Stuart, Kranichfeld, Keil, Kliefoth, Behrmann, etc., and, among older commentators, Jepheth-ibn-Ali; but none of the older versions have it. The LXX. renders, *ὅτι τούτων*; Theodotion, *περί τούτων*; the Peshitta has the preposition; the Vulgate renders, *in his omnibus*. With these Calvin agrees, though Luther renders, *videri jense*. Certainly, the most common meaning of *לֵב* in such a connection is "against." So, notwithstanding the weight of the versions, we feel constrained to translate, "against these persons," and not "in regard to these things." In the first place, "in" is a far less frequent meaning of the preposition, and next, *אֵלֶּה* (*aylayh*), "these," most naturally refers to the persons last named. Although "the Prince of Grecia" was to be the instrument of the overthrow of the power of Persia, it was to become oppressive afterwards, as had been revealed to Daniel in the vision of the ram and the he-goat. Gabriel, the angel of prophecy, the special guardian of God's great ideal kingdom of heaven, was assisted in his guardianship only by Michael, the angelic Prince of Israel. The fact that along the line of the development of Israel as a nation ran, so far at least, the Divine plan concerning the kingdom of heaven, made it natural that Michael should favour that which furthered the interests of the race that was more specially under his care. As we have already said, we cannot even guess at the nature of these angelic conflicts.

HOMILETICS.

Vers. 2, 3.—Fasting. The exercise of fasting seems to grow out of natural spiritual instincts, as it is found in nearly all religions, and is not forbidden but recognized and regulated in the teaching of Christ and his apostles (Luke v. 35; Acts xiii. 2, 3; xiv. 23). It is, however, an exercise which is surrounded with erroneous ideas, and which needs to be cleared of them before it can be admitted as healthy and profitable. Let us notice—

1. **SOME ABUSES OF THE EXERCISE OF FASTING.** 1. *Ortentatious fasting.* Such was the vulgar fasting of the Pharisees. Ostentation in regard to an expression of deep spiritual feelings tends to destroy those very feelings. The study of "effect" and

anxiety about the good opinion of men directly counteracts the influence of those emotions of spiritual grief and shame before God which fasting is supposed to express. Thus ostentatious fasting becomes hypocritical (Matt. vi. 16). 2. *Formal fasting.* Fasting which implies no real self-denial, though certain rules of abstinence are observed, is a mockery, and, if it is relied on for religious efficacy, a superstitious rite. It is then only a *bodily* exercise, and can have no spiritual force (1 Tim. iv. 8). 3. *Meritorious fasting.* (1) If we are to depend on God's mercy, it is foolish to think that we can win this by any meritorious actions. (2) Even if we could merit anything from God, it would be by useful service, not by merely putting ourselves to inconvenience. There is no merit in self-denial for its own sake. We cannot please God by simply displeasing ourselves. Any idea of the kind is a relic of the terror-worship of cruel deities. 4. *Holiness in fasting.* There is a foolish conceit with some people that fasting is more holy than natural living. But Christ teaches us that nature is holy and that joy is holy. Holiness does not imply abstinence, but purity and temperance.

II. THE RIGHT EXERCISE OF FASTING. 1. *Involuntary fasting.* Strong emotion destroys natural bodily appetite. Sorrow, especially, has this purely physical effect. Thus fasting is often a natural result of certain religious emotions. There is a sense of harmony which makes lawful worldly pleasures distasteful at a season of spiritual darkness. At such times fasting is exercised by instinct. Daniel was in sorrow; therefore he fasted. 2. *Fasting to assist repentance.* This is not undertaken to win merit with God, but simply for its effect on our own souls. The feeling of repentance is often too ephemeral. It is soon counteracted by the influx of other influences from the world without. Yet there are times when a man becomes convinced of some great sin. He may then find his compunction deepened and his repentance strengthened if for a season he abstains from lawful bodily comforts. 3. *Fasting to assist spiritual thought.* This cannot be enforced as a duty, nor recommended for universal practice. But experience teaches that there are persons whose spiritual perceptions are quickened while their bodily nature is restrained. For all of us the full indulgence of appetite—even when this does not lead to what is called excess—deadens the spiritual energies. 4. *Mental fasting.* It is sometimes well to abstain from active thinking, from the assertion of our own inclinations and reasonings, and to become passive recipients of truth, as it is borne in to the mind by the influences of nature and the active communings of the Divine Spirit (Zech. ii. 13).

Vers. 18, 19.—*Divine encouragement.* I. THE NEED OF ENCOURAGEMENT. 1. *In trouble.* It is difficult to work bravely and earnestly in the midst of calamity. The calamities of Israel were discouragements in the way of the service of God. 2. *In guilt.* Daniel had been confessing the sins of himself and his nation (ch. ix. 5). Nothing is so depressing as the feeling of failure and the knowledge that it has come by our own fault. 3. *In weakness.* The burden of the mystery of life oppresses all who feel it, as it oppressed Daniel. Before the needs of the world and the tasks of life the strongest man may well feel weak in his own resources, and then his weakness may damp his zeal for service. 4. *In fear.* When the mystery of the future begins to unveil itself and future troubles appear to be drawing near, the vagueness with which they are seen magnifies the terror of them. The fear which is then roused paralyzes our energies.

II. THE SOURCES OF ENCOURAGEMENT. 1. They are found *in God*. God sends the angel to strengthen Daniel. Until we know God, we dread his presence; but when we know him, the more we enter into his presence, the more peace and confidence shall we receive. 2. They spring from the *love of God*. Daniel is "*greatly beloved*." The assurance of God's love is his greatest encouragement. If we know God loves us, we may be assured that he will ward off all real harm, and thus we may lose our fear in his love (1 John iv. 18). 3. They flow to us through channels of *brotherly sympathy*. "One like the appearance of a man" touched Daniel. God comes to us in "the Son of man," and through the brotherly sympathy of Christ communicates his Divine encouragement. 4. They manifest themselves by practical results in *communicating real strength*. Daniel was strengthened. There is a real supply of spiritual strength which is bestowed by the gift of the Holy Spirit. The encouragement this gives is not only in idea, it is in *fact*. The weak man is encouraged by finding himself becoming strong in the strength of God (Isa. xl. 29; 2 Cor. xii. 10).

III. THE WAY TO OBTAIN DIVINE ENCOURAGEMENT. 1. *By humility and contrition.* Daniel had humbled himself and confessed sin, and thus was prepared for God's help. We can only be filled with God's strength when we are emptied of our own self-confidence. 2. *By prayer.* Daniel was a man of prayer (ver. 12). God encourages us in proportion as we seek his help. 3. *By faith.* As we trust God, he strengthens us, because his strength is spiritual and can only enter us as we voluntarily submit to his influence (Heb. xi. 33, 34).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—12, 14—19.—*The vision of the Christ.* "I was left alone, and saw this great vision" (ver. 8). It is well to begin by clearing up the context. We have now only one more prophecy in Daniel. This occupies the eleventh chapter. The tenth contains a prologue to the prophecy; the twelfth, an epilogue. In ch. x. 1 the character of the prophecy is indicated: 1. Its subject-matter is *afflictive*. "*The conflict is great.*" It covers a time of great calamities (see the Hebrew). 2. The prophecy was to be unusually *intelligible*. "And he understood the word, and understanding was there to him in the vision." Some haze of mystery there might be, but not the thick darkness which had enrobed preceding revelations. 3. It would certainly be *true*. "A word was revealed to Daniel . . . and true the word." The prophecy of ch. xi. is the most minute of Scripture; and hence men have been tempted to disbelieve in it as prophecy, and to regard it as prophecy written after the event. Men might have disregarded it before fulfilment; hence Daniel gives this assurance. We now here concern ourselves with *Daniel's vision of the Christ*.

I. THE SCENE OF THE VISION. On the Tigris. The first migration to Jerusalem had taken place. Daniel's advanced age made it, perhaps, impossible that he should have joined in it. He may have been on the Tigris: 1. Either on an *embassage*. 2. Or *retired* from all official life.

II. THE TIME OF THE VISION. 1. *Two years after the first migration* back from captivity (ver. 1). 2. *A time of sorrow.* Mourning was usually for seven days: Daniel mourned for three times seven. Fasting, etc. Why? Realize the circumstances. The temple was indeed rising; but neighbouring peoples were exerting all their influence with the Persian king to frustrate the work. Therefore anxiety and fear. Daniel's affliction would be in proportion as success seemed certain. Good men grieve over *slow progress of the Divine kingdom*, and the *fierceness of the opposition*. 3. *Time of the Passover.* On the twenty-fourth day of the first month came the vision. We infer that Daniel had consecrated the first three weeks of the new year to devotion. This included the Passover week—a time of unusual solemnity—when he would be in earnest sympathy with his nation.

III. THE VISION. That this was none other than the vision of Christ the Lord appears: 1. *From the after-developments of the scene.* 2. *From a comparison with the vision of Christ in the Apocalypse.* (Rev. i.) Compare the two descriptions of clothing—the girdle, the countenance, the eyes, the feet, the voice. Daniel adds, "His body also was like the beryl." John adds, "His head and his hairs were white," etc. In drawing out the description into detail, note: the clothing was of the finest, purest—the garb of priests, prophets, saints, and angels; the uncovered portions of the body shone with gemlike splendour; all the symbols suggest light-splendour; the girdle of fine gold; the arms and feet "like the eye of polished brass," the part that catches the blaze of sunlight and throws it back; the face as lightning, and the eyes as fire; the voice majestic. All this may be *spiritually* expanded.

IV. THE EFFECT OF THE VISION. 1. *On the companions of the seer.* (Ver. 7.) Compare effect on Paul's companions on the way to Damascus, of the vision of the same Christ. 2. *On the seer.* (Vers. 8, 9.) He swooned; but the mighty voice came rolling into his ear, as the roar of ocean breaks into the caves upon the shore. Here we have a picture of the *inability of man to stand before the unveiled revelations of God* (comp. Rev. i. 17).

V. THE RESTORING OF CHRIST THE LORD. Christ: 1. *Sets man erect in the presence*

of *Divine revelations*. (Ver. 11.) No need of cringing. We ourselves are made in the image of God, and have affinity with the Divine. 2. *He does so gradually*. Daniel was first flat on his face; then on all fours; then half-raised and trembling; and finally stood upright on his feet. In this, see how man is gradually led up to all the light which God has to give. In heaven the unveiling may be gradual (vers. 9, 10, 11). 3. *Sympathetically*. "Behold, a hand touched me" (vers. 10, 16—19). 4. *Assures man that his devout aspirations are recognized beyond the sky*. Daniel's was the attitude of a devout truth-seeker. He "had set his heart to understand," and "to chasten himself before his God." We should have more uniformity of Scripture interpretation, were the interpreter always of this spirit. 5. *And of the sure answer to his prayers*. (Ver. 12.) As soon as prayer was offered, it was heard, and secret agencies were evoked for its answer; but there were many obstacles to be overcome. The later part of the chapter shows this. So may it ever be, before our prayers can be answered, long lines and combinations of secondary causes may have to be set in operation, and formidable hostilities subdued. Patience in waiting for, as well as faith in expecting, the answer, are both necessary in the matter of prayer.—R.

Vers. 13, 20—ch. xi. 1.—*War in the realm supernatural*. "And now will I return to fight with the Prince of Persia" (ver. 20). In these verses we have opened out the fact that there is war in the realm supernatural. To understand them, it is absolutely necessary to revise the English version. We read thus: "And the prince of the kingdom of Persia stood against me twenty and one days, and behold Michael one of the chief princes came to help me, and I gained the superiority there by the side of the kings of Persia. . . . And he said, Dost thou know why I came unto thee? And now I will return to war with the Prince of Persia, and while I [thus] go forth [to war], behold the Prince of Javan will come. But yet I will show to thee that which is written in the book of truth. And not one is there showing himself strong with me against these [the princes of Persia and Javan] except Michael your prince; I also in the first year of Darius the Mede stood in order to strengthen and for a fortress to him" (i.e. Michael). This reading of ours is necessary to make clear the meaning of our homiletical culture. Lest any should be surprised at the fulness of the revelation in Daniel as to angels and the angel-world, we may observe that there are two epochs in Hebrew history, when angels are specially prominent. 1. *The time of the judges*. Destitute of direct revelation or prophetic guidance. 2. *The period of the Captivity*. One of special trial, incident to contact with heathenism.

I. THE ANTAGONISTS. 1. *On the side of God*. (1) *The Angel-God*. The Logos. The "certain man" of ver. 5. The Lord Jesus. The speaker throughout (vers. 13, 20—ch. xi. 1). (2) *Michael*. His name means, "Who is like unto God?" and implies that, however high is the scale of being, there is an infinite distance between him and God (see ch. xii. 1; Jude 7; Rev. xii. 7). The following propositions seem clear about him: He is not the Logos; for he is here distinguished from him. "One of the chief princes," one of the principal in the hierarchy of heaven. "Your prince," the angelic representative and guardian of the Jewish nation. "The great prince who standeth for the children of thy people." An archangel. 2. *On the side of the world*. The "princes" here named are the supernatural power standing behind the daimoniæ, who stood behind the national gods, and were represented by them. They are spirits of evil, inspiring the worldly anti-Divine action of the great empires of earth. (1) *The "Prince of Persia"*. (2) *The Prince of Javan*; i.e. Greece.

II. THE WAR. The war was on behalf of Israel, and may be described as being prosecuted through three supernatural campaigns. We consider them separately. 1. *The first campaign*. (Ch. xi. 1.) (1) *The antagonist*. Not mentioned here by name, but, following the analogy of the rest of the description, is certainly the celestial "Prince" of Babylonia. (2) *The casus belli*. The occasion of conflict. This, doubtless, was the necessity of placing on the Babylonian throne one who would be favourable to the return of Israel from the Captivity. (3) *Specialities*. (a) *Michael carried on the war*. (b) *The Christ supported him*. This order is reversed in the next campaign. (4) *The victory*. Lies with the Divine in every case. 2. *The second campaign*. (Ver. 13.) (1) *The antagonist*. "The Prince of Persia." (2) *The casus belli*. The obstruction raised against the restoration of the temple, at the instigation

of Israel's enemies. (3) *Specialities*. (a) *This campaign was carried on by the Angel-God himself*. (b) *But aided by Michael*. Here should be noted the doctrine that *angels and men may be co-workers together with God*. (c) *Was synchronous with Daniel's prayer*. All the way through the twenty-one days the prayer was being answered through a mighty conflict carried on in a higher world. (4) *The victory*. Specially mentioned: "And I gained the superiority there by the side of the kings of Persia." 3. *The third campaign*. (Vers. 20, 21.) (1) *The antagonists*. The "princes" of Persia and Javan. (2) *The casus belli*. All that, in their worldliness, was attempted by Persia afterwards, by Greece, by Alexander and his successors, especially Antiochus, to the sore detriment of the Jewish people. (3) *A speciality*. Only Michael in this great contention was on the Christ-side. Note: (a) *There is, then, liberty in heaven as on earth to do or not to do—to go forth to war or to rest in peace*. (b) *Michael made a noble use of liberty*. (c) *By endowment he towered above others*. "One of the chief princes." (d) *Therefore to him were great responsibilities entrusted*. He was made the guardian spirit of the Hebrew nation and Church. "To whom much is given," etc., seems to be a law of all moral worlds. "Michael your prince." "To a subordinate spirit God will not entrust a work demanding special power and greatness." (4) *The victory*. Again not expressly mentioned, but sure.

The following deductions from the whole subject should, perhaps, have special mention and emphasis: 1. *The Church has many and powerful enemies*. 2. *It abides under most powerful protection*. What Michael was to Israel of old, that, and more than that, is the Lord Jesus to Israel now; and he has many helpers. 3. *Its destiny is in conflict in the worlds above, as well as here below*. 4. *In the holy war here, the humblest may take a share*. The Son of God stooped to avail himself of the help of Michael; so he ever stoops to accept the humblest contribution, the lowliest service.

"The Son of God goes forth to war,
A kingly crown to gain;
His blood-red banner streams afar;
Who follows in his train?"

R.

Vers. 1—10.—*Man's foolish terror in the presence of a heavenly visitor*. In accepting the testimony of others, with respect to matters beyond the reach of our own senses and experience, we must be satisfied on three points. (1) Is the subject-matter of the testimony opposed to reason? (2) Was the witness himself deceived? (3) Is the witness truthful? Now, on all these points the record of Daniel is thoroughly reliable. The matter of this vision is most reasonable in itself. We have an accumulation of proof that Daniel was not deceived. It was not a subjective hallucination, but an objective reality. As evidence of Daniel's thorough truthfulness, he places on record the minutest circumstances of time and place. If there had been any inaccuracy here it would have been detected in the age while Daniel's contemporaries were yet alive. In many parts of the narrative we have the confirmations of secular historians; and best evidence of all have we that this was a *real* visit of an angel, viz. that his predictions of events have been verified in history.

1. THERE WAS PERSONAL PREPARATION TO RECEIVE THIS HEAVENLY VISION. The habit which Daniel formed in youth was of inestimable service to him in old age. Incidentally we may observe how self-consistent are the several parts of this prophetic book. The flesh has always been, more or less, hostile to the spirit. Daniel had wisely repressed and held in control his bodily appetites in the days of his youth; and by reason of this the finer feelings and loftier faculties of his soul had been gradually developed. The practice of abstinence and self-denial had become easy. Yet he did not abstain from food because the act possessed in itself any meritorious excellence. He abstained because his soul was so absorbed in nobler occupation that appetite had lost its edge and food its charm. We are not told the particular reason of this long mourning, yet we can easily infer that his grief was excited by the depressed condition of his people Israel. Self had long since been sacrificed on the altar of his God. He rejoiced in Israel's joy; he mourned in Israel's sorrow. Such tears clear the eye of the soul for the perception of heavenly things.

II. THE SUBSTANCE OF THE VISION. It was the vision of a celestial being, in the form and raiment of a man. To what extent this august person, as he appeared to Daniel, appeared in his native essence, or accommodated himself to human eyes, no living man can say. Whether the unfallen angels have any definite form apprehensible to human eyes, is a question more curious than important. But certain it is that in many vital respects men resemble angels. They have understanding of God's works. They can appreciate truth. Both angels and regenerate men love righteousness and hate wickedness. Both are gifted with benevolence. Both have conscience, affection, choice, will. Here are ample grounds for intercourse and friendship—a joint occupation of heaven. In this resplendent vision we may see what ransomed man shall be. Precious stones, fire, electric flame, burnished brass,—*these* are the emblems of our transfigured nature. Earthly dulness and deformity shall give place to the refinements of celestial splendour. What we call, in our ignorance, supernatural, is but Nature in her higher forms and essences. Whether communication of thought among the angels is by means of outward signs—something akin to words—we cannot tell. On this occasion there was not only the *form* of a glorious man, there was also the language of a man and the sympathy of a man. To accommodate themselves to the necessities of men is a delight to angelic natures as it is to God.

III. THE STRANGE EFFECTS OF THIS VISION UPON MEN. One might have supposed that this visit of a heavenly stranger would be to Daniel, if not to his attendants, an occasion of unmixed delight. It was, without doubt, a special mark of God's favour. When we wish to show a distinguishing mark of respect to a friend we send our messages, not by a menial servant, but by a person of distinction. And that God should have sent a special despatch to Daniel—not a mere voice, not a human messenger, not an ordinary angel—but Gabriel himself, this ought to have been welcomed as a high mark of Divine kindness. To be *assured* that God has other orders of servants beside ourselves, *this* is a pleasure. To be assured that these nobler and more loyal natures regard *us*, not as dangerous rivals of their privileges, but as fellow-heirs of their home, *this* ought to be rich delight. On what ground, then, does this pious man shrink from contact with this glorious servant of Jehovah? We can conceive of no other ground than *this*, viz. the sense of personal sin. Notwithstanding Daniel's penitence for sin, and his faith in God's mercy, there yet remained the consciousness of great unworthiness. Hence a messenger from God may be an instrument to visit just recompense. Still, we must note that the effect on Daniel was very different from the effect on his companions. At the sound of the angel's overpowering voice the attendants on this aged statesman fled. Regardful chiefly of their own safety, they fled to hide themselves. Like the travelling companions of St. Paul, they heard a voice but saw no person. There is such a thing, even in our present life, as a refinement of the bodily senses—a development and quickening of the sensitive capacity—to discern immaterial things. On the eve of the Saviour's crucifixion the Father's voice pierced the blue welkin. Bystanders, with dull and stolid souls, said that it thundered. Others, having a finer perception of things, caught an articulate sound, and averred that an angel spake. Yet One at least detected the very words, and recognized them as the response of the eternal God. Daniel's senses were overpowered by the splendour of this distinguished visitor. Strength failed him. He was prostrate with awe, yet his mind was awake and active, so that he heard the words which this glorious spirit spake.

IV. THE PROOFS THAT THIS VISION HAD AN OBJECTIVE REALITY. The votaries of science make a demand for facts. Theologians respond to the demand, and supply them with facts in abundance—facts which cannot be gainsaid. Here was the *fact* that Daniel's companions heard a voice so novel and so startling that they ran to hide themselves—a type *this* of what guilty men do in every age of the world. Here was the *fact* of which Daniel's *eye* was witness, the *fact* to which Daniel's ear testified, the *fact* to which Daniel's *sense of touch* responded. Here is an accumulation of evidence—one faculty corroborated the testimony of another faculty. Here were *facts* attested by the organs of his body, and confirmed by all the powers of his mind. Here were *facts* which entered into the inmost experiences of the man—clear answers to prayer, which satisfied his wish, and expanded his knowledge, and invigorated his hope. Here were *facts* predicted which, in due time, were verified in

the actual history of the nations. If anything in history or in science is credible, *this* is certain—that Daniel's vision was no subjective illusion, no hallucination of the brain, but an objective reality. He obtained positive information, which has served ever since for the instruction of mankind. He received from his distinguished visitor *strength*—a positive communication of blessing. Here are solid facts, which refuse to evaporate before the breath of honest inquiry.—D.

Vers. 11—21.—*Variety of angelic service.* It is quite legitimate for us to reason from God's conduct towards men in the past to his probable conduct towards men now. If in his wisdom he employed his angels to be ministers of good to Daniel and to Israel two thousand years ago, we may conclude that it is an exercise of wisdom to do the like to-day. Perfect wisdom will only change its plans, so far as new circumstances and needs arise. Hence there is instruction and consolation for us in this Scripture.

I. ANGELS ARE EMPLOYED TO BRING TO MEN ASSURANCE OF THEIR ACCEPTANCE WITH GOD. This angel, who was probably Gabriel, was commissioned to assure Daniel that he was "greatly beloved." Every doubt upon that head was completely removed. The angel knew what were God's dispositions of mind towards Daniel, and he was empowered to convey the intelligence. There is nothing unreasonable in *this*; no improbability that beings of refined nature exist in nearer relation to God than do men; no improbability that they perform acts of service for men. *That* which is naturally probable is made certain by the written revelation. It is often the case that we cannot account for our moods of feeling, our hopefulness and our despondency, by any known events. Who shall say that these states of mind are not the result of angelic visitation? That we are not *conscious* of the presence of angels is no proof that they do not visit us. Their ethereal natures may be impervious to human sight, except by miraculous interposition. Elisha's servant did not perceive the angelic host sent for their protection until God had specially opened his eyes. Once and again this angel assured Daniel of his interest in God's love, charged him to dismiss his fears, and brought to him heavenly peace.

II. ANGELS ARE EMPLOYED TO INFORM THE HUMAN UNDERSTANDING. One main object of Gabriel's visit to Daniel was to shed light upon passing events, and to enlarge Daniel's comprehension of God's government. So high was God's esteem for Daniel, that Gabriel was despatched on purpose to dislodge ignorance and doubt from his mind. He assures him that the want of visible answer to prayer is no proof that God has not heard, nor that he is unwilling to reply. On the contrary, Daniel's prayer had taken effect from the very beginning, and measures were at once set in motion in accordance therewith. The prayers and fastings of good men are links (ordained by God) in the chain of causes and effects. As soon as man interceded for Israel, Gabriel was despatched on business of high importance to the kingdom of Persia. And Gabriel was further charged to unfold to Daniel what was in the volume of God's purposes—the series of vicissitudes through which Israel would be destined to pass. God's thoughts were loftier than Daniel's; *his* designs had a wider scope and range than his servant's. Nothing short of the establishment of permanent righteousness will satisfy God.

III. ANGELS ARE EMPLOYED TO INCREASE OUR STRENGTH. It is noteworthy that as Daniel's needs arose one after the other, the angel was prepared to meet each one. Daniel was prostrate; the angel set him upright. Daniel was so stunned with the intelligence, that he was dumb; the angel opened his mouth, and gave him speech. Daniel fainted under a sense of awe and wonder; the angel imparted new strength with his touch. We are impressed with the considerateness, the tenderness, the thoughtful sympathy, of this angelic visitor. There was strength imparted to his physical nature by a touch; there was strength imparted to his soul by the angel's words. According to the constitution of man's nature is the agency employed by God. The angel who strengthened Christ Jesus in the garden of suffering can also strengthen us.

IV. ANGELS ARE ENGAGED TO PROTECT THE INTERESTS OF THE CHURCH IN PALACES AND IN COUNCILS OF STATE. There are times when they can best serve us, not at our side, but at a distance from us. Probably Daniel was agitated in soul, because for

three weeks no sign of answer came from heaven. Yet, all the while, answer had come, though he was unconscious of it. Daniel was concerned, not for himself, but for the well-being and fortunes of Israel. But he might rest assured that God had more at heart these interests—than man, however zealous, ever can. This report of Gabriel opens to our minds a new view of angelic ministration. It is evident that they do perform their service on earth, for the most part, unseen by human eyes. Gabriel had been with the kings and statesmen of Persia. So important to Israel's well-being was his presence in that court, that for three weeks he had remained there. His power was limited; he could not be in two places at once, nor could he accomplish his mission without the assistance of Michael. For the time being, it was better that Daniel should remain in ignorance of the fact. His continued fasting and prayer were essential to complete success. In what fashion Gabriel rendered service we are not told. Most probably he had power to influence the views, the motives, the ambitions of men. A thousand subtle agencies were at his command, by which he could direct the counsels of men and bring about the purposes of God. Angelic influence, then, is a factor in state concerns which we do well not to ignore.

V. ANGELS HAVE OFTEN TO CONTEND WITH EVIL SPIRITS IN FULFILLING THE BEHESTS OF GOD. There can be little doubt that the language here employed by Gabriel, viz. "the prince of the kingdom of Persia," refers to one of the leading spirits of darkness, one of the fallen angels. There are principalities and powers in hell. Satan is termed the "prince of this world," "the prince of the power of the air." An antagonist of Gabriel would be fittingly an evil spirit. Gabriel speaks of *fighting* with him. There was hot warfare. So we read in the Epistle of Jude that Michael disputed with the devil about the body of Moses. That some bold and crafty spirit, in the confederate host of hell, should be told off to do some particular evil work is probable enough; and that *such*, having subordinates under him, should be styled leader or prince of a particular earthly empire is equally probable. This earth, then, is the scene of mighty conflicts. Angels here have their combats as well as men. *Here*, perhaps, is being fought out the crucial conflict between the Creator and his rebellious creatures—the conflict between righteousness and wickedness. Gabriel, though "excelling in power," is not omnipotent. Some things even an angel alone cannot do. *They* learn that in union is strength. Michael is sent to help him—*Michael*, who is set apart as the prince or protector of Israel. Gabriel cannot be long spared from the particular scene of conflict. During a temporary truce he visits Daniel. This accomplished, he returns to the troublous scene in the court of Persia.—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER XL

Vers. 1—45.—THE KINGS OF THE NORTH AND THE KINGS OF THE SOUTH.

Ver. 1.—Also I in the first year of Darius the Mede, even I, stood to confirm and to strengthen him. The versions show signs of great disturbance having happened here. The rendering of the LXX. is, "In the first year of Cyrus the king, he told me to be strong and to play the man." Theodotion's rendering is yet briefer, "And I, in the first year of Cyrus, stood in strength and might." The Peshitta rendering, "In the first year of Darius the Mede (he) arose to confirm and strengthen me." The Vulgate is close to the Massoretic and the English versions, "I likewise, from the first year of Darius the Mede, was standing that he might be confirmed and strengthened."

DANIEL.

The Revised Version does not differ seriously from the Authorized, "And as for me, in the first year of Darius the Mede, I stood up to confirm and strengthen him." The Septuagint must have read *amar* (*amar*), "he said," instead of *an* (*anee*), "I." When we have the Septuagint and Theodotion supporting each other against the Massoretic text, the evidence against the received text is strong. In this case both these versions have, as will be seen, not "Darius," but "Cyrus." The two names would have in the old Egyptian Hebrew script, a striking resemblance to each other; the fact that the last letter of both names is the same, and also the second letter, made the likeness considerable in any script; but ⁴ the first letter of "Darius" is certainly very like ⁴ the first letter of "Cyrus." The *ear* would possibly be omitted, then the first two letters of either name would resemble closely the first two letters of the

other, and the final letters are the same. Mistake, then, was easy. The first letter of *מלך* and *מלך* is the same, and the words would be liable to be read in accordance with that given to the proper name. Further, all the versions but the Vulgate make the speaker the recipient of the aid. Theodotion may be taken as doubtful. The difference is slight, *מלך* becomes *מלך*, and *לך* becomes *לך*. The Septuagint seems to have read *מלך* instead of *מלך*. The first two letters are thus the same, the *daleth* may have been an intrusion. Bevan and Behrmann would omit the date as spurious, and hold it to have been introduced because the previous four chapters begin each with a date. This reason, to have weight, must assume the division into chapters to be of ancient date, more ancient than the Septuagint Version. The fact that all the versions have it compels us to admit a date here, but, as we have said above, it is to be reckoned by the year, not of Darius, but of Cyrus. (Also 1) in the first year of Cyrus the king. The first year of Cyrus was the year when he decided to set the Jews free, and permit them to return to their own land; but the first year in this case was reckoned from his assumption of the throne of Babylon. We saw reason to doubt whether the reference in the beginning of ch. x. was to the Babylonian reign of Cyrus, or to his reign as King of the Persians. His first year as King of the Persians might be when he first began to turn his arms against Babylon. We do not know enough of the history of the first years of Cyrus's monarchy to know what critical events befell in that year. *Stood to confirm and to strengthen him (me).* According to the Massoretic text, the angel Gabriel stood to confirm either the archangel Michael or King Darius. Certainly, as Darius (Cyrus) is the nearer substantive, the grammatical preference would be to take it, as do Hävernicks, Hitzig, and Calvin. The majority of commentators who hold by the Massoretic text take "him" to refer to Michael—and much can be said for this. Although Darius (Cyrus) is the nearest substantive, yet he is not the subject of the main sentence, but merely denotes a time, therefore a previous substantive must be chosen. In the opening of Cyrus's career, the intimate connection his prosperity had with the prosperity of the people of Israel might well make Michael interested. As Cyrus had been prophesied of, he was under the rule of the angel of prophecy, hence Gabriel strengthened and confirmed the efforts of Michael. Certainly "strengthening" and "confirming" are strong terms to apply to the archangel Michael, yet we know so

little of angelic natures and their limitations that the phrase may be quite natural. The meaning is not materially altered if we read, "He stood to strengthen and confirm me."

Ver. 2.—And now will I show thee the truth. Behold, there shall stand up yet three kings in Persia; and the fourth shall be far richer than they all; and by his strength through his riches he shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia. The rendering of the LXX. is, "And now I came to show thee the truth. Behold, three kings have risen, and the fourth shall be rich with great riches above all, and when he shall strengthen himself in his riches, he shall stir himself up against every king of the Greeks." Theodotion is very like this, only the last words of the verse are, "all the realms of the Greeks." The Peshitta is very like Theodotion, having "kingdoms" instead of "realm." The Vulgate is in nearly exact agreement with the Massoretic text. When we turn to the Massoretic text and compare it with the versions, we find that the LXX. must have read, *מלך*, as it has *ev*. Theodotion reads, *μετὰ*; the Peshitta, *ma*; the Vulgate, *cum*. This is the beginning of the revelation referred to in ch. x. 21a. The doubtful authenticity of that clause throws a shadow on this verse. It is to be noted that we are no longer in the region of symbol, but of distinct narration. There may have been something in the nature of a vision, and that here we have, enlarged, an interpretation of it. The fourth king is certainly Xerxes. If we regard him as one of the three successors to Cyrus, then Cambyzes and Darius Hystaspis are the other two. So Hitzig and Delitzsch. Keil would more naturally make the fourth not the fourth King of Persia, but the fourth successor of Cyrus. (For the Hebrew usage, see Exod. xxii. 30.) Professor Bevan, assuming in his superior way the ignorance of the writer before us, here determines that he drew "most of his information" from the Bible, and, as there are only four names of Persian kings given in Ezra and Nehemiah, that he, this careful student of Scripture, came to the conclusion that there were only four kings. In the first place, if this portion was written, as it not improbably was, in the Maccabean period, the writer must have got his information of the invasion of Greece by Xerxes from classical sources; he could not fail to know of Cambyzes and the pseudo-Smerdis. Further, scarcely even the most casual reader of Ezra could fail to distinguish between the Artaxerxes who before Darius Hystaspis hindered the work of the Jews, and the Artaxerxes after Darius who fostered it. We have followed Herodotus in calling the brother of Cambyzes, whose

name the usurper assumed, "Smerdis;" but Ctæsius calls him "Tanyoxarces;" Xenophon, "Tanaoxares;" and Æschylus, "Mardos." We know that Artaxerxes was probably not a personal name, but rather a title, as was also *Achæverosh* Xerxes. Some, as Behrmann, assume the fourth monarch here to be Darius Codomannus, but there seems no reason for this assumption, save that critics are superior persons; and the writer, albeit many of them admit him to be inspired, would be more likely to be wrong in his facts than that their theories should be defective. As the writer here gives no names, it is certainly singular to assert that, though, if we take his Hebrew as grammatical, he gives a correct enumeration of the Persian kings, he has defied Hebrew usage, and been wrong in his enumeration. *He shall stir up all against the realm of Grecia.* All the versions except the Vulgate imply a plural here—מְלָכֵיהֶם instead of מְלָכֻהָ. This reading is preferable to the Massoretic, which would arise easily from the next verse. If we may take this as the true reading, then the diversities of the states in Greece is indicated in the way most natural to an Oriental.

Ver. 3.—And a mighty king shall stand up, that shall rule with great dominion, and do according to his will. None of the versions imply any difference of reading. The Hebrew implies that the king was a mighty warrior. All critics are agreed that here the reference is to Alexander the Great. This does not mean that Alexander immediately followed Xerxes, but that his expedition was the revenge for that of Xerxes. Alexander, in his answer to Darius Codomannus, justified his invasion of Persia by referring back to Xerxes' invasion of Greece. The two expeditions, that which Xerxes made into Greece, and that of Alexander into Persia, might be regarded as causally connected.

Ver. 4.—And when he shall stand up, his kingdom shall be broken, and shall be divided toward the four winds of heaven; and not to his posterity, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be plucked up, even for others beside those. The LXX. rendering is, "And when he is risen up, his kingdom shall be broken, and divided to the four winds of heaven; not according to his might, nor according to his dominion which he ruled: because his kingdom shall be taken away, and he shall teach these things to others." It is difficult to see what reading the LXX. translator had when he rendered, "his might," for no word meaning "might" is at all like *ahareetho*, "his posterity." In the last clause he must have read, not *milbad*, but *melamayd*. Theodotion resembles the

Massoretic more closely; he renders, "But when his kingdom stood (shall stand), it shall be broken, and shall be scattered to the four winds of heaven; and to his latter end (*ἔσχατα*), nor according to his rule which he ruled: for his kingdom shall be rooted out, and (let) for others besides these." The Peshitta agrees generally with this, only that when in the English we have, "not to his posterity," it has, "not to his sword (*siphoh*)." The last clause is somewhat paraphrastic, "And his kingdom shall be rooted, and shall not be to others save these." The Vulgate agrees with the Massoretic. The description here given of the empire of Alexander the Great is strictly accurate; his empire did not go to his posterity, nor did any of his successors possess a dominion as extensive as his. *For others beside those.* This has been thought to refer to the successors of those who first divided the empire among them. It seems more natural to regard "those" as referring to the posterity of Alexander, as the nearest antecedent.

Ver. 5.—And the king of the south shall be strong, and one of his princes; and he shall be strong above him, and have dominion; his dominion shall be a great dominion. The LXX. rendering differs from this, "And he shall strengthen the kingdom of Egypt; and one of the rulers shall overcome him (*καταλύσει*) and rule; and his power shall be a great power." Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic in sense. The Peshitta agrees verbally with the Massoretic, but, as it omits the preposition *min*, the meaning the translator attached to the verse is difficult to ascertain. The Vulgate agrees with the Massoretic. The verse abruptly introduces the conflict between the Lagid and Seleucid princes. There is no indication in the preceding verses that the four winds of heaven are to be taken so rigidly as is implied by this verse. It is no answer to say that Egypt and Syria alone came into intimate relations with the Jews; it is not a question of fact, but a question of the necessities of composition. The appearance presented is that of a fragment existing separately, and inserted here. The intruded references to the truth which is to be shown have the look of being awkward attempts to prepare for the subjoined narrative. Whatever its origin, it is very difficult to explain to what it refers. The king of the south is certainly one of the Ptolemies, most probably Ptolemy Lagi. *And one of his princes shall be strong above him.* This is usually understood to mean Seleucus Nicator, who, when driven from Babylon, his original satrapy, by Antigonus, took refuge with Ptolemy Lagi, and became a commander under him in his war against Antigonus. Ptolemy also gave him

the few troops with which, after the battle of Gaza, he recovered possession of Babylonia. He certainly became by far the most powerful of the successors of Alexander. Indeed, he may be said to have had all the dominions of Alexander save Egypt and Syria on the south, and Macedonia and Greece on the west; for he had overthrown Lysimachus, and absorbed his dominion. *His dominion shall be a great dominion* states accurately the extent of the dominions of Seleucus. Rosenmüller would refer the prenominal suffix *his*, to Alexander, and understand Ptolemy as the prince in question; but this is improbable. It is impossible not to observe the abrupt introduction of this prince. Grätz would suggest that a clause has dropped out here, which declared that one of his (Alexander's) princes stood up in the north. Had this any manuscript authority, it would be plausible. More, however, would seem to be wanting.

Ver. 6.—And in the end of years they shall join themselves together; for the king's daughter of the south shall come to the king of the north to make an agreement: but she shall not retain the power of the arm; neither shall he stand, nor his arm: but she shall be given up, and they that brought her, and he that begat her, and he that strengthened her in these times. The LXX. differs in a remarkable way from this, "And at the end of years he shall lead them, and the King of Egypt shall enter into the kingdom of the north to make covenants: but he shall not prevail, because his arm shall not establish strength (*οὐ στήσσει ἰσχύον*); and his arm shall become stiff, and that of those accompanying him, and he shall remain for a season (*εἰς ὥρας*)."¹ It is certainly difficult to see the reading from which this rendering came. It is noticeable that there is no reference to "the king's daughter of the south." History confirms the statement in the Massoretic text, but there is no expedition related in the history of Philadelphus undertaken against the kingdom of Syria. It is true our records of the reign of Philadelphus are somewhat scanty. Theodotion is nearer the Massoretic text, though not quite in accordance with it, "And after his days they shall mingle with one another (*συμμιγνύσονται*); and the daughter of the king of the south shall enter unto the king of the north to make treaties with him: but she shall not retain the power of the arm; and his seed shall not stand: and she shall be betrayed, and those that brought her, both the damsel and he that did violence to her." The last words are separated from this verse and conjoined to the following verse. The text behind this seems, in many ways, superior to the Massoretic. The Peshitta agrees in the opening clauses with

the Massoretic; at the end of the verse the difference is considerable, "But power shall not be in her, from the fear which she feared: and she shall be betrayed, and her youths, and those accompanying her, and those supporting her in this time." The Vulgate agrees pretty closely with this. The reference here is generally understood to be to the affinity made by the Lagids with the Seleucids, when Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy Philadelphus, married Antiochus II. (Theos), who repudiated his first wife, Laodike, in order to do so. The leap over a space of approximately sixty years is not so trying as Professor Fuller imagines; but the uncertainty as to the text is great, and the meaning of even the Massoretic is by no means fixed. Still, the agreement with the course of events is so marked according to the common interpretation, that one feels inclined to adopt it. After the death of Philadelphus, father of Berenice, Antiochus Theos took back Laodike, who, in order to escape the risk of being again dismissed, unceremoniously poisoned her rival and her son, and then her husband Antiochus. Yet this transaction seems somewhat dubiously set forth in the Massoretic text. Theodotion is closer to facts, though it is possible that the text has been altered to suit what were known to be facts.

Ver. 7.—But out of a branch of her roots shall one stand up in his estate, which shall come with an army, and shall enter into the fortress of the king of the north, and shall deal against them, and shall prevail. The version of the LXX. is very different here also, "And a plant shall arise out of his root against himself, and the king of the north shall come against his power in his might, and shall cause disturbance, and prevail." The Hebrew text would bear the translation here given of the last clause, save "cause disturbance." The nominative may be the "king of the north." History confirms the ordinary interpretation. Theodotion, as usual, is in closer agreement with the Massoretic. Yet even he differs considerably: he connects the last words of the preceding verse, "In those times, one shall arise out of the flower of her root of his preparation, and shall enter into the strongholds of the king of the north, and shall do in them (according to his will), and prevail." The Peshitta is somewhat like this, "And there spring from the stem of her seed against his place, and he shall come in might, and he shall come in strength against the king of the north, and he shall pass over against them, and prevail." The Vulgate rendering seems to have a relation to that just given, "And a plant shall stand from the seed of his roots, and he shall come with an army, and shall

enter into the province of the king of the north, and shall abuse them, and take possession." There must have been very different manuscript readings to explain these widely different renderings. The Massoretic text scarcely quite bears out the rendering of the Authorized Version. Yet it is difficult to make any other consistent sense. Certainly Euergetes, brother of the murdered Berenice, advanced into Syria, and overran the whole country, captured Seleucia, the port of Antioch, then mastered Antioch itself, and advanced even beyond the Tigris, while Seleucus retired behind the Taurus Mountains. The statements in the LXX. suit better a later period in history, when Physcon rebelled against his brother Philometor. Epiphanes invaded Egypt, nominally in the interest of Philometor, and laid siege to Alexandria. This, however, does not suit with the next verse.

Ver. 8.—*And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes, and with their precious vessels of silver and of gold; and he shall continue more years than the king of the north.* The version of the LXX. is again very different from that of the Massoretic text, "And their gods, with them that moulded them, he shall subdue" (*καταστρέψει*), and their multitudes with the vessels of their desirable things, the silver and the gold, shall go into captivity in Egypt, and the year shall be to the king of the north." Theodotion, as so frequently is the case, takes a place intermediate between the Massoretic and the version of the LXX. His rendering is, "And their gods, with those that moulded them, all their desirable vessels of gold and silver, he shall carry with the captivity into Egypt, and he shall prevail over the king of the north." Both the Greek versions take *נִסְחָיָהֶם* (*n'sikhayhem*) as derived from *nasak*, "to pour out," hence "to mould," "to form a molten image," reading the word *noskeem*. The Syriac differs from both the Greek renderings and also from the Massoretic, "And even he shall terrify them, and their desirable vessels of silver and gold and the captives he shall carry down to Egypt, and twice (literally, 'one, two') shall rise against the king of the north." The Vulgate differs in meaning from all the preceding, but the text it is drawn from does not differ consonantly from that of the Massoretic, "And besides their gods, and their graven images, precious vessels too of silver and gold, he shall lead captive into Egypt, he shall prevail against the king of the north." The word *n'sikhayem* is rendered, in the Revised Version, 'molten images'—a meaning given to the word by Fürst, Gesenius,

and Winer, with reference to this verse. The meaning assigned to the word in the Authorized is drawn from Rashi, and is in accordance with the usage of Ezekiel (xxxii. 30). *And shall also carry captives into Egypt their gods, with their princes.* As we have said, Ptolemy Euergetes conquered all Syria and Mesopotamia to beyond the Tigris. From this we learn he carried off immense booty, and among the articles taken were images of their gods. And not only the gods of Syria, but the images of the Egyptian gods, which had been carried into Syria from Egypt by Cambyzes, nearly three centuries before. If this doubtful word, *nasakeem*, is taken to mean "images," it is difficult to see the reference of the prenominal suffix. Does it mean that the gods themselves, and the images of these gods, were taken? That is to say, does it mean that gods of the Syrians were taken, and also their images, as if the images and the gods were different? From this, notwithstanding the general consensus of interpreters, we feel ourselves necessitated to differ, and to make the word mean "princes," although there is no prominence, in the few accounts we have of this expedition, to any captives of such rank as to be called princes. *And with their precious vessels of silver and of gold.* This rendering, although retained in the Revised, is scarcely grammatically accurate, as the noun for "vessels" is already defined by the prenominal suffix. On the other hand, this word cannot readily be in apposition, as the article would be needed. Professor Bevan would make it "in silver and gold." We feel inclined to regard this as a somewhat irregular construction, as if a *vav* had dropped out before *נָכָה*, "silver," though most of the versions regard these nouns as in the genitive after "vessels." *And he shall continue more years than the king of the north.* It is a matter of fact that Euergetes survived Seleucus Callinicus, his sister's stepson, about four years. Hitzig and Ewald would render, "He shall refrain for some years from attacking the king of the north." This rendering has the advantage that it escapes from the purely unimportant personal statement that Ptolemy should survive Callinicus. That the king of the north was allowed to regain the greater part of the dominions which had been wrested from him, without any counter effort on the part of Ptolemy, is more important. Keil objects to this that the emphatic position of *נָכָה* is against this, and would support the rendering of the Vulgate, *Ipse prevalebit adversus regem Aquilonis*. Both versions are so far grammatically defensible; yet both are a little strained: both are in accordance with history.

Ver. 9.—So the king of the south shall come into his kingdom, and shall return into his own land. The Septuagint Version differs less than usual from the Massoretic, "The King of Egypt shall enter into (his) kingdom certain days and return to his land." Theodotion renders, "And he shall enter into the kingdom of the king of the south, and return into his land." The Peshitta differs more, "The king of the south shall enter in strength, and turn to his own land." The Vulgate does not differ from the others. This verse, assuming the king of the south, Ptolemy Euergetes, to be the subject of the verb, merely completes the statements of the previous verse, and seems to describe the triumphant return of Euergetes into Egypt. If we take—which, however, is not so natural—the king of the north as the subject, then the reference may be to the unsuccessful attempts made by Seleucus Callinicus to invade Egypt.

Ver. 10.—But his sons shall be stirred up, and shall assemble a multitude of great forces; and one shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through; then shall he return, and be stirred up, even to his fortress. The version of the Septuagint differs from this, "And his son shall both be stirred up, and shall assemble (*συνάξει συναγωγὴν*) a great multitude, and, ravaging with it (*κατασφύρων*), he shall enter, and pass by and return." The K'thib here supports this to the extent at least that it has "his son," not "his sons;" but the verbs are plural. The last clause of this verse in the Massoretic text is transferred by the Septuagint to the next; Theodotion, while, as usual, more closely in agreement with the Massoretic text, is not quite identical with it, "And his sons shall assemble a multitude moderately numerous (*ἀνὰ μέσον πολλῶν*), and he that cometh and overfloweth shall come and shall pass by, and shall enter, and shall struggle hard (*συμπροσλακῆσεται*), even to his fortress (*ισχύος*)." The Peshitta and the Vulgate are in close agreement with the Massoretic text. But his sons shall be stirred up. The natural inference is that it is the sons of the king of the south who thus are stirred up, but, historically, it can only refer to the sons of Seleucus Callinicus, who, one after the other, succeeded him on the throne: Seleucus Ceraunus, who died after a short reign of rather more than two years; and Antiochus III., Magnus. Certainly Seleucus did little in this conflict, although he undertook a campaign to Asia Minor, in the course of which he was assassinated. It may be that this campaign was intended as a preparation for a great campaign against Egypt. On the death of Ceraunus, he was succeeded by Antiochus Magnus. This prince was

very warlike. He began to assail Syria, which was in the possession of Philopator, but was interrupted by news of war in the far East. After a successful campaign in Media and Persia, he wrested first Seleucia from the hands of Ptolemy Philopator; and then proceeded on his invasion of Coele-Syria and Palestine. And one shall certainly come, and overflow, and pass through. This describes in a compendious way the campaigns of Antiochus Magnus. And be stirred up, even to his fortress. This is supposed to refer to the recovery of Seleucia. Some think that this rather states that he pierced nearly to Pelusium, the frontier fortress of Egypt.

Ver. 11.—And the king of the south shall be moved with choler, and shall come forth, and fight with him, even with the king of the north; and he shall set forth a great multitude; but the multitude shall be given into his hand. The LXX. differs a little from the Massoretic, "And the King of Egypt shall be much embittered and enraged, and shall come forth and fight with the king of the north; and he shall set forth (*στήσει*) a great multitude, and the multitude shall be betrayed into his hands." Theodotion, like this, differs from the Massoretic by inserting, "the king of the north," without the pronoun, as do all the other versions. Ptolemy, usually slothful and lethargic, was at length roused, and placed an army of seventy-five thousand men in the field. Against this Antiochus opposed the slightly superior army of seventy-eight thousand. The two armies engaged at Raphia, and Antiochus sustained a severe defeat, losing no less than ten thousand men. The multitude commanded by Antiochus was given into the hands of Ptolemy Philopator. This seems the only interpretation which is consistent with facts.

Ver. 12.—And when he hath taken away the multitude, his heart shall be lifted up; and he shall cast down many ten thousands; but he shall not be strengthened by it. The rendering of the LXX. is, "And he shall take the levy (*συναγωγὴν*), and his heart shall be lifted up, and he shall trouble many, and shall not be afraid." There seems to have been some difference of reading in the last clause, but it is not clear what. Theodotion renders the first clause as does the Septuagint; but the latter clause is more in accordance with the English version of the Massoretic text. The Peshitta from the same text differs in its interpretation, "And he shall destroy them mightily, and his heart shall be lifted up, and he shall cast down many, and shall not be strengthened." The Vulgate presents no occasion of remark. And he shall cast

down many ten thousands. This, most probably, refers to the complete victory at Raphia, where Antiochus was reported to have lost ten thousand men. There is thus a repetition here of what has already been narrated. *But he shall not be strengthened by it.* It is very noticeable that Ptolemy did not even attempt to strengthen his position by vigorously following up his victory.

Ver. 13.—For the king of the north shall return, and shall set forth a multitude greater than the former, and shall certainly come after certain years with a great army and with much riches. The LXX. does not differ essentially from this, only *πόλεως* comes in unnecessarily by a blunder—the less to be understood, as there seems no word which can have occasioned the misreading, unless it is simply a blunder of hearing for *πολλήν*; but against this is the fact that Paulus Tellensis has *μεdeenatha*. There is also the limitation of the period after which the king of the north will return to “one year” (*καιροῦ ἑνιαυτοῦ*), “a period of a year.” Theodotion is closer to the Massoretic. The Peshitta is closer than either of the Greek versions, as neither of them attempts to give, “coming he shall come,” which it does. The Vulgate is like Theodotion. The reference here is to the second expedition against Egypt, undertaken by Antiochus after the death of Philopator. After his victory at Raphia, Ptolemy resumed his life of self-indulgence. Antiochus endeavoured to build up his empire by curbing the Parthians; then, after an interval of fourteen years, he once more invaded the territories of the Egyptian monarch. This second invasion resulted in Antiochus gaining possession of all Palestine.

Ver. 14.—And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south: also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves to establish the vision; but they shall fall. The versions here differ from this, which represents the Massoretic with fair accuracy. The LXX. renders, “And in those times thoughts (*διδόται*) shall rise against the King of Egypt, and he shall build again that which has fallen down of thy people”—reading *וְבָנָה* (*oobnah*), “and he shall build,” instead of *וְבָנָה* (*oob'nee*), “and sons of;” he has read also *p'ratze*, “branches,” instead of *p'ritzee*, “robbers,”—“and he shall raise himself up”—reading singular instead of plural—“to fulfil the prophecy, and they shall stumble.” This confusion indicates that the reading of the LXX. is mistaken. Theodotion is as much removed from the Massoretic as is the above, “And in those times many shall rise against the king of the south, and the sons of the plagues (*λοιμῶν*)

of thy people shall be exalted to establish the vision, and they shall become weak.” If there were any trace of uncertainty in the reading at this point, we might be tempted to read *ἀπαίων* instead of *λοιμῶν*, written *ΔΗΙCΤΩΝ* for *ΔΟΙΜΩΝ*. The reading of Nestle (*λοιπῶν*) is no improvement. The Peshitta renders, “And many shall rise against the king of the north, and the sons of the perversity of thy people shall be raised up to fulfil the vision, and shall be cast down.” The change from “king of the south” to “the king of the north” must be noted, probably simply the result of blunder. The Vulgate renders *et prævaricatorum*. And in those times there shall many stand up against the king of the south. Ptolemy Epiphanes was not only exposed to the assault of the confederates Antiochus and Philip of Macedon; but there were intrigues and conspiracies in the palace. *Also the robbers of thy people shall exalt themselves*; literally, *the sons of the oppressors*. Commentators of all varieties have assumed that these are Jews. Hitzig maintains that they were the Jews that sided with Antiochus's rule (“Historical Exposition of Daniel”); that they were the separatists, those who had gone down to Egypt (Calvin; Behrmann, “Die Stürmische Jugend”); Keil, “violent men who break through Divine law.” So Kranichfeld and Wordsworth. Stuart, “the violent of thy people;” Ewald, “young high-handed men.” Fuller thinks the word *prizeem* is used as “rulers.” Grätz would render, “to establish the vision, to make the law to totter”—an attempt to get, by addition to the text, an explanation. The Hebrew text does not bear out this meaning. Grätz here implies *חֲזִיוֹן* (*hazion*), “vision,” to be equivalent to *תּוֹרָה* (*torah*), “law;” but this is never the case. But the oppressors of the people do not necessarily belong to it. *To establish the vision* (comp. Acts iv. 28). It may be that here there is a portion of the original vision of Daniel, which has been overlaid with what we have before us. It is a summary of the whole history of the Jews under the Greek domination. *But they shall fall.* A general statement true of all the oppressors of Israel.

Ver. 15.—So the king of the north shall come, and cast up a mount, and take the most fenced cities; and the arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people, neither shall there be any strength to withstand. The version of the LXX. is, “And the king of the north shall attack and turn his spears, and shall take the fortified city, and the arms of the King of Egypt shall stand with his rulers, and there shall not be strength in them to resist them.” It is difficult to imagine what

Hebrew text was before the translator when he rendered, "turn his spears." Theodotion agrees with the Massoretic in the first portion, and with the LXX. in the latter. The Peshitta rendering is not unlike the Massoretic, "And the king of the north shall come and shall lay ambushes, and shall conquer strong fastnesses; and the arms of the south shall not stand, because there is not in them might to stand; and his chosen people shall not stand, because there is not might in them to stand." The Vulgate, as usual, is closest to the Massoretic. The reference here is most probably to the capture of Sidon, into which Scopas, the general of Ptolemy, had thrown himself after his defeat at Paneas. Other strongholds and fortified cities were of necessity taken at the same time. *The arms of the south shall not withstand, neither his chosen people.* Ptolemy sent several successive armies to relieve Sidon, but was unable to compel Antiochus to give up the siege. Finally Scopas had to surrender. *Neither shall there be any strength to withstand.* Egypt was to all appearance helpless; there was neither wisdom in their counsels nor valour in their arms.

Ver. 16.—*But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him: and he shall stand in the glorious land, which by his hand shall be consumed.* The rendering of the Septuagint is quite different, "And he who entereth in shall do to him according to his will, and there shall be none to resist before him, and he shall stand in the province in the place of his will, and all things shall be fulfilled in his hands." Some of the variations may be understood by a slightly different vocalization, but others resist this explanation. Theodotion renders in a way that suggests a text between that used by the Septuagint translator and the Massoretic, "And he who entereth in shall do to him according to his will, and there shall not be one that standeth before him, and he shall stand in the land of Sabei, and it shall be perfected (*τελεσθήσεται*) by his hand." The Peshitta has, "cometh against him," as in the Massoretic, "the glorious land" is put down directly as "the land of Israel." The Vulgate renders exactly as our Authorized Version does. *But he that cometh against him shall do according to his own will, and none shall stand before him.* This is a fair description of the advance of Antiochus the Great through Coele-Syria and Palestine. Fortress after fortress fell before his arms. *And he shall stand in the glorious land; "the land of delight."* Ewald would render, "land of the ornament." It is certainly the land of Judæa. *Which by his hand shall*

be consumed. This certainly contradicts history as we have it elsewhere. The Revised is little better, "And in his hand shall be destruction," which is the rendering of Behrmann, Keil, Hitzig, and Bevan. The rendering of von Lengerke, Ewald, Stuart, and Fuller seems better to take קָלָה (*kalah*) as meaning "completely." The answer to the historical objection that Antiochus did not destroy Palestine, is that this destruction refers to Egypt; but as little did he destroy Egypt.

Ver. 17.—*He shall also set his face to enter with the strength of his whole kingdom, and upright ones with him: thus shall he do: and he shall give him the daughter of women, corrupting her: but she shall not stand on his side, neither be for him.* The LXX. renders, "And he shall set (give, *δώσει*) his face to enter upon (*επελθεῖν*) his work with violence, and he shall make covenants with him, and shall give him a daughter of man to corrupt her, but she shall not obey, neither shall it be." The translator seems to have had before him מְלָכָוּ, "work," instead of מְלָכּוֹ, "kingdom"—a reading not equal to the Massoretic, and מִשְׁתָּרִים instead of מִשְׁתָּרִים, in which case the LXX. reading is preferable. Theodotion is like the Massoretic, "And he shall set (*ράξει*) his face to enter with the strength of all his kingdom, and he shall make all things straight with him, and shall give him a daughter of the women to corrupt her, but she shall not continue on his side, neither be for him." The Peshitta renders, "And he shall set his face to enter with the force of all his kingdom, and all his people shall pass over, and the daughter of men shall be given to him to corrupt her, but she shall not stand, neither be for him." The Vulgate rendering is independent of the other versions, "And he shall set his face that he may come to lay hold of his whole kingdom, and he shall do right things with him, and he shall give to him the daughter of women that he may overturn it, but she shall not stand, neither be for him." The events portrayed here are well known. Antiochus collected all his forces with a view to the conquest of Egypt, then, alarmed by the progress of Rome and the overthrow of Philip of Macedon, he changed his plan. He now endeavoured to get Ptolemy to be his ally, and gave him his daughter Cleopatra to wife, with Coele-Syria as a dowry. His idea was that she would remain always on his side, would be his spy in the court of her husband, and would always lead the policy of Egypt in the lines he wished. His hopes were frustrated. She was not corrupted so as to be false to her husband. In proof of

this, when her father's armies were defeated by the Romans, she joined with her husband in sending congratulations to the Senate of Rome.

Ver. 18.—After this shall he turn his face unto the isles, and shall take many; but a prince for his own behalf shall cause the reproach offered by him to cease; without his own reproach he shall cause it to turn upon him. The rendering of the LXX. is nearly unintelligible, "And he shall set (δῶσει) his face against the sea, and shall take many (πολλούς), and shall turn the wrath of their reproach in an oath against his reproach." The translator had read לִי instead of לָאִים. Professor Bevan would ingeniously supply some words to the Greek. With all it seems nearly impossible to explain the relation between the Massoretic text and that used by the Septuagint. Theodotion is much briefer, "He shall turn his face to the islands, and shall take many, and shall cause rulers to cease from their reproach; but his reproach shall return upon him." The Peshitta renders, "And he shall turn his face to the islands of the sea, and shall conquer many, and a ruler of reproach shall cause it to cease in regard to him, and his reproach shall return to him." The Vulgate is closely related to the Peshitta. We would render the last clause, with Behrmann, "Yea, his reproach will he repay to him." The events referred to are clear and obvious enough. Antiochus the Great took advantage of the disastrous defeat inflicted on Philip of Macedonia by the Romans, to seize many of the islands of the archipelago. He not only took possession of all the Asiatic dominions of Philip, but crossed into Europe and seized Thrace. The Romans demanded that he should retire from all the former dominions of Philip. He refused, and war ensued, in which, after being driven out of Europe, he was totally defeated at Magnesia by Lucius Scipio, and compelled to surrender all his dominions west of the Taurus.

Ver. 19.—Then he shall turn his face toward the fort of his own land; but he shall stumble and fall, and not be found. The versions do not present any occasion for remark. After his defeat, Antiochus was not only compelled to submit to the loss of much of his empire, but was adjudged to pay all the expenses of the war, estimated at eighteen thousand Eubœic talents. Justin relates thus the death of Antiochus: "Meanwhile in Syria King Antiochus, being loaded with heavy tribute after his defeat by the Romans, whether urged by want of money or impelled by avarice, flattering himself that, under the plea of necessity, he might with fair excuse commit sacrilege, assaulted with an armed force by night the

temple of Jove (Bel) in Elymais. But the attempt having been discovered, there was a concourse of the inhabitants, and he was slain with all his forces." The resemblance here between the fate of Antiochus the Great and that of his son Epiphanes is so striking as to throw suspicion on one or other of them.

Ver. 20.—Then shall stand up in his estate a raiser of taxes in the glory of the kingdom; but within few days he shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle. The rendering of the LXX. differs very much from this, "Then shall a plant arise out of his root to the restoration (ἀνάστασις) of the kingdom, a man striking the glory of a king." It is impossible to find any connection between the opening clause of this and the corresponding clause in the Massoretic. Some of the other clauses contain echoes of the Massoretic, or *vice versa*. The first clause of ver. 21 in the LXX. really belongs to this verse, "In the last days he shall be broken, not in wrath nor in war," reading thus, אֶחָדָם ("haroneem) instead of אֶחָדָם ("shadeem). Theodotion agrees in the first clause with the Septuagint, but is equally unintelligible, "There shall arise out of his root one removing a plant of the kingdom; on his preparation he shall act (πράσσειν), the glory of the kingdom; yet in those days he shall be broken, and not openly (ἐνπροσώποις) nor in war shall he stand." The Peshitta renders, "In his stead shall one stand up who shall cause a ruler to pass through even the glory of your kings; and in a few days he shall be destroyed, not in tumult, nor in battle." The Vulgate renders, "In his stead shall stand a vile person (vilisimus), and unworthy of royal dignity; and in a few days he shall be broken, not in fury, nor in battle." Difficult as is the interpretation of the words, just as difficult is it to find out the reference. Seleucus Philopator, who succeeded Antiochus, might be called a "raiser of taxes," as he had to meet as best he could the heavy demands of the Roman treasury. The rendering of the Revised suits also, "causing the exactor to pass through the glory of the kingdom." The reference might be to Heliodorus, were there any probability that he ever made an expedition to rob the temple. Certainly the story in 2 Maccabees makes it doubtful. It is not likely that Palestine would be exempt from taxation. To a Jew resident in Palestine—the land the possession of which had been the occasion of so many wars—it might well seem the glory of the Syrian kingdom. But within few days he shall be destroyed. It is difficult to understand how the writer could reckon the reign of Seleucus Philopator as only a few days. His reign

of twelve years was certainly much shorter than that of his father Antiochus, but longer than that of Epiphanes his brother, or of Seleucus III. his uncle. The Greek versions do not give this clause. If we do not resort to the somewhat desperate remedy of altering the rendering, we are compelled to measure the days from the taxing of Judaea. A good deal might be said for the reading of the LXX. *He shall be destroyed, neither in anger, nor in battle.* If we may assume as correct the unsupported account of Appian, that Seleucus IV. was assassinated by Heliodorus, we can see that he was destroyed "not in battle." It conveys an idea of the facts of the case different from that given in Appian, when we say he was "not destroyed in anger." Moreover, the fact that Josephus refers to the death of Seleucus Philopator in terms that imply that he knew nothing of his violent death, makes his alleged assassination by Heliodorus at least doubtful.

Ver. 21.—And in his estate shall stand up a vile person, to whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom: but he shall come in peaceably, and obtain the kingdom by flatteries. As said above, the opening clause of this verse, as it appears in the Septuagint, really belongs to the previous verse, "And there shall stand up in his place a mean person (*ἐνκαταφρόνῃτος*), and the glory of a king shall not be given to him, and he shall come suddenly, and the king shall be strong in his inheritance." Evidently the translator, has omitted the reduplication and has derived the word חֶלְקָה (*halaqlaqqoth*) from חֶלֶק (*hel'qah*), "a portion," "an inheritance." Theodotus's rendering is not very intelligible, "On his preparation he shall be set at naught, and they shall not give to him the glory of the kingdom, he shall come in prosperously (*ἐν εὐθηνίᾳ*), and shall overpower the kingdom by flatteries." It is, however, more in accordance with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta is in practical agreement with the Massoretic, and the Vulgate reads as if a rendering of the Peshitta. It is assumed that this is Antiochus Epiphanes, yet there are considerable difficulties. A vile person. Certainly he was morally vile enough, though not nearly so vile as some of the kings of Egypt, his contemporaries, or some of his own ancestors. The meaning of נָמָה is "rejected," "despised" (see Isa. liii. 3). It may be that it was derived from the idea that the Romans rejected Epiphanes as a hostage, and demanded Demetrius the son of Seleucus instead, and so Epiphanes got the opportunity of returning to Syria. This, however, is not the aspect which the matter assumes in Appian. Seleucus

appears as the party desiring the change of hostage. *To whom they shall not give the honour of the kingdom.* That certainly is not the case; he had the kingdom as much as his brother had; he was acknowledged as king. He certainly had not the power his father had before his defeat at Magnesia, but he had as much as the semi-subject conditions of Syria permitted. *He shall come in peaceably.* That also is doubtful, for Eumenes of Pergamos supported his claims with an army. *Obtain the kingdom by flatteries.* Even that is not a prominent feature of the accession of Antiochus. The Septuagint, as will be seen, separates between the vile person who should not have the glory of the kingdom given to him, and the king who should be strong in his inheritance. If we were sure that Appian had followed Polybius, we might see in the first part of the verse Heliodorus, and in the second the coming of Epiphanes.

Ver. 22.—And with the arms of a flood shall they be overflown from before him, and shall be broken; yes, also the prince of the covenant. The rendering of the LXX. is very wide of this, "And the broken arms he shall break from before him." Although this is much shorter than the Massoretic text, yet the contradictory assertion that arms already broken are broken before him is conclusive against accepting the evidence of the Septuagint absolutely. Theodotus agrees with the Massoretic, not with the English versions, "And the arms of the overflowing shall be overflowed from before him, and be broken, even the leader of the covenant." The Peshitta is widely different, alike from the Massoretic text and that of the Septuagint, "And their mighty ones of the city he shall carry away, and they shall be broken from before him, even the leader of the covenant." The Vulgate stands in a closer relation with the above than with the Massoretic text or the Greek versions, "The arms (*brachia*) of one fighting shall be driven out (*expugnabuntur*) from his face, and shall be broken besides, and (*insuper et*) the leader of the covenant." The reference here seems to be to the campaign—if there was a campaign—by which Epiphanes secured possession of the throne of Syria. *The prince of the covenant.* Who this can be it is impossible to say. The idea supported by Hitzig, Bevan, Behrmann, that Onias III. is referred to, is founded on the utterly unhistorical narrative in 2 Macc. iv. The view of Moses Stuart is that it is some sovereign who had a league of amity with Epiphanes. The reference thus might be to Eumenes or Attalus, who supported the claims of Antiochus. *Neged breeth* may be explanatory of the pre-

nominal suffix in *milpanayo*, "before him." As Stuart acutely remarks, had the reference in *b'reeth* been to the Divine covenant with the Jews, we should have had *habbereth*.

Ver. 23.—And after the league made with him he shall work deceitfully: for he shall come up, and shall become strong with a small people. The rendering of the LXX. is, "And with the covenant and a people set in array he shall fabricate a lie, even against a strong nation with (*ἐν*) a small people." The rendering of Theodotion is somewhat difficult to comprehend, "By reason of leagues against him, he shall make a device, and shall ascend and master them with few people." The Peshitta is very like Theodotion, only the last clause of this verse is regarded as the first of the next. The Vulgate is closer to the Massoretic than are any of the other ancient versions, "And after friendships with him, he shall work fraud, and shall go up and conquer with a small number." The reference here is to the obscure events which attended the contest—if there was a contest—that resulted in Epiphanes securing the throne. The alliance may refer to his league with Eumenes. Appian assigns as a reason for the help given to Epiphanes by Eumenes, that it was to gain his friendship. Only Appian mentions "Attalus and Eumenes," as if they were separate sovereigns; but Attalus was brother of Eumenes, and, at the time of the arrival of Epiphanes, his brother's envoy at Rome. There may be some foundation of fact, and this would explain the statement in the text. The hopes of Eumenes, if he wished to strengthen himself by an alliance with Epiphanes, were probably soon frustrated, as Epiphanes involved himself in conflict with Egypt.

Ver. 24.—He shall enter peaceably even upon the fattest places of the province; and he shall do that which his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; he shall scatter among them the prey, and spoil, and riches: yea, and he shall forecast his devices against the strong holds, even for a time. The rendering of the LXX. is, "Suddenly he shall desolate the city, and he shall do such things as his fathers have not done, nor his father's fathers, and he shall give captives (*πρηνουμή*, Deut. xxi.) and spoils and riches to them; and against the strong city a device shall be forecast (*διανοήσεται*), and his reasonings are in vain." In the first clause, *עָרָא* seems to have been read instead of *מִדְבָּרָא*. *Medeena* is taken in its Syriac meaning. It is difficult to see what reading could produce both the Massoretic and the Septuagint renderings. Theodotion differs alike from this and from the Massoretic, "And in plenty, and in the fat places he shall come, and he shall do

what his fathers have not done, nor his fathers' fathers; and he shall disperse among them captives (*πρηνουμή*), and spoil and possessions, and against (*ἐν*) Egypt he shall devise devices, even for a season." The Peshitta is like the Massoretic. It joins what is reckoned the last clause of ver. 23 to the present verse, and omits "peaceably;" the last words of this verse are transferred to the next. The Vulgate is more related to Theodotion than to the Massoretic text, "And he shall enter plentiful (*abundantes*) and rich cities." The remaining part of the verse agrees with the Massoretic text. The events here indicated are somewhat difficult to identify. The histories of this period are scanty, and, with the exception of Polybius, whose work has come to us in a fragmentary condition, not very trustworthy. Moreover, the readings are uncertain in a portion of the verse. It is generally held to describe the first entrance of Epiphanes into Palestine or Egypt—more generally the latter—an opinion shared by Theodotion. The English versions do not bring out the probable meaning, although their rendering agrees with the Massoretic pointing, "That which his fathers have not done," etc. The repeated triumphant invasions of Egypt are probably referred to. *Forecast devices against the strong holds*. This may refer to the siege of Alexandria, which he was on the eve of commencing when he was compelled by the Roman envoy, Popilius Lena, to desist; but this is evidently the subject of the later verse. We can most easily understand this verse if we regard it as a summary of the whole reign of Antiochus.

Ver. 25.—And he shall stir up his power and his courage against the king of the south with a great army; and the king of the south shall be stirred up to battle with a very great and mighty army; but he shall not stand; for they shall forecast devices against him. The versions present no point of remark, save that, instead of "king of the south," the Septuagint has, as usual, "the King of Egypt." This is supposed to be a compendious account of the second of the wars waged by Epiphanes against Egypt; but it suits the first better. At this time the Romans had declared war against Perseus, King of Macedon, and Antiochus, finding that they did not conquer Macedon easily, regarded the opportunity a suitable one for assailing Egypt and wresting from Ptolemy Philometor Cœle-Syria, which his father had given as dower with Cleopatra, his daughter. The state of Egypt presented an aspect eminently hopeful to an assailant. The court of Egypt was full of intrigue and treachery; the centre of intrigue was the brother of the king, Ptolemy, nicknamed

Physcon. The king, Ptolemy, was young; his generals, however, took up the challenge, and set on the field a large army; but the army was defeated, and Antiochus advanced as far as Memphis. Ptolemy was taken prisoner by his uncle, and Physcon his brother ascended the throne. The defeat of Philometor was supposed to be largely due to treachery.

Ver. 26.—*Yea, they that feed of the portion of his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall overflow; and many shall fall down slain.* The Septuagint rendering here is different, "And his cares shall consume him and turn him away, and he shall pass by (and shall hiss, *κατασπύει*); and many shall fall down wounded." Paulus

Tellensis renders *κατασπύει* by *נִגְרוּפִי* (*nigrophi*), "shall overflow," as if he had read *καταπύσεται*, or perhaps *κατασπύει*, though it does not exactly represent the Hebrew. Theodotion is like the Massoretic, "And they eat his provisions, and shall break him to pieces; and he shall overflow powers, and many shall fall wounded." The account of the invasion of Egypt by Epiphanes occurs in 1 Macc. i. 18. The Septuagint translator appears to have read, instead of *נִגְרוּפִי* (*nigrophi*), *נֶאֱחָלִי דַּגְוֹתָר* (*nachloy path-bago*), *נֶאֱחָלִי דַּגְוֹתָר* (*nachloy dagothar*). There would seem also to have been some confusion between *הֵל* (*heel*), "strength," and *הָלַךְ* (*halach*), "to go." The Peshitta rendering is, "They that eat his meat shall destroy him, and his army shall be dispersed, and many shall fall wounded." The Vulgate is closely related to this. This refers to the treachery which was alleged to have been at work and to have caused the overthrow of Philometor in his contest with his uncle. The version of the Septuagint is more picturesque, and more in accordance with facts. Cares might well devour Ptolemy Philometor—treachery in his army and his brother occupying his throne. Certainly he was defeated, turned aside, and was compelled to accompany the victor as a prisoner, while Egypt was wasted (*κατασπύει*).

Ver. 27.—*And both these kings' hearts shall be to do mischief, and they shall speak lies at one table; but it shall not prosper: for yet the end shall be at the time appointed.* The Septuagint Version is, "And two kings shall dine alone at the same time, and eat at one table, and they shall speak lies, and they shall not prosper." The translator has read *לִבָּם* instead of *לִבָּם*. Theodotion is closer to the Massoretic, agreeing in this with the Peshitta and Vulgate. The probable reference is to Ptolemy Philometor,

conveyed practically a prisoner with his uncle's army, while Epiphanes carried on his invasion of Egypt. They dined at one table, and probably deceived each the other. The purpose of Ptolemy was to get his usurping brother Physcon dethroned; the object of Antiochus was to possess Egypt for himself. Rashi sees in this a reference to the quarrels and reconciliations which diversified the conflict between John Hyrcanus II. and his brother Aristobulus. Jepheth-ibn-Ali makes the two kings mean Arabia and Rome, since, according to him, these are respectively the kings of the south and of the north. *Yet the end shall be at the time appointed.* The progress of Antiochus was interrupted by the Romans.

Ver. 28.—*Then shall he return into his land with great riches; and his heart shall be against the holy covenant; and he shall do exploits, and return to his own land.* The Greek versions and the Vulgate are in close agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta differs only by omitting the last clause, which certainly seems a redundancy. On his return from his Egyptian campaign, Epiphanes, we learn from 1 Macc. i. 20—23, plundered the temple of all its treasures. On the somewhat suspicious authority of 2 Macc. iv. some have referred to the report spread that Antiochus was dead, and that, taking advantage of this, Jason seized the city and drove Menelaus into the citadel; and that, hearing of this uproar, Antiochus, imagining that Judæa had revolted, retired from Egypt, and wreaked vengeance on Jerusalem, taking it by assault. The slaughter inflicted is confirmed by other authorities; but the resistance implied in the assertion that he took the city by force of arms (*δουρῶσαν*) is contradicted by Josephus and 1 Maccabees.

Ver. 29.—*At the time appointed he shall return, and come toward the south; but it shall not be as the former, or as the latter.* The LXX. does not differ from this materially, save that it has Egypt, as usual, for south, and asserts that the king of the north entered Egypt. Theodotion is also in practical agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta is much shorter, and differs very much from the above, as well as from all the other versions, "And he shall do in the former and in the latter." There seems to have been something omitted. The Vulgate gives a different rendering of the last clause, "The last shall not be like the former." The reference is to the second expedition of Antiochus into Egypt. His two nephews, whose quarrels and rivalries he had hoped to utilize for his own purposes, were now to appearance reconciled;

they agreed to a joint occupation of the throne. It is supposed this second expedition was intended, if possible, to break up this agreement.

Ver. 30.—For the ships of Chittim shall come against him: therefore he shall be grieved, and return, and have indignation against the holy covenant: so shall he do; he shall even return, and have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant. As the LXX. do not obscure the reference to Egypt, so they here call the ships of Chittim *Ῥωμαῖοι*. The rendering is, "And the Romans shall come, and shall drive him out, and shall make him wroth, and he shall return and be enraged against the covenant of the holy, and shall do and return and plot against those on account of whom they left the covenant of the holy." Theodotion renders in a slightly different way, "Those who come from Chittim shall assail, and he shall be humiliated, and he shall return and be enraged against the covenants of the holy. And he shall do and return, and have understanding against those who have been left to the holy covenant." The Peshitta renders more in harmony with the Massoretic text, "Those who come against them from the lines of Chittim, even they shall break him, and he shall turn and be enraged against the holy covenant, and shall have understanding with them that forsake the holy covenant." The rendering of the Vulgate is singular, "And there shall come against him trieres (ships of war, *τριεῖς*) and Romans, and he shall be beaten, and shall return, and shall be enraged against the testament (*testamentum*, covenant) of the holy place and shall do, he shall even return and shall devise against those who have left the testament (*testamentum*) of the holy place." The ships of Chittim are the Roman ships, bearing the envoys of the Senate with C. Popilius Lænas at their head. He delivered to Antiochus the tablets on which were inscribed the wishes of the Senate. Antiochus was then on the eve of commencing the siege of Alexandria, and completing the conquest of Egypt. Having read that the Senate of Rome desired him to refrain from attacking the allies of the Republic, Antiochus said he would answer after consulting with his friends. Lænas drew a circle round him with his staff on the sand, and demanded that he should give his answer before he left the circle. Antiochus had to submit. *Shall have indignation against the holy covenant.* It is not certain whether Antiochus was present personally at the plunder of Jerusalem or superintended the massacre of the Jews; but it is practically certain that at this time began the systematic attempt to put down

Judaism. *And have intelligence with them that forsake the holy covenant.* It is not improbable that Antiochus was encouraged to make the attempt he did, by the fact that so many persons high in position were Hellenizers (1 Macc. i. 11-15, in which there is reference to those that forsook the holy covenant). The desire of Antiochus was probably to make his empire more homogeneous. The Jews, he would see by the fact that they had a national unity apart from his empire, might at times be thorns in his side—might become allies of Rome if he were compelled to engage in war with the Republic. It was their religion that was the bond which united the nation; let that be broken, then there would be a chance of the Jews blending harmoniously with the other races that made up the Syrian Empire. Those that forsook the holy covenant made him think it an easy task.

Ver. 31.—And arms shall stand on his part, and they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall take away the daily sacrifice, and they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate. The rendering of the LXX. is close to the above, "And arms shall stand by him, and shall pollute the sanctuary of fear"—probably the LXX. read *μαγ* (*magor*), "fear," instead of *μφορ* (*ma'oz*), "fortress," a change probably due to the fact that *y* sounded in Greek ears like *a* hard, *Γάρα* for *μφορ*—"and they shall take away the sacrifice and place (*δωσουσι*, give) the abomination of desolation." Theodotion, from a mistaken vocalization, renders, "And seeds"—reading *σπέρμα* instead of *σπέρμα*—"shall spring up from him and shall pollute the sanctuary of power, and shall change the continual (sacrifice), and shall place (*δωσουσι*) the abomination of things that have disappeared (*ἡφανισμένον*)." The Peshitta is quite different in the first clause, "And their strong ones shall arise from them, and they pollute the sanctuary of strength, and they cause the sacrifice (*qorban*) to pass away, and they shall hang up the abomination in the temple." The Vulgate rendering is in accordance generally with the Massoretic, "And arms shall stand from him, and shall pollute the sanctuary of strength, and shall remove the continual (*juge*) sacrifice, and shall place the abomination of desolation." *Arms shall stand on his part.* This word "arms" here is not to be understood as weapons—a misunderstanding possible in English. "Arms" here stands as the symbol of physical power generally. "On his part" is represented by the preposition *עִם*, which means "with" or "from;" hence we find the Septuagint translating by *παρά*,

and Theodotion by ἐξ. Probably the most natural view is to take the preposition as equivalent to "by," that is, he shall set physical forces in motion. *And they shall pollute the sanctuary of strength.* That the temple in Jerusalem had all the characteristics that fitted it to become a fortress, was proved in every one of the numerous sieges it has endured. It becomes still more a fortress, of course, when the Tower Antonia was erected overlooking the temple area. There may, however, have been a reference to the fact that the collectors of tribute sent by Antiochus fortified the city of David, and used it as a basis of operations from which to assail the temple and defile its courts with blood (1 Macc. i. 35—36). *And take away the daily sacrifice.* The Hebrew word here used means "continual," and the substantive "sacrifice" is supplied. In ver. 45 of the same chapter of 1 Macc. we are told that Antiochus forbade "burnt offerings, and sacrifices, and drink offerings in the temple." *And they shall place the abomination that maketh desolate.* One must note here the source of δῶσουσι which we find in both Greek versions, and dabit, which we find in the Vulgate. The Hebrew has נתן (ʿnath'noo), "and they shall give or set." It seems to refer to an altar to Jupiter, which was erected on the brazen altar (1 Macc. i. 59). This altar is spoken of in ver. 54 as the "abomination of desolation (βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως)." The Hebrew phrase has been borrowed from ch. ix. 27; hence the suggestion of Professor Bevan, to read here נתן, is not necessary.

Ver. 32.—*And such as do wickedly against the covenant shall be corrupt by flatteries: but the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.* The LXX. translates, "And by sins of the covenant shall they defile themselves with a hard people, and the people knowing these things shall have the mastery and do (exploits)." The כ, the preformative of the participle hiphil, has been taken for the preposition כ written defectively, and probably כִּי כִּי for כִּי־כִי. Theodotion does not require special notice, as his version here agrees closely with the Massoretic. The Peshitta is somewhat shorter and having a different significance, "And those who transgress against the covenant he shall condemn them. And the people who know the fear shall be strong." The Vulgate rendering is, "And the impious against the covenant shall feign falsely (simulabunt fraudulent), but the people knowing their God shall possess and do (exploits)." Men like Alcimus, the high priest after Menelaus, were transgressors of the sacred covenant, and were corrupted by the flatteries of

Epiphanes. He used them to gain the people over to his views. *But the people that do know their God shall be strong, and do exploits.* Even when Epiphanes seemed most nearly successful, there was a deep-seated opposition to this Hellenizing process. Especially prominent were those who were zealous for the Law, the *Hasidim*, or, to give them the name they have in the Book of Maccabees, the *Assidians*. These religionists, headed by Mattathias and his sons, especially by the heroic Judas Maccabæus, certainly knew their God, and as certainly did exploits.

Ver. 33.—*And they that understand among the people shall instruct many: yet they shall fall by the sword, and by flame, by captivity, and by spoil, many days.* The LXX. rendering is, "The prudent of the people shall understand in multitudes (ἐν πολλοῖς), and they shall push against them with the sword, and shall grow old with it (παλαιωθήσονται ἐν αὐτῇ)." We should feel inclined to read ἐπιδάσσαν, had Paulus Tellensis not read as the text, "And by bondage and by plunder of days they shall be disgraced." The mysterious clause, "shall grow old with it," is due to the translation of עָבַד (sh'eevee), "captivity," as if it had been עָבַד (seebah), "oldage." Theodotion is obscure also. "The understanding of the people shall understand in regard to many things, and they shall suffer (ἀσθενήσουσιν) by the sword, and with fire, and by captivity, and in plunder of days." The Peshitta renders, "The dispersed of the people shall instruct many, and they shall fall by the sword, and by fire, by captivity, and by spoil, a thousand days." The Vulgate does not supply any point worthy of remark. *And they that understand among the people shall instruct many.* In 1 Macc. ii. 27 we have an account of a multitude instructed in the Law and determined to keep it, who, with their wives, children, and cattle, retired into the desert. *Yet they shall fall by the sword, etc.* After the multitude pursued the army of King Antiochus, which was at Jerusalem, and overtook them, the fugitives would not submit to sacrifice to idols. The army assailed them on the sabbath day; from a superstitious reverence for the day of rest, they did not even defend themselves, and therefore fell an easy prey to their enemies (1 Macc. ii. 38, "They slew them with their wives, and children, and their cattle to the number of a thousand people"). While we would not be held as regarding as literally historical the sufferings of Eleazar and the seven brethren and their mother, as related in 2 Macc. vi. and vii., and more fully in 4 Maccabees, yet it can only have been an exaggeration of what must have actually occurred.

Ver. 34.—Now when they shall fall, they shall be holpen with a little help: but many shall cleave to them with flatteries. The Septuagint rendering is, "And when they are crushed many shall be gathered to them in (ἐν) the city, even many as in distribution by lot (καταβολαί)." This phrase is

rendered by Paulus Tellenensis, فصل

(*poolog pesa*), "the division of the lots;" wrongly rendered by Bugati, in *hereditate*. The reading here is due to dropping of the reduplication in *h'laqlaqoth*. The Peshitta generally agrees with the Massoretic, only it renders the last clause, "Many shall add themselves to them in division, فصل

(*palgoota*)," which, however, Castelli renders in this one case as *simulatio*. When success crowned the arms of Judas and his brethren, many of the Sadducean party joined themselves to them, although formerly they belonged to the Hellenizers. This association rendered the Assidæans dissatisfied, and resulted in disaster. Probably the reference is to nothing so far down history. When Judas began to be successful, many would join him, hoping, by a limited amount of treachery to Judas, to secure safety if the king ultimately prevailed, while at the same time, their presence with the Maccabees would save them from the vengeance of their own countrymen if Judas were successful and the Syrian yoke thrown off.

Ver. 35.—And some of them of understanding shall fall, to try them, and to purge, and to make them white, even to the time of the end; because it is yet for a time appointed. The rendering of the LXX. is, "And some of those of understanding shall consider to purify themselves both to be chosen and to be purified to the time of the end, for the season is for hours." The translator must have read בְּכָל instead of בְּכָל. The reading of the Massoretic is to be preferred. Theodotion's, while closer to the Massoretic text, is not identical with the sense as represented by the Authorized and Revised Versions, "And some of those of understanding shall be weak to try them, that they may be chosen out and revealed at the end of time, for it yet is for a season." Both Greek versions, as will be seen, render *barar*, "choose"—a meaning it has in the pual—and both omit one of the clauses. In this the Greek versions have the support of the Peshitta, which renders, "And (some) of the wise shall be overthrown to choose among them, and that they may understand to the end, because it is again protracted for a season." Here, too, the last of the clauses descriptive of the effect of the fall

of the wise is omitted. Although the Vulgate supports the Massoretic in this, we feel it suspicious. And some of them of understanding shall fall. Though marvellously successful, yet Judas and his comrades suffered some reverses; the reference may be to those that fell in battle. The rendering in Theodotion would seem to point to some apostatizing. We have no record of any such cases, yet it is not impossible that some would fall away. This would be a greater trial than defeat and the death in battle of such heroes as Eleazar, surnamed Avaran, or even of Judas Maccabeus himself. To try them, and to purge, and to make them white. The death of teachers and of military leaders would be a severe test of the zeal and enthusiasm of the faithful. All the fearful and insincere would fall off from the ranks of the faithful. Those zealous for the Law of God would be at once tried and purified by these untoward events. This has been the experience of the Christian Church in every age. Because more a trial, therefore more purifying would be the failure of some to maintain the faith under trial. Even to the time of the end: because it is yet for a time appointed. It is in perfect accordance with the view that the purpose of the death of teachers and leaders, even their failure, is the purification of the saints, that the time of the trial should be fixed and definite. This view is frequent in the Apocalypse.

Ver. 36.—And the king shall do according to his will; and he shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god, and shall speak marvellous things against the God of gods, and shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished; for that that is determined shall be done. The LXX. does not differ greatly from this, "And the king shall do according to his will, and shall be enraged, and be exalted above every god, and against the God of gods shall he speak marvellous things (ἐξάλλα) and shall prosper until the wrath be accomplished; for on him (ἐν αὐτῷ) there is an end." The difference in the last clause is considerable between the LXX., and not easily explicable. Theodotion differs somewhat more, "And he shall do according to his will; and the king shall be exalted, and be magnified, and he shall speak marvellous things, and he shall prosper until the wrath is ended; for it is to a determined end (συντέλειαν)." The Peshitta is closely related to the Massoretic, even in the last clause, where a difference is manifested in the others. The Vulgate affords no occasion of remark. The question that has to be settled here is—Who is the king who shall do according to his pleasure? Aben Ezra maintained the refer-

ence was to Constantine the Great. Rashi, followed by Calvin, would make it the Roman Empire personified. He notices the Rabbins' referring this to Titus and Vespasian. As above mentioned, his own view is that the 'Monarchia Romana' is here intended. Jepheth-ibn-Ali sees in this a prophecy of Mohammed; others, Wordsworth and Rule, following Jerome and Luther, think the reference here is to the antichrist of the New Testament. For our own part, we see no necessity for supposing any other monarch than Epiphanes is referred to. While Livy and Polybius remark on the piety of Epiphanes, it may seem strange to refer what is said here to him; but his ruthless plundering of temples proved that his piety was merely a political expedient. *Speak marvellous things against the God of gods.* We have no record of any proclamations of Antiochus which exactly suit this; but then we must bear in mind that we have only compendious accounts of what he did proclaim. To the heathen, moreover, as to Polybius and Livy, words of contempt against Jehovah would seem nothing worse than impolitic; but to the Jew, blasphemous words would be so horrible that they would not be recorded, as being a contamination: hence it is not extraordinary that we hear nothing of blasphemy in the history of Antiochus. The forbidding of sacrifices and of circumcision, while clearly enough dishonouring to God and to the Jewish nation, do not contain enough to justify the statement. *Shall prosper till the indignation be accomplished.* If by the indignation (*byn, za'am*) is meant the sufferings endured by the Jewish people, then the prosperity of Epiphanes—his life, indeed—did not last so long as the sufferings inflicted on the Jews; for these continued for some time after his death. There is probably here an indication that the writer's horizon did not reach to the death of Antiochus. Certain, by his faith in God, that Antiochus would perish, he thinks that until that time he may prosper. *For that that is determined shall be done.* There is considerable difficulty as to the text here, but all the various forms convey the same meaning—a definite limit to oppression.

Ver. 37.—*Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women, nor regard any god: for he shall magnify himself above all.* The Septuagint rendering is, "And to the gods of his fathers he will not have respect, and to the desire of women he will not have respect, because in everything he shall be exalted, and by him strong nations shall be subdued." The last clause belongs really to the next verse, of the first clause of which it is a variant reading. Theodotion is nearly identical in sense with

this, "And no god of his fathers will he regard (*συνήσει*) and a desire of women."¹ This clause stands thus incomplete, as if the translator would have finished it with (*αὐτῷ*) "to him"—"he regards no god, because over all he is exalted." The Peshitta rendering is, "And to the god of his fathers he shall not have regard; nor to the desire of women, nor any god, will he have respect; but over all he shall exalt himself." It is to be noted that the Peshitta renders as does the English Version, and has the singular, "the God of his fathers," not as the Greek versions, "the gods of his." The Hebrew might be either. The Vulgate agrees here with the Syriac. *Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers.* Antiochus is looked upon, not as a man of Macedonian or Greek descent, but as a Syrian, and certainly he had no reverence for the ancient gods of Syria. His opposition to the theocracy and to the worship of Jehovah was but a portion of a wide policy, the object of which was the abolition of all local cults. *The desire of women.* It might mean that he was not lustful; but there is no evidence that, like Charles XII, he was abstinent. On the other hand, he never neglected war for luxury, as did some of the Hellenic kings. Moreover, it is almost imperative that it be an object of worship that is here referred to. Taking "the desire of women" as an object of worship, there is an interpretation which has come down to us from Ephrem Syrus and Jerome, that Beltis or Nanäsa is here referred to; and the fact that in an attempt to plunder the temple of this goddess, in Elymais, Antiochus lost his life, supports this view. The worship is said to have been very lascivious. On the other hand, it was a worship that would not naturally be prominent to a Palestinian Jew. The suggestion of Ewald, that it was the worship of Adonis or Tammuz which Antiochus despised, is more likely to be meant here. *For he shall magnify himself above all.* Claiming the right of annulling worship, and taking the sacred utensils from the temple treasures, he allowed himself to be addressed by the Samaritans as a god. Antiochus was probably utterly without faith in the Divine; worship was merely policy.

Ver. 38.—*But in his estate shall he honour the God of forces: and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honour with gold, and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things.* As we have said above, the last clause of the preceding verse accord-

¹ The reading preferred by Grabe, *ἐν ἐπιθυμίαν πάντα*, is an attempt to make the passage more intelligible.

ing to the LXX. really belongs to this, "Strong nations shall be subject to him," reading לְאֵלֵי קָדְשִׁים instead of לְאֵלֵי קָדְשִׁים. There is ה in the Massoretic, where 'has been in the reading followed by the Septuagint. After this clause the Septuagint proceeds, "And to his place he shall move, and a god whom his fathers knew not he shall honour with gold, and silver, and precious stones." It is possible that נָדָד (*nadad*), "to flee or move," was read instead of כָּבֵד (*kabad*), "to honour," for though נָדָד is usually active and transitive, there is no object here. Theodotion has, "And the God of Maozeim he shall honour in his place, and a god whom his father knew not he shall honour with gold, silver, and precious stones, and with offerings." The Peshitta rendering is freer, "The mighty god he shall honour in his possession, and a god whom his fathers have not known shall he honour with gold and with silver, with precious gems and desirable things." The Vulgate adopts the transliteration *Maosim*. *In his estate shall he honour the god of forces*. There are a number of questions here. To whom does the prenominal suffix refer? The English translators have arranged the words so that we cannot escape the view that "the estate" is the king's, but the natural meaning of the Hebrew order is that it is "on the place" or "pedestal" of the god. The word translated "estate" is used in Gen. xl. 13 for "office." It is used of the "base" of the "laver." It may mean "place." The next point—What Deity is meant by "the god of strong holds"? There is absolutely nothing to guide us in the matter. Some have supposed that the reference is to Jupiter Olympius, whose statue Antiochus is reported to have set up in the temple. Others, that the reference is to Jupiter Capitolinus. Were there any evidences that Antiochus worshipped the genius of Rome, something might be urged for this; but we have no evidence of this. In the absence of anything to fix a definite meaning on this word, we feel inclined to suggest that Jehovah is meant by the *eloah mauzeem*. Repeatedly in the Psalms is God declared to be the Strength of the saint; e.g. Ps. xxvii. 1; xliii. 2. Of Jehovah it might be said that the ancestors of Antiochus—Greek and Syrian—knew him not. *Honour with gold*, etc. The repeated defeats of the armies of Antiochus and the spoiling of their camps by the followers of Jehovah, was giving honour to Jehovah, however unwittingly and unwillingly it was done. God "gave him honour upon Pharaoh," and so now he was honoured upon Epiphanes.

Ver. 39.—Thus shall he do in the most strong holds with a strange god, whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory;

DANIEL.

and he shall cause them to rule over many, and shall divide the land for gain. The version of the LXX. is somewhat difficult to render intelligibly, "By desires of cities he shall act, and to a strong fortress shall he come with a strange god whom he will acknowledge; he will increase his glory, and shall master him much, and shall divide his territory freely." The first words of this belong to the previous verse, and at the same time there has been some confusion with the opening words of the present verse according to the Massoretic division. Theodotion is not much closer to the received text, "And he shall act in strongholds of refuge with a strange god, and shall increase glory, and subject many to them, and shall divide the land in gifts." The sense of this last, as given in the Greek versions, is illustrated by Ps. xvi. 4. The Peshitta renders, "He shall pass over¹ to the strong cities, on account of ('al) the strange gods which he shall see, and he shall rule over many, and the land he shall divide for gain." The Vulgate renders more in accordance with Theodotion than with the Massoretic yet independently, "And he shall do (*faciet*) that he may fortify *Maosim* with a foreign god, whom he knew not, and shall multiply glory, and shall give to them power in many (things), and shall divide the land gratuitously." This verse as it stands is nearly unintelligible. The suggestion of Hitzig and von Lengerke, followed by Bevan, that we should read מִן ('am), "people," instead of מִן ('em), "with," is very plausible. The only objection is that none of the versions have it. As, however, it seems to us the only way out of the difficulty, we shall take this reading, and render, with Professor Bevan, "He shall procure for the strong fortresses the people of a strange god." For this use of מִן Professor Bevan refers to 2 Sam. xv. 1, "Absalom procured for himself chariot and horses;" 1 Kings i. 5, so of Adonijah. *Whom he shall acknowledge and increase with glory*. This we should render, "who have acknowledged him," making the antecedent to the relative, not the king, but "the people of the strange god;" the reference being to the mercenaries of the Syrian army, who were the people of a god strange to the Israelites, and not impossibly made less difficultly in giving up their national gods, and recognizing the gods of Greece as their gods. The K'thib here is the preterite instead of the imperfect, which occurs in the following clause, the reading which we accept here *He shall increase with glory*; or rather, *h*

¹ Is this due to error in transcription in the manuscripts of the Peshitta, 'aber being written instead of 'bad?

shall multiply in glory. These mercenaries of his he would increase, and give ever more honour to them. *And he shall cause them to rule over many.* These mercenaries placed in fenced cities were formed into Hellenic communities, and received many of the natives as subjects. The reference is not merely to garrisons being placed in fortresses, but to a chain of Hellenic cities, which, in imitation of the Romans, Antiochus placed in Palestine. *And shall divide the land for gain.* As will be seen, the Greek versions and the Vulgate reverse the idea here, and render—the LXX., *δωδεδν*, "gratuitously;" Theodotion, *ἐν δώποις*, "in gifts;" the Vulgate, *gratuito*, which is due to reading *מְהֵר* (*m'heer*) instead of *מְהֵר* (*m'heer*). The word may mean, as it is taken by the English versions and the Peshitta to mean, "for a price;" as in 2 Sam. xxiv. 24, David purchased the threshing-floor of Araunah *bim'heer*, "at a price;" but it also means "wages," as in Micah iii. 11, "Her priests teach for hire wages (*bim'heer*)." The reference, then, is to the fact that in the depleted state of his treasury, Antiochus divided the land of Palestine to his mercenaries, in lieu of the wages he could not pay.

Ver. 40.—*And at the time of the end shall the king of the south push at him: and the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships; and he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.* The Septuagint Version is somewhat shorter, "And at the time of the end the King of Egypt shall push at him: and the king of the north shall be enraged at him, with chariots and many horses and many ships, and shall enter into the land of Egypt." Probably the Massoretic has been amplified. Still it is a possible thing that, as Egypt was the natural objective of all the military preparations of Syria, the shorter summary might be inserted instead of the longer paraphrase of the Massoretic. Throughout in the Septuagint Version, as may be noted, "Egypt" stands in place of "the south." Theodotion is much closer to the Massoretic, but omits "the whirlwind," and has, instead of "countries," *γῆν*, "the land." The Peshitta differs in some respects more from the Massoretic than either of the Greek texts, "And at the end of time the king of the south shall strive with him: and the king of the north shall be moved against him, with chariots and horsemen and with many ships; and he shall act impiously in the land." The Vulgate agrees with the Massoretic text. *At the time of the end.* This refers to the same "time of the end" as that in ver. 35; that is to say, not the end of the world,

but the end of this distress. It is possible that to the writer the entrance of the new era—the Messianic time—would coincide with the fall of Antiochus, and that this era might be regarded as the end of the world. *The king of the south shall push at him.* This suggests war begun by the King of Egypt against Syria. It is difficult to see how this could take place after the fourth expedition of Antiochus into Egypt. The two brothers, Philometor and Euergetes (Physcon), were at war with each other shortly after this, and though Philometor gained the mastery, he was not in a position to threaten Syria. Certainly, had Ptolemy Philometor been in a position to take vengeance on his uncle, the successful rebellion of the Jews afforded an opportunity. We have no record in Polybius, Livy, 1 Macabees, or Josephus of any fifth expedition of Egypt against Epiphanes, either planned or attempted. Polybius is certainly fragmentary, and so to a greater extent is Livy; yet what has come down bears on events so near chronologically to this alleged expedition planned against Syria that it would scarcely fail to be noticed. *And the king of the north shall come against him like a whirlwind, with chariots, and with horsemen, and with many ships.* This purports to be an account of an expedition undertaken by Epiphanes against Ptolemy, presumably Philometor. Of this there is not a trace; Antiochus is in so great need of money that he must use one half his army to collect money by robbing temples in Elymais, while the other, under Lysias, is occupied in attempting to put down the rebellion of the Jews. Again the historians of the period are silent, and what they tell us is inconsistent with this fifth expedition. Jerome, in his commentary on Daniel, quotes Porphyry, who gives an account of an expedition against Egypt in the eleventh year of his reign. That, however, was the year of his death—the year, therefore, of his expedition against Elymais. It is impossible that in the beginning of that year he should undertake such an expedition into Egypt as that described by Porphyry, and at the end have time to march into Elymais. It cannot be the expedition of Lysias which is referred to, for he is represented (1 Mac. iii. 32) as having the oversight of all the territory of the king from the river Euphrates, but there is no notice of ships. *And he shall enter into the countries, and shall overflow and pass over.* This might refer to the expedition which Antiochus undertook to Elymais, but in the following verse we learn the direction was toward Egypt. No such expedition occurred after the fourth. What explanation is to be given of this? The

explanation favoured by Keil of this whole chapter, that the king of the north is antichrist, is applied here; but so much of the earlier portion of this chapter can be interpreted as history, that we, for our part, are loth to give an eschatological interpretation to this. The view favoured by most is that here the author narrated his expectations, but these expectations were contrary to facts. This is Professor Bevan's view. If this view had been correct, the expectations of the author would be falsified almost as soon as they were recorded; this would certainly seem to render it impossible for the book to get the vogue it did. We, for our part, favour a modification of the view maintained by Hitzig, that this section is a repetition of what has been previously mentioned. Against this is the chronological statement at the beginning. Regarding, as we do, this chapter as an interpolation and the work of a later hand, our idea is that the section before us is one attempt to interpolate, and the preceding section is another, and that both have been incorporated in the narrative.

Ver. 41.—He shall enter also into the glorious land, and many countries shall be overthrown; but these shall escape out of his hand, even Edom, and Moab, and the chief of the children of Ammon. The Septuagint rendering is slightly of the nature of a paraphrase, "And he shall pass into my land,¹ and many (feminine) shall be offended, and these shall be saved from his hand, Edom, and Moab, and the head of the sons of Ammon." It is possible that the word *tz'bee* was omitted, and the prenominal suffix attached to *'aretz*. Theodotion renders, "And he shall enter into the land of the Sabaeem, and many shall be made weak; but these shall be delivered out of his hand, Edom, and Moab, and chief of the sons of Ammon." The transliteration here might suggest רָבִי instead of רִבִּי, and a mistake of the former for רָבִי is in the square letters not impossible; but *x* and *y* are, in the older scripts, very unlike. The Peshitta, while agreeing with the Massoretic generally, renders, "the glorious land," "the land of Israel"—an evident paraphrase. The Vulgate introduces *solæ* before Edom and Moab, otherwise agreeing with the received text. The expedition of Antiochus reaches Palestine, on which the full force of the tempest is represented as being directed. The countries adjacent

escape. Edom, Moab, and Ammon are mentioned, but Moab had by this time disappeared as a national name. It may have been inserted—as suggested by Professor Bevan—in consequence of the frequent conjunction of the three names, "Moab, Ammon, and Mount Seir." It is, however, singular that these nations should be named as "escaping," since they were the allies of Antiochus, or more properly, as they would be regarded by him as subjects, his instruments in the oppression of Israel. It may be that this version of the vision of Daniel has been less modified from the original than what has preceded. In the original document, Edom, Moab, and Ammon might have some symbolic reference. *The glorious land* can scarcely be other than Palestine. It is rendered by Ewald, "the land of the ornament." It might be rendered, "the land of the gazelle." Out of the thirty passages in which this word occurs in Scripture, fourteen times it must have this meaning, in some of the other cases it may have it. So far, then, as the name goes, it might apply to any country fitted for the habitation of the gazelle; but the mention of "Edom, Moab, and Ammon" renders it nearly a necessity that the reference here be to Palestine. *Many countries shall be overthrown*. The verb used is *kashal*, which means, in the niphal, "to totter," "to fall," "to be weak." It is assumed by Hitzig and Fuller, as by the English versions, that "countries" is to be understood. Ewald, however, and many other commentators, following the older versions, would refer to men, and translate, "myriads shall fall." In the version from which Origen has supplemented the Septuagint it is rendered, "Many women or countries shall be offended (*σκανδαλισθήσονται*)," the feminine rendering being due to the feminine termination *-oth* in *rabboth*, but the verb is masculine.

Ver. 42.—He shall stretch forth his hand also upon the countries; and the land of Egypt shall not escape. The Septuagint rendering is, "And he shall send forth his hand upon the countries, and in the land of Egypt there shall not be a saviour in it." The first part of this verse is marked with an asterisk. Evidently the text before the translators had לַח פְּרִיָּאֲתָה (*lah p'laytah*), "to her deliverance," and "deliverance" in the abstract became "deliverer" in the concrete. Theodotion renders in a different sense, "And he shall stretch his hand upon the land, and the land of Egypt shall not be for salvation." The idea here is that for the land of Palestine, Egypt shall not be a deliverer. This, probably, is the true reading. The Peshitta agrees with the Massoretic pretty closely, "He shall stretch

¹ After this clause to the end of the verse, the asterisk is placed in the Syriac Version, indicating an omission from the Septuagint Version. The *lacunæ* are usually supplied from Theodotion; but here this is not so.

his hand over the countries, and the land of Egypt shall escape from his hands." The Vulgate has nothing to justify remark. Probably this verse, in the way it is rendered by Theodotion, is a portion of the lost vision of Daniel. The vagueness of "countries" stands in contrast to the definiteness of Edom, Moab, and Ammon, and is thus suspicious. Help was always expected from Egypt in the time when Assyria and Babylon successively claimed the subjection of the Holy Land.

Ver. 43.—But he shall have power over the treasures of gold and of silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; and the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps. The rendering of the LXX. is somewhat fuller, "He shall have power over the place of gold and the place of silver, and over all the desire of Egypt, and Libyans and Ethiopians shall be in his multitude." The word translated "treasures" is a late one, but evidently the Septuagint translator had *magom* (מָגוֹם) instead of *mich'manay*. Theodotion renders, "And he shall have power over the secret hoards of gold and silver, and over all the desirable things of Egypt, and of Libyans, and of Ethiopians in their fortresses." Theodotion has read *מִצְוֵרָיִם* (*m'tzorayim*) instead of *מִיֵּצְרָיִם* (*mits'adayo*). The Peshitta rendering is, "And he shall have power over the house of the treasures of gold and silver, and of the pleasant things of Egypt, and the Libyans, and the Cushites (Ethiopians) are his allies." The Vulgate follows a slightly different rendering, "And he shall rule the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt; through Libya and Ethiopia, too, shall he pass." Having a different reading in the last clause from the Massoretic, the natural Hebrew equivalent for *transibit* is *יָבֹר* (*ya'bor*)—a word that could scarcely arise by mistake from that in the text. *He shall have power over the treasures of gold and silver, and over all the precious things of Egypt.* Strictly speaking, this never was the case, as Antiochus never wholly conquered Egypt, although in that expedition, in which he had laid siege to Alexandria, he came very near completing his conquest. *And the Libyans and the Ethiopians shall be at his steps.* This certainly is not true in the sense in which Jerome takes it, "he shall pass through Libya and Ethiopia." Though Antiochus more than once invaded Egypt, he never passed further into Africa. These nationalities are associated with each other; e.g. in Jer. xlv. 8, 9, we have, "The Ethiopians and the Libyans that handle the shield." So in Ezek. xxx. 5 we have the countries spoken of together. It may merely mean that

individuals belonging to these nationalities had joined his armies. This is altogether a more ornate and poetical passage than the rest of this chapter, and gives the feeling of a different hand; therefore, probably, it belongs to a time nearer that of Daniel, and contains more of the original prophecy. Professor Fuller remarks on a reference being made to the help Ptolemy received from Cyprus. Cyprus, or Chittim, is referred to in the earlier part of this chapter, but not here. The Lubim and Cushim are contemporary with Edom, Moab, and the sons of Ammon.

Ver. 44.—But tidings out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him; therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many. The version of the Septuagint is very like this, "A rumour out of the east and out of the north shall trouble him, and he shall come out in great rage to lay waste with the sword, and to slay many." The version of Theodotion is somewhat briefer, "Rumours and disturbances out of the east and from the north shall trouble him, and he shall come in much wrath to destroy many." The Syriac is closer than any other version to the Massoretic text. The Vulgate renders, "A rumour out of the east and north shall trouble him, and he shall come with a great multitude that he may beat down and slay many." The word *קָהָל* (*hayma*) may mean either "wrath" or "multitude." It is difficult to identify the rumours that recalled Antiochus from his conquests. The account given by Porphyry (quoted by Jerome) of his receiving news that led him to ravage the coasts of Phœnicia and march against Armenia is unsupported by other historians. A phrase in Tacitus ('Hist.' v. 8) seems to throw light on this, "After the Macedonians held the supremacy, King Antiochus, when he was endeavouring to change the superstition of this people, i.e. the Jews, into the manners of the Greeks, was hindered by a Parthian war." There is, however, no record of such a Parthian war; but such a war may have arisen, and not be recorded, as the histories for the period before us are very incomplete. Should we regard these verses as giving another account of the war between Epiphanes and Ptolemy, the tidings out of the north might mean the arrival of the Roman envoys, headed by Popilius Lænas. If there were also a threat of a Parthian invasion, we should then have, "tidings out of the east and north." *Therefore he shall go forth with great fury to destroy, and utterly to make away many.* Certainly Antiochus did return furious from the expedition in which he was stayed by the Romans; and certainly also he set himself thereafter

to compel the Jews to become Greeks in religion, punishing with death refusal to yield to his demands (1 Macc. i. 24—28; Josephus, 'Ant.' xii. 5. 3).

Ver. 45.—And he shall plant the tabernacles of his palace between the seas in the glorious holy mountain; yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him. The rendering of the LXX. is, "Then shall he set up his tent between the seas and the mountains of the choice of the sanctuary, and the hour of his end shall come, and he shall have no helper." Theodotion's rendering is, "He shall pitch his tent Ephadano between the seas at the holy mountain of Sabasin; he shall come to his lot, and there will not be a deliverer to him." It is to be observed that the word אֶפְדָּאִן (*appadno*), "royal tent," a late word in Hebrew, was not present in the text before the translator of the Septuagint. Further, Theodotion did not know the meaning of the word, although his recension was prepared under Jewish supervision. The Peshitta renders, "And he shall place his tent on the plain space between the sea and the mountain, and shall assail its sanctuary, and he shall come to his end; there shall not be to him a helper." The Vulgate renders, "And he shall place his tabernacle, *aphadno*, between the two seas upon the glorious and holy mountain; he shall come even to its (his) highest point, and no one shall help him." *He shall plant the tabernacle of his palace.* The word here used (*appadno*) does not occur elsewhere, and seems to denote the royal tent. The fact that it does not appear in the Septuagint or Peshitta renders its right to be in the text somewhat doubtful. Theodotion and Jerome transliterate it, as if it had not got a place in Hebrew even in their day. It does occur in the Targum and the Peshitta. At the same time, a purely technical word like this might really be of ancient usage, yet the occasion for its use

might not have previously occurred; the literature of ancient Hebrew is exceedingly limited. *Between the seas in the glorious holy mountain.* Hävernick maintains that the glorious and holy mountain here is the mountain on which the temple of Nanai was placed, and that the seas in question were the Caspian and the Persian Gulf. It is difficult to imagine a Jew calling the mountain on which a heathen temple was placed, "glorious holy," even were we sure that the temple in question was on a mountain, for which we have no evidence. The Jews probably knew of the sea into which the Euphrates discharged its waters; but it is not prominent in their writings, and the Caspian may be looked upon as unknown. The distance between these two seas is so great that no one would locate such a small thing as a city by saying that it was between them. The natural interpretation is that the seas in question are the Mediterranean—the great sea—and the Dead Sea—the Salt Sea. But the Hebrew leads rather to the idea that the plural is one of excellence. בֵּין (*bayn*), "between," is not infrequently construed with ל' (*le'*), "to," as here; hence the translation would be between the seas, i.e. the great sea and the holy mountain. There can be no doubt that "the glorious and holy mountain" is Mount Zion. *Yet he shall come to his end, and none shall help him.* The death of Antiochus, baffled in his attempt to rife the temple of Nanai, humiliated not only by his own disaster, but by the news received from Jerusalem, is full of disappointment and misery, even when we get rid of the rhetoric with which the events are clothed in Polybius and 1 and 2 Maccabees. One-half of his army under Lysias had been baffled and defeated by Judas Maccabeus; he himself had been repulsed in his attempt to replenish his coffers; there is therefore for him no helper, so he dies of disappointment at Tabes.

HOMILETICS.

Ver. 21.—*Successful dissimulation.* I. DISSIMULATION IS OFTEN MORE SUCCESSFUL THAN VIOLENCE. The successful usurper is known to be a "vile person;" the people do not willingly bestow upon him the honours of royalty,—he grasps them for himself; yet he perpetrates no violence to obtain them. He wins power by dissimulation. 1. But dissimulation is most common in an age of *advanced civilisation*. Violence belongs to simpler times. As life becomes more complex, evil becomes more subtle. 2. It has most power at a time of *moral corruption*. When morality is corrupted, the discerning faculty of conscience is blinded. Deceit succeeds most with those who have lost the clear judgment which results from the direct insight of purity. 3. It is most successful under circumstances of *material prosperity*. Then we are off our guard, and are tempted to a false feeling of security based on the mere enjoyment of present ease.

II. THE SUCCESS OF DISSIMULATION IS MORE INJURIOUS TO THE WORLD THAN THE SUCCESS OF VIOLENCE. The greatest enemies to a state are its traitors. The worst

foes to a religion are its hypocritical adherents. The most dangerous enemies a man can have are his flattering friends. In such cases (1) the evil is more slowly recognized; (2) it is less energetically hated; and (3) it is resisted with more difficulty.

III. **THOUGH DISSIMULATION MAY SUCCEED FOR A TIME, TRUTH WILL ULTIMATELY TRIUMPH.** There is "an end" at "the time appointed" (ver. 27; ch. xii. 1, 2). 1: By its own nature evil ultimately *declares its true character*. If it always remained concealed, it would effect little. By dissimulation power is won, which in being used casts off the mask. 2. When evil is declared, it is seen to be *hateful and weak*. Once fairly known, it loses its attraction and becomes a despicable thing. 3. *God will finally interfere* to destroy all false appearances, and judge the world in truth according to real character and conduct. Some forms of deceit may linger till that great judgment-day; but none can outlive it. Then all actions will appear in the white light of truth. 4. It is *wise and prudent* (as well as right) to seek truth and to live truly, because the true only can live in the great future of eternity (Rev. xxi. 27).

Ver. 28.—*Evil prosperity*. I. **TEMPORAL PROSPERITY MAY BE ATTAINED APART FROM MORAL GOODNESS.** It is not found in experience that the old Jewish ideal is realizable in which the righteous all prosper, and the wicked are all in adversity (Job xxxvi. 11, 12). Bad men often grow rich and flourish in external success (Ps. lxxiii. 3). 1. This is *no proof* of the *weakness of moral and spiritual forces* in the economy of life, (1) because physical prosperity is made to depend largely on physical causes; (2) because energy of will and intellectual ability may exist apart from moral worth, and may secure temporal success; (3) because adversity is not regarded by God as a supreme evil, nor prosperity as a supreme good—both are subservient to higher aims; (4) because justice and right have not scope in this world to effect their ultimate triumph. 2. This should warn us from the erroneous conclusions (1) that our prosperity is *a proof of our goodness*; and (2) that it is an *evidence of God's favour*.

II. **WHEN TEMPORAL PROSPERITY IS ENJOYED WITHOUT MORAL GOODNESS, IT IS LIKELY TO BE A CURSE TO THE OWNER OF IT.** 1. All the *higher uses* of prosperity will be *neglected*. These are to lift up our hearts to God and his love; to give leisure from care for the service of God; and to bestow talents for the good of mankind. If the higher uses of prosperity are neglected, the prosperity can only degrade us. 2. We are likely to become *unduly satisfied with ourselves*. Dust glitters like gold in the sunlight; and worthless people are tempted to think themselves of great value when the sun of prosperity shines upon them. Hence groundless pride, vanity and blindness, poverty of soul, guilt of sin, and danger of ruin. 3. We are inclined to *set our heart on temporal comforts*. This danger always follows prosperity. It may be mitigated by right spiritual thoughts of the wants of the soul which no earthly possessions can satisfy, and by the infinitely more precious heavenly treasures. Where such thoughts are not cherished the danger is great. 4. We are inclined to *over-estimate the capacities of earthly riches*, to suppose that they can secure the future from harm. 5. If we have begun to walk in evil ways we shall be *hardened and hastened* in them by the absence of needful checks, and under the influence of foolish feelings of triumphant success.

Ver. 32 (last clause).—*Strength in the knowledge of God*. I. **SPIRITUAL STRENGTH.** 1. Spiritual strength must be *distinguished* (1) from *physical power*, as in the case of Samson, who had very little strength of soul; (2) from *intellectual energy* which can solve mysteries of thought, and construct lofty arguments, but cannot resist temptation and accomplish spiritual work; and (3) from *strength of human will*—such as is manifested by a Napoleon—which may exist apart from moral self-control and capacity for the higher efforts of life. 2. Spiritual strength is *strength of the inner and higher nature*. It is capacity of the character and will, raised to spiritual energy, to resist evil and to do good. It implies (1) self-control (1 Cor. ix. 27); (2) power to resist external influences of fashion and of tyranny, of seduction and of terror (Neh. vi. 9); (3) capacity and energy for doing spiritual work, *i.e.* for overcoming the evil in the world and extending the good, as in reaching the conscience of men, convincing of sin, and persuading them to be reconciled to God (2 Cor. v. 20). It is seen in moral courage, patience, zeal and persevering activity in God's service.

II. THE SOURCE OF SPIRITUAL STRENGTH. 1. It is *derived from God*. It is not innate, nor acquired by our own efforts, nor attained by any worldly means. It is given to us in our natural weakness (Isa. xl. 29), when we are most conscious of this and distrustful of ourselves (2 Cor. xii. 10), and in response to prayer (Ps. cxxxviii. 3). 2. The *knowledge of God* is a condition for the receiving of spiritual strength. (1) This is necessary that we may have understanding and faith to ask strength of God. (2) It is necessary as a means for attaining the strength; because ideas of the greatness, goodness, and might of God are bracing and invigorating. (3) It is necessary as a moral condition. If we seek to know God, he will give us strength, but if we are neglectful of this duty, it is not right that God should honour us with such favour. 3. *Union with God* in living sympathy is the direct means for receiving this strength. The people referred to in the text know God as *their God*. This *appropriation* of God secures to us his strength.

III. THE USE OF SPIRITUAL STRENGTH. It is the Divine aid for the needs of life. We often pray for relief of the burden and release from the task. God leaves the burden and task undiminished, but gives strength by which to do and bear. This method of help involves less disarrangement of the order of the outside world, and is for us a nobler and more fruitful blessing. Thus when we seek peace through relaxation and ease, God gives it in inspiration and energy (2 Cor. xii. 8, 9). 1. It is needed for the resistance of *temptation*. Temptation is too strong for our unaided powers. In God's strength we are conquerors (1 Cor. x. 13). 2. It is useful for the *endurance of trouble*. The necessary trouble must be gone through in any case. But spiritual strength is essential to patient, calm, uncomplaining endurance (Phil. iv. 13). 3. It is helpful for *active service*. We often fail in work for want of energy of soul. Divine strength brings zeal, capacity, and successful activity (2 Chron. xv. 7). 4. It is useful for growth of the spiritual nature. As we are strong in soul we can know more of Divine truth, and enlarge and elevate the life of the inner man. This growth is the result of the working out of indwelling spiritual energy (Luke i. 80).

Ver. 35.—*Purged by trial*. I. THE CHURCH NEEDS PURIFICATION. The people "of understanding" are to be purged and made white. These are clearly the people who are "wise unto salvation"—the true Church. 1. The ends of the gospel are not attained until the Church is *completely purified*. The first aim is to gather men into the Church by penitence and faith. The second is to perfect them when they are in the Church. The forgiving grace of God does not dispense with the necessity of holiness. It passes over the sin of the past, that it may secure a better life for the future. The ends of Christ's work are not satisfied in releasing us from the penalties of our sins, and securing present peace and future blessedness. They seek the complete renewal and purification of our lives. 2. These ends are only attained by a *lifelong process of purification*. The act of conversion does not satisfy them. Though the life may be turned from sin to God, evil still lingers, old sins rise up again, and new temptations often prove too strong. Hence the need of the Christian's daily prayer for forgiveness, and the need of a continual discipline in holiness.

II. THE CHURCH IS PURIFIED BY HER TRIALS. Some of them fall to try, and thus to purge. Trial purges: (1) by making us think *humbly of ourselves*, and suggesting the question whether we have not brought it on ourselves by our sin; (2) by making us *dissatisfied with this world*, and therefore anxious to be right in relation to the spiritual world; (3) by leading us to feel the *need of God*, and so to seek to be conformed to his mind. These, however, are only secondary means, and need right using. Trouble may harden in sin or result in complaints against Providence. We need the Spirit of God to enable us to profit by the holy influences of trial. This conception of the end of trial should lead us (1) to accept it with *patient submission*, since it is sent, not as vindictive punishment, but as purifying chastisement; and (2) to seek *grace to use it profitably*.

III. WHEN THE PURIFICATION OF THE CHURCH IS ACCOMPLISHED, HER TRIALS WILL CEASE. 1. *This will be complete*. The battle with sin will not last for ever. The dross will be all purged away, and the people of God will be free from all taint of sin and all indwelling love and power of it. This is the final issue of the discipline of this life, which will be accomplished in the next. 2. *Then trial will cease*. The present

life of probation, education, and discipline is only temporary (2 Cor. iv. 17). It will be followed by a life of perfect peace (Rev. xxi. 4).

Vers. 36—38.—Self. The undue prominence of self is a leading characteristic of all sin, just as all goodness implies self-denial. Where this is allowed, it is shown in every sphere of life.

I. IN ACTION, SELF APPEARS AS SELF-WILL. “The king shall do according to his will.” This implies the neglect of law and right, of the will of others and of the will of God. It is seen in tyranny, in rebellion against lawful authority, and in the denial of our duty as servants of God.

II. IN THOUGHT, SELF IS SEEN AS SELF-WORSHIP. “He shall exalt himself, and magnify himself above every god.” The shadow of self is thrown over everything. All things are viewed in their relation to self, and valued according as they please or inconvenience self. Self is the ideal standard to which nothing is equal, and by comparison with which all merit is measured.

III. IN RELIGIOUS MATTERS, SELF IS MANIFESTED BY THE CHOICE OF WORSHIP ACCORDING TO PRIVATE CONVENIENCE. The king rejects the God of his fathers, and blasphemes the “God of gods” because the will of the great God is against his evil conduct. He selects for worship a “god of forces” as more suited to his lawless violence. Thus where self dominates, the *truth* of religion counts for nothing, no *reverence* is felt for the awful holiness and majesty of God, but convenience settles the creed, and that religion is adopted which involves the least self-denial. Thus degraded, religion is no longer the master, it is the slave of man. But surely religion should be accepted because it is true, whether it suits our convenience or not, and must then be felt to guide and overawe our lives.

IV. IN SOCIAL RELATIONS, SELF APPEARS AS SELF-ASSERTION AND NEEDLESS BREACH OF CUSTOM. The king disregards the habits of his age, apparently out of contempt and pure indifference. The bondage of custom is degrading. But indifference to the habits of others is insulting and sometimes cruel. It is a proof of cold selfishness. Where it is necessary to be independent, we should let our conduct be conciliatory rather than irritating, if we would practise humility and generosity.

V. IN PRACTICAL RESULTS, THE PROMINENCE OF SELF IS EVIDENCED BY DESTRUCTIVE VIOLENCE. The god chosen is the “god of forces.” Might takes the place of right. The will and welfare of others are often crossed. How many wars have no better origin!

Finally note: **THOUGH THE UNDUE ASSERTION OF SELF MAY SUCCEED FOR A SEASON, IT IS DOOMED TO ULTIMATE FAILURE.** The king prospers, but only “till the indignation be accomplished.” In the final issue self-seeking brings ruin. Selfishness prospers for a time, and unselfishness means temporary loss, but ultimately the suppression of self would lead to our lasting welfare (Matt. xvi. 25).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Ver. 1—ch. xii. 1.—The roll of the universal Church. “Thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book” (ch. xii. 1). Two remarks here seem necessary on the part of the writer of this set of homilies. 1. That, deeply interesting as may be the eleventh chapter considered as prophecy, and so demanding minute historical exposition, there does not seem to be much admitting of strictly homiletical treatment. The impression of others may be different; but that is our view; and we act upon it by advancing to the twelfth chapter. 2. That the homilies immediately following are founded upon the view expressed by Keil, that the closing verses of the eleventh chapter refer to “the end of the present world-period,” not to Antiochus Epiphanes, but to the final enemy of the people of God, the antichrist; and further, that the first three verses of the twelfth chapter treat of “the final deliverance of Israel from the last tribulation.” In other words, that the prophecies of Daniel close by projecting themselves on into the closing scenes of the history of our world. The first verse declares that the close of earth’s history shall be a time of unparalleled trouble; that the activity of Michael, the guardian angel

of Israel, shall then be prominent; that there shall be deliverance for all the true Israel of God, viz. of those whose names are written in "*the book*." Of that book we treat; but seeking light upon it from the later revelations of God. By "*the book*" we understand the register of the redeemed of the Lord—the heavenly Church-book—the roll of the one universal Church.

I. THE BOOK. The language is symbolic. There is in heaven *something* which may well be *represented* by a book. Books play no mean part in Scripture symbolism. To understand the passages we must remember that ancient books were, for the most part, written on parchment, rolled on cylinders, and *usually* the writing was on one side only. In Rev. v. 1 the book is the *crowded* roll of the providential counsels. A book *sealed* is one whose contents are secret. To *eat* a book is spiritually to assimilate its contents (Rev. x. 9, 10; Jer. xv. 16). A book "*folded up*" stands for law repealed, or teaching of no further use. To "*receive*" a book is to enter on new dignity (Rev. v. 7). Christ enters on the functions of mediatorial providential King.

II. THE TITLE. "The book of life" (Rev. xxi. 27). 1. *What it is not*. Not what is called "the volume of the Divine decrees." Rev. iii. 5 settles that. 2. *What it is*. One of the *two* to be produced at the last judgment (see Rev. xx. 11—13). Look at them separately. (1) *The books of the deeds of men*. The judgment of the great day will be "according to the deeds," etc. (2 Cor. v. 10). But how does this comport with the evangelical doctrine that believers are saved and unbelievers lost (John iii. 14—19)? (a) *As to the unbeliever*. His deeds are the evidence of unbelief. (b) *The believer*. (a) Deeds, again, are evidence of faith. (b) Deeds determine place in glory. (2) *The book of life*. A book of names only, of the living—spiritually; i.e. of the saved. Alford says, "Those books and the book of life bear independent witness to the fact of men being or not being among the saved; the one by inference from the works recorded, the other by inscription or non-inscription in the list." 3. *The origin of the figure*. Whence? Various answers, but all suggestive. The carefully kept list of *priests*? of *citizens*? of *wrestlers* in the great Greek agony? the monster roll of *soldiers* in the Roman army? Believers ought to be all there—priests, etc. Think, then: In the book every believer's name, not in the world's order, but in the order of coming into the Church universal. It is the family register of our Father in heaven. What if we could read it? The names clearly written! No mistake! What disclosures! Names there; names *not* there! No impeachment of the record. No doubtful name. Are our names there?

III. THE OWNER. "The Lamb's book of life." Why? 1. *The book is the register of his property*. His "*own*." Blood-bought. His ransomed, servants, subjects, soldiers, friends, younger brethren. 2. *He enters the names*. How do we know? None beside has the ability or qualification. The writer must be everywhere, see all, know all. What wise discrimination needed too! tender sympathy! instant delicate recognition of the trust of a soul going out to him! 3. *As Guardian, he keeps the book*. The book, ever open, lies in the shadow of the protection of Christ's throne (John x. 28).

IV. THE NAMES. 1. *The names ever there*. Of those "who go out no more for ever." 2. *The blotted names*. (Rev. xxii. 19; iii. 5.) Surely no idle threats these (Heb. x. 29)!

V. THE BLANK SPACES. There are places for coming names. Millions of names have been filled in; and "yet there is room." The blank space for your name waits your decision. *Some names never will be there*. (John v. 40.) What then? Rev. xx. 15: figurative language? Yes. But figure must be *less* ever than the reality.—R.

Vers. 1—4.—*Revolutions in earthly empires*. In answer to prayer, Daniel obtains the consolation that other persons—other orders of being—were actively engaged in the same cause as himself.

I. UNSEEN AND UNOSTENTATIOUS SERVICE IS OFTEN THE MOST EFFECTIVE. It is not probable that Gabriel appeared in visible form in the Persian court. His presence was unknown; his influence on men unobserved. He was content to exert his power over the feelings, dispositions, motives, of men; in this way he could best direct the affairs of nations, and serve the cause of righteousness. We may be content to retire into obscurity; be unseen and unknown, so long as we use talent and influence on the

side of God and truth. The forces of life are unseen; they are made visible only in their effects.

II. WHEN THE SEASON IS OPPORTUNE, THE TRUTH SHALL BE REVEALED. "*Now*" (said Gabriel to Daniel) "will I show thee the truth." It is evident that the unsinning angels are not in possession of all knowledge. They are ever learning. They "learn from the Church the manifold wisdom of God." Into many things "the angels desire to look." In the ratio of their knowledge is the service they render. *Now* Gabriel is at the Babylonian court, strengthening the purpose of Darius, and *now* he is at the river Hiddekel, revealing to Daniel the events of the future. For a season it is better for us to remain in ignorance. There are other possessions to be gained beside knowledge. When we have reduced to practice all we know, *then* we may expect further revelation. A spirit of generous benevolence towards men fills the angels. They delight to relieve our anxieties and to increase our knowledge. We may conclude that they would gladly proclaim the tidings of the gospel to the nations, if God had seen it to be good.

III. MATERIAL RICHES ARE NOT ESSENTIALLY BLESSINGS. The kings of Persia, seized with an ambition to subdue the world, extorted from their subjects the largest measure of taxation, and hoarded their revenues year by year, only to carry sword and fire into the continent of Europe. To expend riches in invading other kingdoms, in devastating lands and cities, is a criminal waste of God's treasure. Not for such purposes did God create gold and silver, brass and iron. Fallen man perverts and degrades many of God's possessions. Mental and material gifts are but talents entrusted to our keeping, and a day of reckoning comes on apace, when, as stewards, we must render an account to our Lord. A sad and woeful day will *that* be to kings and statesmen who have squandered a nation's wealth in war and bloodshed. In the case of Xerxes, great riches were a snare—a *trap* which involved him and his empire in ruin. Had he been a poor monarch, or only moderately rich, he and his people might have dwelt in safety; his name might have escaped reproach. His wealth fed the appetite of ambition. His ponderous army was a source of weakness. His ostentatious display invited the invasion of the Greeks. Riches are not real strength.

IV. EMPIRE, BUILT ON DESPOTIC POWER, IS EPHEMERAL. A king, however mighty, becomes utter weakness in the presence of disease, age, or death. Either of these forces is mightier than he. God permits, for hidden reasons, unscrupulous men to rise to the very summit of imperial power; but he does not guarantee their continuance; and if *he* does not uphold their power, it soon wanes and disappears. Nor can man secure that his authority and rank shall descend to his posterity, through the channels of ordinary law and custom. God is above all law, and often disappoints our fondest expectations. Despotic power is not a human virtue. It is a quality of doubtful character, and usually becomes dangerous to the public weal. Rapid as is the *rise* of some men to fame and power, their *fall* is usually more rapid still. At the moment of their greatest glory they are on the brink of ruin. When richest ripeness is on the fruit, rottenness is not far distant. Alexander's victorious march was unprecedented; he speedily reached the highest pinnacle of empire; yet the king of terrors struck him down at a blow, and sudden collapse of his vast empire followed. As he had not honoured God, neither did God honour him. Had Alexander been pious and devout, how great a blessing might his power have been to the world! How efficient and useful he might have been in advancing the principles of truth and godliness! But his vast kingdom, not being founded in righteousness, was soon plucked up by the roots.—D.

Vers. 5—20.—*The chequered fortunes of earthly empire.* There is but one condition of permanence in any kingdom, viz. righteousness. Success, founded on military power, collapses as quickly as it rose. As night succeeds to day, so misfortune succeeds to fortune. If God be not recognized, the one element of durability is a-wanting.

I. GOD GOVERNS OUR WORLD BY IMPERFECT HUMAN AGENCIES. If men express their astonishment at this, our reply is that it is the best on the whole, and if he did not use *imperfect* instruments, he must not employ men at all. This allowance of evil men to be monarchs brings to light the evil that is in men; tends to impress the

world with the unprofitableness of sin; and prepares the way for the advent of the real King of men. It is *best*, on the whole, that men should live in communities and nations; *best*, on the whole, that *some* should be rulers and *some* should be subjects; *best* that God's hand should not appear in the selection of earthly rulers. "His way is in the sea."

II. WAR IS THE MOST PROMINENT FEATURE OF SECULAR HISTORY. Read what chapters in secular history we choose, we find the uniform tale to be ambition, war, disaster, suffering. Man, when left alone by God, becomes his own deadly enemy, and the enemy of the human race. No greater proof can we have of the turpitude and malignancy of sin, than that furnished by the course of human history. Wherever scope and opportunity have been afforded for the exercise of human inclination, the outcome has been strife and mutual destruction. To rule the world has been the arrogant desire of many, and heedless have they been of the miseries of the human race, so long as one vain man may ride upon the wave of fortune. As a rule, kings have been the curse of our globe. If successful in war, the appetite is whetted for further enterprise; if defeated, the spirit of revenge leaps up, at the first opportunity, to regain its loss.

III. IMPERIAL AMBITION CRUSHES OUT THE BEST AFFECTIONS OF THE HUMAN SOUL. The noblest affection that has survived man's fall is the parental—the love of a father for his children. Yet even this has been persistently trampled on—often trampled out—by the diabolic lust of power. The King of Egypt gives his daughter in marriage to his hereditary foe, not because there was any tie of mutual affection, but solely to promote his ambitious policy. This was nothing less than the sacrifice of his own child to an evil spirit—to the baser lusts of his own depraved nature. On the altar of vain-glory, kings are wont to sacrifice natural affection, domestic peace, the Divine institution of marriage, connubial bliss, the welfare of children, yea, the lives of their own flesh and blood. No blacker biographies can be written than those of successful kings. One bad man has been an active spring of mischief for centuries after his decease. One unworthy king has been a fount of misery and wretchedness for a myriad families of men. If every private individual needs the restraining grace of God, tenfold more does a king.

IV. ISRAEL IS THE CENTRAL OBJECT OF GOD'S REGARD. It is a very unusual thing for God to make known to men what is about to transpire in the world. As a rule, this course would be full of hazard. It would tend to remove human responsibility. By such a plan, God might defeat his own ends. But God designed to show special favour unto Daniel. He generously conceded, in answer to prayer, what otherwise he would have withheld. Daniel was concerned about Israel's welfare. God was concerned about it also. One mind prevailed with God and with his servant; hence it was in accordance with God's plan to make known, in such a case, his will. The revelation which was vouchsafed respected Israel; for Israel's home lay midway between these kings of Egypt and Syria. Daniel was moved, not by a spirit of curiosity to learn what should happen elsewhere, but by a pure regard for his country's weal. As a fact, well-certified in later history, this prophecy, being shown to Alexander the Great at Jerusalem, secured his favour and protection. In every age, Israel—the true Israel—is God's especial care. He that "toucheth Israel, toucheth the apple of his eye." The arms of Jehovah encircle the righteous. Saith he, "I will never leave thee; I will never forsake thee."

V. SACRED PROPHECY AND SECULAR HISTORY CONFIRM EACH OTHER. All that is true in history, though written by the pen of sceptical men, is from God. He is the sole Author of *truth*. Hence we may not despise human learning, nor throw contempt upon honest researches into past history. Whatever in the world is *true* will prove, in the end, a confirmation of the ancient oracles. It is impossible that God can, in any way, contradict himself. If, for a moment, there should *seem* any discrepancy, we may rest in the tranquil assurance that further light will resolve all difficulty, and that apparent discord will only lead to richer harmony. Every item of prophecy in this chapter has found exact fulfilment. If, in some respects, the predictions of the angel seem obscure, they were as clear as it was proper to make them. The measure of obscurity is an additional proof of Divine wisdom; and, read in the light of later events, every unprejudiced mind feels that such pre-announcements of national events could proceed from none other than the living God. If we are forced to believe that

a faithful record of history has proceeded from the hands of an intelligent man, we are also compelled to conclude that accurate predictions of distinct events can only result from supernatural agency—a revelation made from heaven.—D.

Vers. 21—45.—*The specious success of a bad monarch.* There is mystery in the fact that, under the administration of a righteous God, bad men should be elevated to highest rank. Yet, evil though it is, it would probably be a greater evil to employ mere force to prevent it. It is evident that God rules among men by moral agencies. This is one circumstance among the "all things" that "work together for the good" of God's elect.

I. BAD MEN ARE PERMITTED BY GOD TO CLIMB INTO IMPERIAL THRONES. There is a sense in which it is true that "God setteth up one, and putteth down another" Yet it is not true that God acts apart from men, nor is he responsible for any unrighteous act. Without his permission it could not be; but if power should interfere to prevent wrong-doing, this would be to make virtuous by compulsion—this would be to destroy virtue's essential nature. The people of Israel, in Samuel's day, clamoured for a king. God did not approve; yet, in anger, he permitted them to have a king. Nor would it have then availed for God to have furnished Israel with a king "after his own heart." The people would not at that time have tolerated such a prince. Very clear is it that God sets no high value on the highest earthly distinctions. The wealth and dignities and sceptres of earth are not deemed worthy to be rewards for his friends. Riches and sovereignties often fall to the lot of the vilest of mankind—clear proof *this* how God values such possessions. "That which is highly esteemed among men is often an abomination in the sight of God." The wise men in God's kingdom will not envy any of fortune's favourites.

II. THE BOLD ARTS OF FRAUD AND DECEIT OFTEN FIND A PASSING SUCCESS. From the hour when Antiochus was liberated from Rome, until the hour of his death, he was studying the shrewdest arts of duplicity and treachery. If men wish to make a lie succeed, they must make it big enough and utter it boldly, and it will travel far and wide. So too any act of wickedness will best succeed if it is carried out with brazen effrontery. No consideration of truth, or duty, or feeling, or self-consistency, was allowed by Antiochus to stand in the way of vile success. To be rightly or wrongly a monarch over a large area—this was his one ambition, and to this evil deity everything was sacrificed. If lying, or reserve, or deceit, or tergiversation, would serve his turn, all were resorted to. No covenant, or treaty, or promise, issuing from him, was worth a groat. He was more a demon than a man; for all manly qualities had been parted with. To the eye of his courtiers and generals it would seem as if this course of life secured success; yet it was a very doubtful success and very ephemeral. Granted that it continued, more or less, through his lifetime; this was merely a period of eleven years. To estimate justly the success of a man's life, we must measure it, not by years, but by centuries—not by the fleeting hours of time, but by its continuance through eternity. Posterity has long since reversed the judgment of this Syrian king's contemporaries. Scorn and detestation are his inheritance.

III. SUCCESSFUL WICKEDNESS ATTRACTS BAD MEN TO ITS SIDE. The majority of men are more fitted to follow than to lead. If only a bold and self-assertive leader appear, crowds of weaker men will attach themselves to his person; and if only something can be gained, be it earthly spoil or glory, the appetite of avarice will be sharply whetted. The public and faithful testimony of a good man will strengthen the confidence of feeble saints, and make the pulse of piety beat stronger. This has an effect in drawing righteous spirits more closely together, and, as a consequence, increasing their severance from the wicked. So it is also a fact that the public success of a bad man (especially if he be an opponent and persecutor of the Church) will serve to detach hypocrites and self-deceivers from the cause of truth and righteousness. The successful violence and blatant profanity of Antiochus separated the impious Jews from the pious. Then it was discovered that many who observed the sacred rites of Judaism were atheists at heart, and were more eager to share in the spoils of sacrilege than to defend their temple and their God. In days of prosperity and peace, multitudes are content with a superficial faith. But persecution is a sterling test, and well brings out the genuine and the spurious in character.

IV. **SUCCESSFUL WICKEDNESS SERVES TO FORTIFY THE COURAGE AND FAITH OF THE RIGHTEOUS.** The tyrannic violence of Antiochus drove good men nearer to God; it led them to examine the foundations of their hope; it brought them to the fount of Divine strength; it disposed them to inflame each other's zeal. Though the pious in Jerusalem were a little band, they resisted with heroic fortitude the profane invader; and if they were not at once successful, their devotion to the Jewish cause soon developed sufficient martial skill to defeat and drive out the foe. Out of evil came good. Had it not been for the violence and sacrilege of Antiochus, the Jews would have borne the yoke of the Syrian monarchs. But now a Jewish hero—Judas Maccabæus—is brought to the front, who resolves on the bold enterprise of Jewish independence. If vice can be bold and fearless, much more ought virtue to be.

V. **ATHEISM AND SUPERSTITION GO HAND-IN-HAND.** It is instructive to observe how the mind of this usurping king vacillates on the matter of religion. He who sought to dethrone the true God from his seat in Jerusalem, and to overturn his altars, sought also to en throne the mythical idol Jupiter, and to erect an altar for this imaginary deity. Man must worship somewhat. His religious faculty cries out for some exercise. If the true God be rejected, some counterfeit god must be invented. Well did the leaders of the French Revolution affirm, "If there be no God, we must make one." But, in truth, Antiochus believed in nothing save himself. The world existed *for him*. Armies existed for him. Men's lives, or family happiness, or national weal, or religion's temples, were counted as nothing, if seemingly opposed to his advantage. He was simply a monster of egotistic selfishness. He might have said truly, "Syria? it is I! The world? 'tis only for me!" If it seems to serve a passing caprice, a temple is erected for some Roman deity. If money is wanted for war, he will strip every temple of its treasures. The only deity his soul worshipped was force—vulgar power.

VI. **WICKEDNESS AND TYRANNY HAVE AT LENGTH TO YIELD TO A DIVINE RULE.** Even good men are sometimes impatient to see the progress and the success of villainy. In their anguish they often cry out, "How long? O Lord, how long?" But God does not move, in his administration of the world, with premature haste. "The time is appointed" when iniquity shall cease to be successful, and when complete retribution shall overtake the unrighteous man. A royal tyrant may as well knock his head against a granite wall—and better—than to work against God, or to fling himself on the bosses of the Almighty's shield. In the midst of apparent success, such a man feels oftentimes that fate (as he calls it) is against him. Strangely are his ends defeated, as were Napoleon's by a snowstorm. The mightiest warrior is working, with his blustering noise, within a very tiny circle; and all imperial and martial events are embraced within the supreme purpose and administration of God. Let appearances be as they may, "God has prepared his throne in the heavens;" "His kingdom ruleth over all." At last, reward and retribution shall be distributed by royal and impartial hands. Every one shall "receive the due reward of his deeds." God's end may be far off, humanly speaking, yet it shall "surely come." Though it tarry, childlike faith will wait for it.—D.

EXPOSITION.

CHAPTER XII.

Vers. 1-13.—THE LAST THINGS.

Vers. 1.—And at that time shall Michael stand up, the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people: and there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation even to that same time; and at that time thy people shall be delivered, every one that shall be found written in the book. The rendering of the Septuagint is, "And unto that place shall come Michael

the archangel, who standeth over (עֲמִיד) the children of thy people; that day shall be a day of affliction, such as was not from the day when they were [presumably the Jews as a nation] till that day, and in that day every people shall be exalted whose name is found written in the book," reading כל עם instead of כל עם. Theodotion's rendering is, "In that time shall stand up Michael, the great prince that standeth for the children of thy people, and it shall be a time of affliction such as there has not been since there was a nation upon the earth till

that time: in that time shall thy people be saved, every one who is written in the book." The Peshitta rendering is, "At that time shall stand up Michael, the great angel who is overseer over the children of thy people, and it shall be a time of affliction such as has not been from the days of eternity; there shall be delivered of the children of thy people every one who is found written in the book." The rendering of the Vulgate is in close agreement with the Massoretic text. The difference in the first clause between the text of the Septuagint and that represented by the Massoretic text and that of the versions which follow it is of importance. It is hardly possible to suggest any Hebrew word for the place which can have been suggested by *mg*, the word used here for "time." Both versions of the clause look like attempts to supply a link of connection which was wanting in the text before them. This supports our idea that the eleventh chapter is mainly an interpolation. It would seem that the Septuagint translator had before him a text having some derivative possibly of *לפל*, perhaps in the passive of the *pilel*, which has no extant example. *And at that time*. The connection would naturally imply the time of the destruction of the oppressor—the king of the south. When he was cut off "without a helper" would be a time one would expect of joy, not of affliction. It may refer to the coming of the oppressor from Egypt with "great rage." If that produced the great affliction, what is the result of Michael's standing up? It seems as if the connection here were hopelessly broken; some dislocation has occurred. *Michael the great prince which standeth for the children of thy people* (see ch. x. 21). "Thy people," this pronominal suffix only occurs once in the previous chapter, in the fourteenth verse, in a clause that does not harmonize with the context—a clause that we think is a portion of the missing vision of Daniel. *Shall stand up*. This, taken in connection with his function, means he shall come for the help of Israel. *And there shall be a time of trouble, such as never was since there was a nation*. This is certainly not what might be expected to result from Michael arising for the deliverance of the people of God. It certainly may be intended to explain the fact that Michael does "stand up." But in the succeeding verses we have no account of special deliverance being given to Israel. The natural meaning of this would be that from the time that Israel began to be a nation there had not been such affliction. It might mean that never since there were nations had there been such a persecution. Either of these interpretations would

be true. Never in the history of Israel had there been such a persecution, because the attempt to force the people to worship Jupiter was met by a far fiercer resistance than that which met Jezebel's attempt to make Israel worshippers of Baal. The people were not then so permeated with love and honour to Jehovah as they were now. Further, there was more kindred between Baal-worship and that of Jehovah originally than between the latter and the worship of Jupiter. Baal means simply "Lord," and Jehovah seems to have been worshipped under that title (Hos. ii. 16). A collateral proof of this is the fact that Saul named one of his sons after "Baal"—Eshbaal (equivalent to Ishbosheth), 1 Chron. viii. 33; and Jonathan also named his son from Baal—Meribaal (equivalent to Mephibosheth), 1 Chron. viii. 34. The plea might thus be advanced that Baal-worship was a revival of an ancient cult. Hence the persecution, severe as it was, would not be so severe as under Antiochus. Yet, again, the Greek intellect, keen and polished as it was, could persecute in a way more thorough and complete. If fiercer persecution for religious views could not have been at any earlier time in Jewish history, in no other country would there have been any persecution at all, because there would have been no resistance to the will of the monarch. Our Lord, in Matt. xxiv. 21, has this passage in mind, and uses terms borrowed from it to describe the sufferings to be endured by the Jews at the hands of the Romans, when Jerusalem shall be besieged and taken. It is to be observed that while in Daniel the comparison is only with the past, in Matthew there is added a reference to the future, "No, nor ever shall be." Nothing, then, shall equal the appalling horrors of the siege and sack of Jerusalem. *And at that time thy people shall be delivered*. The mere fact of deliverance is mentioned, but the nature of the deliverance is not indicated there; cessation of persecution would not be deliverance, for only Israel was persecuted. The application of the phrases of our Lord have a totally different reference—the Jews perished, the Christians were delivered. There is here another evidence of dislocation. *Every one that shall be found written in the book*. There seems to be a faint reminiscence of this in Phil. iv. 3, and a clearer in Rev. xiii. 8. Although "books" is here referred to, and referred to also in ch. x. 21, yet the "books" are different. The "book" in the tenth chapter contains presumably an account beforehand of all that is to happen. This book is, so to speak, a register of the names of those who should "and through the fiery trial that was to try them and maintain their faithfulness. It is to be

noted that the Septuagint makes this refer not to individuals, but to nations whose names shall be found written in the book. There seems nothing to justify such a reading.

Ver. 2.—And many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt. The Septuagint rendering is, "And many that sleep in the breadth (*πλάτει*) of the earth shall arise, some to life eternal, and some to reproach, some to dispersion (*διασποράν*) and eternal shame." These terms, "reproach" and "dispersion," are different attempts to render רִמְיָה (*h'raphoth*), "reproaches." The differences between the above and Theodotion are merely verbal; "dispersion" is omitted, *χάματι*, "dust," is instead of *πλάτει*. The rendering of the Peshitta is, "And many of those that sleep in the dust shall awake, some to life everlasting, and some to destruction and contempt of their friends for ever." The Vulgate has a somewhat singular version of the last clause, "And many that sleep in the dust of the earth shall awake, some to life eternal, and some to contempt, in order that they may always see it (*ut videant semper*)."
Many of them that sleep in the dust of the earth. Sleep, as a symbol of death, is frequent, both in the Old Testament and the New: Ps. xiii. 3; Job iii. 13; for the New Testament, Acts vii. 20; 1 Cor. xv. 6. "Dust" is a common phrase for the grave: Job vii. 21; Psa. xxii. 30; xxx. 10; Gen. iii. 19. The reference here is to those who are not only dead, but buried. The phrase translated, "dust of the earth," literally means "earth of dust." The phrase is so singular that Professor Robertson Smith has suggested that instead of reading 'admath 'aphar, we should read 'armath 'aphar—aram in Arabic meaning a "cairn" or "mound." There is, however, as Professor Bevan remarks, no instance in Hebrew or Aramaic of such a word being in use. It is assumed that the reference here (Behrmann, etc.) is to the Jews alone; but for this assumption there is no justification. While, on the one hand, one cannot prove from this that others besides Israel shall partake in the resurrection; on the other, as little can we assert that "the Jews" at the period when this verse was written, excluded all but Jews. We cannot deduce that "many" here excludes "all." The idea suggested is rather multitudinousness. *Shall awake, some to everlasting life, and some to shame and everlasting contempt.* This is a distinct reference to the resurrection of the body; it is those that "sleep in the dust" that shall thus "awake." It is to be noted that at the resurrection the condition of each is fixed finally—it is to "everlasting life" and "ever-

lasting contempt." This resurrection is individual, not national, as shown by the contrasted fates. The doctrine of the resurrection is thus clearly stated. There is no need to examine how much the Jews of the time of the Maccabees understood of this doctrine. Isa. xxvi. 14—19, as clearly as does this passage, proclaims the same belief. Ezek. xxxvii. 1—14 shows that resurrection was to the Israelites not such an incongruous or impossible idea as it was to the Greeks. But when is this? We might be led by the juxtaposition of this to the account of the sufferings of the Jews under Antiochus, to think that the writer believed the end of the world would take place immediately on the fall of Antiochus. But in the first place we must remember that we have not the vision given to Daniel; it has been replaced by the eleventh chapter. Further, the method of prophecy must be borne in mind. The future was made known in vision. If, as seems probable, distance in space from the apparent standpoint of the prophet represented distance in time from his actual or assumed chronological position, then, if the description of the vision proceeded from one side of the picture to the other, those things would be in close juxtaposition which were to be far removed from each other chronologically. Thus an astronomer may place in the same constellation stars inconceivably distant from each other—nay, may even unite as one binary star two suns, the one nearer the earth than the other by thousands of millions of miles. So our Lord correlates the destruction of Jerusalem with the end of the world. Moreover, the misery endured by the Jewish saints under Antiochus was a type of the sufferings of the people of God of every age.

Ver. 3.—And they that be wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament; and they that turn many to righteousness as the stars for ever and ever. The rendering of the LXX. differs from this considerably, "Those who understand shall appear as the lights of heaven, and those that confirm my word as the stars of heaven for ever and ever." There seems to be a difference of reading in the first clause. Instead of *yazheeroo k'zohar*, there seems to have been *yayra'oo kim'ooroth*. The verb used in the Masoretic text means really "admonish." The noun occurs only in Ezek. xiii. 2. In the last clause, instead of רַבִּים (*harabbeem*), "many," the Septuagint has read דְּבָרַי (*d'baray*), "my words." It is difficult to account for the omission of the final *o* unless from the likeness of *o* to *u* and *u* to *h* and *h* to *l* (see Corpus Insc. Semit.). Theodotion renders, "And they that understand shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and certain from amongst the righteous as the stars for

ever and ever." The Peshitta rendering is somewhat paraphrastic, "Those that do good and are wise shall shine as the brightness of the firmament, and those who conquer many shall be lights, and arise as the stars of heaven for ever and ever." The Vulgate is in close harmony with the Massoretic text. The versions are superior to our Authorized, in having "those that understand" instead of "those that be wise." Bevan regards the wise here as the "teachers." There seems, however, no reason for such a restriction. The reading of the Septuagint in the opening clause of the second member of the sentence is inferior, as confirming or justifying the words of Daniel or of God is a simpler idea than that of turning many to righteousness. Further, there is a difficulty of fixing who is referred to by the prenominal suffix "my." Professor Fuller refers to Isa. liii. 11 for a parallel use of the *hiphil* of פָּרַץ ; but there, as elsewhere, it means, not "turn to righteousness," but "justify," that is, "declare righteous." Yet the connection between the two ideas is close, and the forensic idea can have no place here. Matt. xiii. 43 represents a similar reward to the righteous.

Ver. 4.—But thou, O Daniel, shut up the words, and seal the book, even to the time of the end: many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased. The Septuagint rendering in the last portion of the verse is totally different from the Massoretic recension, which is correctly rendered in our English version, "And thou, Daniel, hide the commands and seal the book till the time of the end, till many shall rave violently ($\alpha\sigma\mu\alpha\nu\epsilon\sigma\omega$) and the earth be filled with unrighteousness." It is possible that יִשְׁחָטוּ (*yishootoo*), "were mad," was read instead of יִשְׁחָטוּ (*yishot'oo*), "ran to and fro." In the older script חָט (= ח) was not unlike פ (= O). Professor Bevan has suggested that instead of חָדָדָה (*hadda'ah*), "the knowledge," the Septuagint translator has read $\text{חָרָה$ (*hara'oth*), "the evils," and thinks that this gives the Septuagint Greek. Were one, however, to render the Greek back into Hebrew, that would not be the form the words would take. It may, however, be regarded as a paraphrase. Theodotion's version is closer to the Massoretic, "And thou, Daniel, shalt guard ($\epsilon\mu\phi\alpha\zeta\omicron\nu$, 'make a fence round') the words, and seal the book till the time of the end, till many shall be taught, and knowledge shall be fulfilled." Theodotion here takes רָץ as meaning, not "run to and fro," but "peruse carefully." The last clause somewhat justifies Professor Bevan's suggestion: מָלֵא used to mean "fulfil" or "fill out." The Peshitta renders, "And thou, then, Daniel, seal these commands, render silent, and seal this book

till the time of the end, and many shall inquire, and knowledge shall be increased." The Vulgate agrees on the whole with the Massoretic text. *Shut up the words.* The exact rendering of the words is "close up," hence Theodotion's rendering "put a rampart round," the *arpp* (*satham*), means generally "to stop up a well;" e.g. 2 Kings iii. 19; 2 Chron. xxxii. 30; Gen. xxvi. 15. In Neh. iv. 1 (7) it is used of stopping the breaches in the wall; only in Ezek. xxviii. 3 and Ps. li. 8 (6) is the word rendered, even in the English versions, "hidden;" but even in these cases that is not the necessary or even the natural meaning of the word. These remarks apply also to ch. viii. 26. *Seal the book.* There is a question as to the force of this phrase. Does it mean, as Hitzig, Bevan, and the critical school generally maintain it means, that the book was to be hidden and concealed? This view, if correct, would certainly give a plausibility to the contention that the book of Daniel is the work of a *falsarius*. We have seen, however, that the real meaning of the verb translated "shut up" is not "conceal," but "to shut up" with the view certainly of hindering access to them, but not at all with the intention of concealment. So the "sealing" here does not necessarily indicate concealment, but rather the conclusion of the matter with further idea of confirmation. The oracles of God are regarded as a spring of water; if we follow the figure implied in the first word used, the flow is stopped now; so far as this message is concerned, nothing more is to be drawn from the fountain. But a fountain may also be sealed (see Song iv. 12, "A garden enclosed, a fountain sealed"). In that case there is no idea of concealment. The book, then, of the prophecy is to be sealed against any change or addition. Even take the view of the critics, there is here no elaborate directions as to the concealment of the vision as we find in the case of the 'Assumption of Moses.' But further, we have no account of the finding of the book. Daniel was not like the 'Assumption of Moses,' the esoteric possession of a single sect, it was on the critical hypothesis soon known all over Palestine and Egypt. We know that the finding of the book of the Law in the reign of Josiah is narrated in 2 Kings xxii. and 2 Chron. xxxiv.; but neither 1 Maccabees nor 2 Maccabees says a word about the finding of the Book of Daniel. Josephus also has no word of the discovery of Daniel, although he relates the finding of the book of the Law in the days of Josiah. There must have been no tradition of such a thing taking place, yet two centuries was not so long as to obliterate tradition. The sealing had

a metaphorical meaning—a book sealed, though it was visible to the eye, and was not hidden away—could not be read. If the key by which to interpret it is not granted, a book in cipher cannot be read (comp. Isa. xxix. 11, 12, “And the vision of all is become unto you as a book that is sealed, which men deliver to one that is learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I cannot, for it is sealed. And the book is delivered to him that is not learned, saying, Read this, I pray thee: and he saith, I am not learned.” If the book were sealed that it could not be opened, the delivering of the book and the request to read it would be meaningless). Prophecy was delivered frequently in enigmatic language, and the meaning of it could only be grasped when circumstance supplied the key. *To the time of the end.* The end is not the end of the persecution of the days of Antiochus—that is already past; we have now reached the consummation of all things. *Many shall run to and fro, and knowledge shall be increased.* This is to be looked upon as a description of the last time, when circumstance shall remove the seal from the book. The translator of the Septuagint has been led away by the idea of the time as one of sorrow. The verb, however, translated “going to and fro” may be rendered, as it is by Ewald, as “to peruse.” The veil then shall be removed, the seals broken when men peruse the prophecy carefully, and knowledge is increased.

Ver. 5.—Then I Daniel looked, and, behold, there stood other two, the one on this side of the bank of the river, and the other on that side of the bank of the river. The versions do not require remark, save that the Septuagint and the Peshitta do not repeat “river.” The abrupt introduction of “two other” is another proof that the long eleventh chapter, as we have it now, is an interpolation. We must go back to ch. x. 18 to get the person from whom these two mentioned are distinguished. The two new *dramatis personæ* are, as Professor Bevan remarks, in all likelihood angels, and the river in question is the Tigris. In ch. x. Hiddekel is *nahar*; here the word used is *yôr*, a word very often used of the Nile, but not exclusively (see Isa. xxxiii. 21). Hitzig asserts that נַחַר (*yôr*) is an Egyptian appellative, made by the Hebrews into the proper name of the Nile. The example just given disproves this statement, and from this false premise he deduces that the Book of Daniel was written in Egypt. They may be angels of countries. There seems nothing to justify the idea that Michael and Gabriel are the two here intended—the word “other” excludes this. The reason of this introduction of two angels is,

DANIEL.

Professor Bevan thinks, as witnesses to the oath of the angel. But an oath, to be binding, did not need witnesses; e.g. when David swore to Jonathan, there were no witnesses. Another idea may be hazarded—the Tigris may be looked upon as the boundary of the East and the West; and the two other angels may be the angelic guardians of these two regions.

Ver. 6.—And one said to the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, How long shall it be to the end of these wonders? The Septuagint rendering is, “And I said”—reading $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha$ instead of $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha$ —“to one clothed in fair linen (*Bénissa*), which is above the water of the river”—the last five words being omitted from the Syriac of Paulus Tellensis—“When, then, shall the end be of these marvels which thou hast told me, and their purification?” The last clause, which does not represent anything in the Massoretic, is due to a confusion between $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha$, with which the next verse begins, and $\alpha\gamma\alpha\theta\alpha$. Theodotion's rendering is, as usual, closer to the Massoretic, “and he said to the man clothed in *baddin*, who was upon the waters of the river, When shall be the end of those marvels of which thou speakest?” Both the Greek versions insert “of which thou speakest.” The rendering of the Peshitta differs slightly, “And they said”—a reading that one would be wishful to adopt if it had any probability in its favour—“to the man clothed in beautiful apparel, who was standing above the waters of the river, Until when shall the end of these things be?” The omission of “wonders” is to be observed. The Vulgate follows the Septuagint in making Daniel the speaker, “And I said to the man clothed in linen, who was standing over the waters of the river, When shall be the end of these marvels?” And one said. Aben Ezra makes this one of the two who spoke. This suggestion is the most natural, only the sentence is singularly abrupt, and favours the idea that there is an omission here. The LXX. and Vulgate, as we have seen, read, “I said.” While the reading is an easy one, it is, as Professor Bevan remarks, against the analogy of ch. viii. 13. *To the man clothed in linen.* This man is mentioned in ch. x. 5, presumably Gabriel. *Which was upon the waters of the river.* The reference may be to ch. viii. 16, where a voice comes to him from between the banks of the river Ulai. Here, not upon the waters of the river Tigris, but over them, was the appearance of the angel Gabriel. *How long shall it be to the end of these wonders?* One difficulty that strikes one is that there are no wonders foretold. That the rulers of Syria should war against the possessors of Egypt was not a marvellous

thing. Professor Bevan, who holds that the marvels referred to are the events foretold, quotes Isa. xxix. 14 as a parallel instance, but, though marvels are there mentioned, such marvels that all the wisdom of the wise should fail, etc., yet here nothing is told of the nature of these marvels. Had there been visions of symbolic animals, as in the seventh and eighth chapters, we could have understood these things being spoken of as marvels. The probability, then, is heightened that there have been omissions as well as insertions here. The time contemplated is the end, when judgment and resurrection are passed. It is, in fact, the question of the apostles (Matt. xxiv. 3), "Tell us, when shall these things be? and what shall be the sign of thy coming, and of the end of the world?"

Ver. 7.—And I heard the man clothed in linen, which was upon the waters of the river, when he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven, and sware by him that liveth for ever that it shall be for a time, times, and an half; and when he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people, all these things shall be finished. The Septuagint essentially agrees with this. It omits "man" in the first clause; has "water" instead of "waters;" adds "God" as explanatory of "him that liveth for ever;" it renders "scatter the power" by "loose the hands." Theodotion, while agreeing with the Massoretic text as to the first portion of the verse, differs very much in the end. He renders, "when the scattering is finished, they shall know these things." There is, as will be seen, no reference to the "holy people." His manuscript must have omitted "holy," for the rest may be explained by a false division into words, מִן־יְהוָה being read מִן־יָד. The Massoretic reading is to be preferred. The Peshitta and Vulgate do not call for remark. *When he held up his right hand and his left hand unto heaven.* The lifting up the hand, in sign of making a solemn asseveration, is used of God himself (Deut. xxxii. 40), of Abraham (Gen. xiv. 22), of the angel in the passage in Revelation founded on this (x. 5). Here the fact that both right hand and left hand are lifted up to heaven gives greater solemnity to the act. *And sware by him that liveth for ever.* This title is ascribed to God in ch. iv. 34 (31); also in Deut. xxxii. 40; the idea is involved in the name Jehovah (Yahveh). The relationship between the oath and the ascription to God, on whose faithfulness its fulfilment depended, is obvious. The fact that the "man clothed in linen" thus "swears" implies that in some way he is the source of the determination of the period. This notion is involved in the

whole spiritual scenery of the Book of Daniel; the angels of the nations are the agents under God for carrying out the decrees of providence. *That it shall be for a time, times, and an half.* This is a space of time repeatedly used in the Biblical apocalypses (ch. vii. 25; Rev. xii. 14). In Rev. xi. 3, the same period seems to be represented by twelve hundred and sixty days. In the present case twelve hundred and ninety days seem to be regarded as equivalent to the "time, times, and an half" (ver. 11). The divergency of interpretation comes to its height here. A great number of interpreters—not merely those of the critical school—maintain that "time" here is a literal year, and the days of the succeeding verses literal days, and that the period in question is that between the desecration of the temple by Antiochus's orders, and the setting up "the abomination of desolation" (1 Macc. i. 54), till the Jews were able to sacrifice once more in the re-consecrated temple (1 Macc. iv. 52). This period, however, is only ten days over the three years from the 15th Casleu, 145 of the era of the Seleucids, to the 25th Casleu, 148. Or, if we take the date from the time that sacrifices to Jupiter began, till the re-establishment of the worship of Jehovah, it is then exactly three years from the 25th Casleu to the 25th Casleu. This period is not sufficient. Professor Moses Stuart gets over the difficulty by reckoning back from the cleansing of the temple to what he considers the probable date of Antiochus's entrance into Jerusalem on his retreat from Egypt. This, however, is arbitrary, as the eleventh verse makes the *terminus a quo* the setting up of the "abomination of desolation," which occurred in 145, Seleucid era. Professor Bevan would reckon to the death of Antiochus. Of this event we only know it happened in 149, Seleucid era (1 Macc. vi. 16). If the year began, as the Maccabæan reckoning seems to have been, with the month Nisan, it might be that approximately three years and a half was the time from the desecration of the temple to the death of Antiochus. But the death of Antiochus produced but little change on the condition of the Jews. In the following year Lysias inflicted a defeat on Judas and besieged Jerusalem, and captured a portion of the city. To some extent we have anticipated our remarks on this text when considering ch. vii. 25. There are, however, peculiarities due to the fact that Aramaic, not Hebrew, is the language used in that passage. מִקֶּר (mo'ed), here rendered "time," is translated "congregation" most generally in the Pentateuch. Sometimes it is "feast," and sometimes it is "season;"

but if the word here means a definite period of time, it is the only case in which it does so, and it is a word that appears several hundreds of times in the Scriptures. We admit that the enumeration of days which follows renders the assertion that *mo'ed* means here a "year," to some extent plausible, yet only plausible. But the next question arises—Even though we should grant that it means a year, are we to understand a literal year? We saw that the "weeks" of ch. ix. are not to be taken literally, but as weeks of years, in which each day stands for a year; the contention of the traditional interpreters has then a justification from analogy in taking a *mo'ed*, if a "year," to be one of three hundred and sixty or three hundred and sixty-five years. Not only is the extent of time indicated here extremely doubtful, but the *terminus a quo* is also. Although the writer of 1 Maccabees fixes the setting up of the abomination of desolation, that is only his interpretation. Our Lord, on the other hand, refers it to the Roman conquest of Jerusalem, which was a vastly more thorough destruction than that inflicted by Antiochus. The meaning of this period is not fixed yet. *When he shall have accomplished to scatter the power of the holy people.* Professor Bevan would change the reading here, as from the order of the Greek words in the Septuagint he deduces that the order in the text before the translator was different from that in the Massoretic text. He would render, "When the power of the shatterer of the holy people shall come to an end." Behrmann sees grammatical difficulties, but these are not cogent; but the argument for this change is weak. Yet we prefer, though with difficulty, Professor Bevan's reading. It makes the connection much simpler to take this solution, as the end of all things is not the scattering of the holy people, but their building up. If we had any authority from the versions we should be inclined to read *קְבֹלֹת* instead of *וְקִבְלֹת*, and insert *וְ* before *תְּהַלֵּךְ*, and thus would wish to render, "From the breaking of the power of the scatterer of the holy people till all these things are ended." This gives both *termini*, but none of the versions gives any hint of such a reading. *All these things shall be finished.* As the resurrection is mentioned in the second verse, we might at once assume that this refers to the end of time; but Matt. xxiv. 34, compared with 30, renders this conclusion doubtful.

Ver. 8.—And I heard, but I understood not: then said I, O my Lord, what shall be the end of these things? The Septuagint rendering differs in a somewhat singular way from the above, "And I heard and understood not, especially about this time;

and I said, Lord, what is the solution of this word, and what are those parables?" These variations seem due to glosses and paraphrase. Theodotion is in complete agreement with the Massoretic text. The Peshitta differs only by inserting "Daniel." The Vulgate renders the last clause, *Quid erit post hæc?* "What will be after these things?" Daniel understood the words, but by hypothesis he did not understand the meaning of them. This exhibits the relation of the prophet always to the revelations given—his faculty of understanding was totally independent of the receptive faculty by which he received the revelation. If we assume this as representing a fact, then all arguments which are grounded on the meanings which the prophet himself might see in his words are beside the question. Since he does not understand, he appeals to the angelic messenger, who had declared so much.

Ver. 9.—And he said, Go thy way, Daniel; for the words are closed up and sealed till the time of the end. The Septuagint omits the last clause, and completes this verse from that which succeeds, "And he said, Depart, Daniel; for the commands are veiled and sealed until many shall be tried and shall be sanctified." Theodotion renders, "Come, Daniel, because the words are fenced and sealed till the time of the end." The Peshitta and the Vulgate agree with the Massoretic. *Go thy way, Daniel.* This is a refusal to grant Daniel's prayer, but in the refusal no condemnation of Daniel is implied. The oracles were sealed until circumstance broke the seal. The purpose of prophecy was not to enable men to write history beforehand. It is to be a sign that, recognized in its fulfilment, may afford evidence of the Divinity of the message or person to whom it referred. *Closed up and sealed.* This verse gives us the real meaning of these words. Daniel's oracles were not concealed and sealed from being read, but because they were not interpreted they were not understood. For even to Daniel they are "closed up and sealed." *Till the time of the end.* This is omitted, as may be seen above, from the Septuagint. Although this has a satisfactory meaning, yet it seems better to connect this verse more directly with that which follows.

Ver. 10.—Many shall be purified, and made white, and tried; but the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the wise shall understand. As before observed, the Septuagint takes the first words of this verse and joins them to the verse preceding, omitting, however, one of the three stages of the process. The rest of the verse is, "And the sinners shall sin, and none of the sinners shall under-

stand, and the wise shall attend." The version of Theodotion is longer than the Massoretic, "Many shall be chosen and made white, and tested, and sanctified; and none of the transgressors shall understand, and the wise shall understand." The additional stage is probably due to a "doublet." The Peshitta rendering is, "Many shall be chosen, and made white, and tried; and the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the sinners shall understand; but those that then do good shall understand." The Vulgate rendering is, "And many shall be chosen, and made white, and tried as by fire; and the wicked shall do wickedly: and none of the wicked shall understand; but the learned shall understand." It is to be observed that all the versions take the *hithpael* of כָּרַךְ and לָבַן as if they were the passives of the *kal*—a view that shows the grammatical influence of the Aramaic dialects. This verse as a whole is paraphrased in Rev. xxii. 11, "He that is unjust, let him be unjust still: and he that is filthy, let him be filthy still: and he that is righteous, let him be righteous still: and he that is holy, let him be holy still." *Many shall be purified, and made white.* If we keep strictly to the meaning of the *hithpael*, we ought to render, "Many shall purify themselves and make themselves white," as the Revised renders. When men make a sincere effort after purity, then the Lord is ready to help them. John vii. 17, "If any man will do his will, he shall know of the doctrine." Then, when men were thus striving after purity, would the meaning of Daniel's prophecy be made known. An age in which there is great religious fervour is never one in which men are conscious of prevailing goodness; on the contrary, it is one when men are conscious of prevailing evil in themselves and others. Hence the Book of Daniel could not have been written in the age of the Maccabees; by their very earnestness they would be conscious of moral and spiritual defects in themselves and others, and would not reckon their age one in which special revelations could be expected. *Tried.* The reference implied in the word used is trying by fire—after these saints have purified themselves they are tested by fire. *But the wicked shall do wickedly.* No amount of affliction will of itself produce purity. The northern tribes were oppressed by Hazael, but that did not work any change in them. The most striking example of this in all history is the siege of Jerusalem. The sufferings of the siege made the besieged more utterly lawless than before. Our Lord interprets a portion of this passage as referring to this siege. *None of the wicked shall understand;*

but the wise shall understand. This again repeats the doctrine that effort after holiness is necessary to understanding God's ways. The historical instance above cited proves the truth of the statement here. The Christians, who were the wise in the sense of those that considered and sought after God, understood the signs of the times, and left Jerusalem; but none of the wicked understood, and so perished in the fall of the city.

Ver. 11.—And from the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away, and the abomination that maketh desolate set up, there shall be a thousand two hundred and ninety days. The Septuagint is, "From the time the sacrifice is taken away for ever, and the abomination of desolation is prepared to be set up, are a thousand two hundred and ninety days." The translator must have had *עֹלָה* (*olah*) before him, and read *עֹלָה* (*olah*), else he could not have translated קָרָב "for ever," and written "sacrifice" also. The Hebrew copyist, following the usage of Palestine, which makes "sacrifice" understood after "continual," had omitted it in the text followed by the Massoretes. Theodotion's rendering is, "From the time of the change of the daily sacrifice (*ἐν δαλεισμοῦς*) and the abomination of desolation set up (*δοθήσεται*) is a thousand two hundred and ninety days." The Peshitta and Vulgate do not call for remark. This verse is a veritable *crux interpretum*. *From the time that the daily sacrifice shall be taken away.* This event is referred to in ch. xi. 31. Whether the eleventh chapter is earlier or later is in our opinion scarcely doubtful. Also in ch. viii. 11 we have the taking away of the daily sacrifice mentioned as one of the deeds of Antiochus. While the reference in ch. xi. and ch. viii. is to the action of Antiochus, it is not necessary to maintain that this refers to him; other oppressors might take away the daily sacrifice. This clause certainly seems to give the *terminus a quo*, but it is difficult to fix the date in question. Certainly from the fact that the words used here are used by the writer of the eleventh chapter to describe the actions of Antiochus, and that in 1 Macc. i. 54 there is also a similar identification, we might be inclined to take the event here mentioned as the starting-point of the twelve hundred and ninety days. But the acknowledged impossibility of fitting the days to the chronology militates against this view. *And the abomination that maketh desolate set up.* At first sight the reader is inclined to follow Wieseler, and regard this as a statement of the *terminus ad quem*. The grammatical difficulties against this

view are forcible. Although $\gamma \dots \rho$, "from" and "to," are sometimes used for $\tau \gamma \dots \rho$, "from . . . until," it is rare, and the intrusion of γ , "and," is strong against this interpretation. Yet it seems strange that two *termini a quo* should be assigned and no *terminus ad quem*. A thousand two hundred and ninety days. While this seems to be the same period as that reckoned in the seventh verse, "a time, times, and half a time," yet it is not absolutely coincident. It is thirty days more than three and a half times the prophetic year of three hundred and sixty, and eleven days more than three and a half mean solar years. As we have already said, if we take the profanation of the temple, 25th Casleu, 145 Seleucid era, as our starting-point, it is impossible to fix any great deliverance or any event of importance which happened some three years and seven months after. Antiochus may have died seven months after the news arrived of the reconsecration of the temple; but we have no data. As above stated, the death of Antiochus wrought but little alteration in the condition of the Jews. If we regard the days as literal days, there is one period that nearly coincides with the twelve hundred and ninety days—our Lord's ministry upon the earth. It is difficult to understand how our Lord's commencing his ministry was the removing of the daily sacrifice. Yet in the "heavenlies" it might be so. Further, we sometimes reckon "from" a period to come, as we can say, "We are yet — weeks from harvest, midsummer, or Christmas." So the Crucifixion as the fulfilment of all the sacrifices of the Law may be regarded as their removal. Certainly in his crucifixion was the real abomination which maketh desolate set up. It suits the next verse. From our Lord's crucifixion to his ascension there would be exactly forty-five days if, as is commonly believed, his ascension, as his resurrection, took place on a Sunday. This, however, is merely a thought thrown out. If we take the date indicated by our Lord, the war against the Jews, dating from Vespasian's march to Ptolemais in the beginning of A.D. 67 to the capture of the temple and the cessation of the daily sacrifice (Josephus, 'Bell. Jud.,' vi. 2. 1), is not far off twelve hundred and ninety days. From this to the final capture of the city is close upon forty-five days. If we, however, take a day for a year, then another series of possible solutions are before us, all more or less faulty. One has the merit of postponing the solution to a date still future. The capture of Jerusalem by the Arabs in A.D. 637 is made the starting-point; if we add to that twelve hundred and ninety

years, we have A.D. 1927. The Mohammedan power may have fallen by that time; anything may have happened then. All these various solutions, all more or less unsatisfactory, prove that no solution is possible. If the fulfilment is yet in the future, circumstances may convey to us the interpretation. We must remember the vision was sealed to "the time of the end." Professor Fuller suggests that Babylonian discovery may at some future date throw light on Daniel's use of numbers.

Ver. 12.—Blessed is he that waiteth, and cometh to the thousand three hundred and five and thirty days. None of the versions occasion any remark. *Blessed is he that waiteth*. It might be rendered, *Oh the blessednesses of him that waiteth!* This implies that forty-five days or years after the unknown event that terminates the twelve hundred and ninety days, another event of yet more surpassing interest, and fraught with yet greater benefit, shall occur. It seems most natural to regard this period as including in it that which precedes, though there is no grammatical reason why this period should not commence at the expiry of the twelve hundred and ninety days. In the latter case we are fully more at sea than before.

Ver. 13.—But go thou thy way till the end be: for thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days. The Septuagint Version here differs considerably from the Massoretic, "Go thy way and rest, for there are days and hours till the fulfilment of the end; and thou shalt rest and arise to thy glory at the end of days." Theodotion closely resembles the LXX. in his rendering of this verse, "But go thou and rest, for there are yet days and hours to the fulfilment of the end, and thou shalt arise in thy lot at the end of days." The Peshitta renders, "Go, Daniel, to the end, rest and arise at thy time at the end of days." The Vulgate agrees with the Massoretic text. As to the additional clause which appears in the version of the LXX. and in Theodotion, Origen has appended the mark which indicates that these words were only found in the LXX., or, at all events, had nothing corresponding to them in the Hebrew text of his day. *Go thou thy way*. Daniel is dismissed in peace, without having his question answered. Before Daniel was a course, and on that course he was to go, without occupying his thoughts with this secret thing. There is no word for "way" in the Hebrew or in any of the older versions. *Till the end*. The versions transpose this clause with that which follows. "The end" is not naturally the end of Daniel's life, for that ought to be "thy end;" still, the next clause seems

to necessitate this. Hitzig would interpret the word *gayte* as "goal" (*ziel*); but it is not the usual meaning of the word, and is not so used elsewhere in this passage. Professor Robertson Smith's suggestion (Bevan, 207), that the word *xp* (*gayte*) is due to a mistake of a copyist, who has inserted it wrongly, is worthy of consideration. *For thou shalt rest.* This is rendered by Hitzig, "und magst ruhig sein"—"and you may be at rest." The fulfilment of the prophecy was for a time long future, and Daniel need not disturb himself. Against this interpretation is the fact that the verb *ny* (*nah*), here translated "rest," never has the subjective meaning which Hitzig here attaches to it. The natural view is that of Ewald and

most interpreters—"rest" in the grave. *And stand in thy lot at the end of the days.* In Jer. xiii. 25 "lot" is used for what is assigned by the judgment of God. "Standing in the lot" primarily suggests one taking possession of what has been assigned by Divine judgment. It is objected by Hitzig that the verb "to stand" does not mean to rise from the dead, which is true; but the connection necessitates this meaning, and as the idea of resurrection had not received theological definition, no technical word would have the exclusive claim to be used. Even now we do not always use "resurrection," and in poetry rarely do. "The end of days" must mean the end of time after the resurrection.

HOMILETICS.

Ver. 2.—*The resurrection.* I. THERE WILL BE A RESURRECTION. For us the Jewish notion of a resurrection is equivalent to the idea of a future life. 1. The yearning for a future life is involuntary and apparently instinctive; the belief in a future life is almost universal amongst people in all degrees of civilization, and with all varieties of religion; the need of a future life for the execution of justice and the development of the hopes and promises of this life is such that we might expect a righteous God to secure it. Providence would be a mockery if it permitted the holiest aspirations of the most spiritual men of all ages and creeds to grow to noble fruits by feeding on one huge delusion (1 Cor. xv. 19). 2. In addition to these presumptions in favour of a future life, we have the following direct evidences: (1) Scripture, backed up by the force of all that goes to prove its inspiration and truth, plainly teaches that there will be a resurrection, and this with a development of clearness and positiveness which is parallel to that of self-evidencing spiritual ideas. (2) Jesus Christ taught the same. To reject this teaching, we must believe that our Lord was in complete error on one of the most fundamental doctrines of his religion (Matt. xxii. 23—33; John xi. 25, 26; xiv. 2). (3) The fact of the resurrection of Christ—amply established on historical evidence which is irresistible when once the supposed presumption against it founded on the testimony of experience in regard to miracles, is balanced by the presumption in favour of it founded on grounds of moral and religious truth—is one instance sufficient in itself to prove that there is a life beyond the grave.

II. THE RESURRECTION WILL RESULT IN A JUDGMENT AND DIVISION OF DESTINIES. 1. It will be an occasion of *revelation*. Men's past history will be rehearsed, their secret thoughts exposed, their true character made known (Rom. ii. 16). 2. It will result in *justice* to all. Now we see justice hindered and delayed, so that the wicked often prosper and the righteous seem to fail (Ps. lxxiii. 3). Then men will receive according to their deserts (Ps. lxxiii. 17). To those, however, who have repented and sought forgiveness and newness of life in Christ, the justification will consist, not in their meritorious works, but in their faith in the grace of God (Rom. iv. 5). 3. The conditions of life thus brought about will be seen to be the *natural fruits* of the life on earth. The judgment will really only bring to light inevitable natural processes. Its results will be the development of natural law—the fruit-bearing of character (Gal. vi. 7, 8).

III. THE RESURRECTION WILL ISSUE IN TWO MAIN COURSES. 1. *Eternal life.* Life is the issue of godliness—not indolent rest, nor selfish pleasure, but glad, restless *living*. This implies not only continued existence, but (1) the exercise of faculties and energies; (2) growth and development—larger being, increased knowledge, nobler activities (1 John iii. 2); (3) nearer communion with God, who is true Life and the Source of all life (John xvii. 3). 2. *Eternal shame and contempt.* This implies suffering—spiritual, but most bitter. It is the degradation of life as opposed to the

fuller development of life in God's people. This is more terrible than physical torture (Isa. lvi. 24). Note: 1. It implies continued existence—not annihilation—and also the preservation of conscience. The lowest degradation is where conscience is extinguished, and shame becomes impossible. 2. The eternity of the suffering implies, at least, its duration beyond any known bounds. Such a prospect is unspeakably awful, whatever the consideration of other aspects of truth may suggest in regard to the final issues of all punishment.

Ver. 3.—*Stars of the Church.* Though all godly men will be called to eternal life at the resurrection, a special honour is reserved for those who evince practical wisdom in spiritual fruitfulness.

I. TRUE WISDOM IS SEEN IN SUCCESS IN "TURNING MANY TO RIGHTEOUSNESS." The wise and those who are thus successful are plainly identified in the text. 1. True wisdom will choose this as the *noblest work*. Men have various aims, as pleasure, pecuniary gain, power, fame, rank, self-culture, etc. The noblest aim is to seek to do good to others, and the highest good we can do is moral good. Hence the mission of the spiritual physician takes the first place among all vocations. It is the most Christ-like. The neglect of this work for the propagation of barren dogmas, the promotion of sectarian tenets, the extension of ecclesiastical influence, or the mere intellectual culture of theological notions, is a proof of folly. The wise man will see that the work of the Christian teacher is practical and spiritual rather than intellectual and theoretical. It is to persuade men to turn from sin to God and goodness (2 Cor. v. 20). 2. True wisdom is requisite for the successful *execution of this work*. God has left this to be dependent on the zeal, energy, and wisdom of his Church (2 Cor. iv. 7). Wisdom is needed (1) to detect the real needs of men, for spiritual diagnosis; (2) to understand the spiritual truths of the gospel, in which are to be found the means of conversion to righteousness; and (3) to choose the right way of approaching, teaching, and persuading men, that wise words may be spoken seasonably (Prov. xv. 23). This wisdom is a spiritual gift, which is to be sought in prayer (Jas. i. 5).

II. THE WISDOM WHICH IS SHOWN IN SUCCESSFUL CONVERSION TO RIGHTEOUSNESS WILL BE REWARDED WITH PECULIAR HONOUR. 1. Though all true Christians will be saved from ruin, and blessed with the heavenly inheritance, *all will not be equally honoured*. There will be differences of rank and honour in heaven (Luke ix. 17-19). 2. Though we shall not be received into heaven on account of our own desert, but through the free grace of God (Eph. ii. 8), our relative *place and honour* in heaven will be determined according to our *merits* (Matt. v. 19). Indolent and selfish Christians must take a lower place than that of self-denying, diligent servants of Christ (1 Cor. iii. 14, 15). 3. The *chief honour* of heaven is reserved for those who have been wise in *effecting the conversion of souls to righteousness*. It is true that we are ultimately responsible for fidelity, not for success (Rev. ii. 10). But failure often arises from unfaithfulness. We have no excuse for not having the wisdom which is the free gift of God, and may be possessed by those who are humanly accounted foolish (1 Cor. i. 21-24). Successful missionary work receives especial honour, because it requires the greatest self-sacrifice, faith, zeal, and love; because it secures the most important good for mankind; and because it glorifies God supremely. 4. This honour consists in *shining brightness*, as (1) a public recognition of worthy service; (2) the possession of true beauty and gladness of soul; (3) the means of still directing and attracting others in the way of right (Matt. v. 16).

Ver. 4.—*Progressive knowledge of Scripture.* The treatment of one of Daniel's prophecies which is here referred to may be applied to all the prophecies of the Bible, and to the higher truths of Scripture generally.

I. THERE ARE MYSTERIES IN ALL REVELATION. "The words are shut up" and "the book is sealed." Revelation, while it clears up some mysteries, presents new ones. It is full of dark places, unfathomable depths, suggestions of endless truths. 1. All is not clear, because we cannot yet *understand* all; if it were made more clear, we might only misunderstand it and so fall into the error. Revelation is open to us only so far as we have capacity to receive it (Ps. cix. 18). 2. There is a Divine reserve, because we are not *morally fit* to use all truth (Matt. vii. 6). There are truths which

we should degrade if we had not the spiritual capacity for the right use of them. This may apply to some questions concerning the ultimate destiny of man. 3. Some truths may be concealed for the present, because the special use of them is for some future time. Now they might only amuse our idle curiosity, and distract our attention from more practical concerns. At "the time of the end" they will do valuable service. This may be the case with revelations of the millennium.

II. REVELATION MUST BE SEARCHED IN ORDER TO BE UNDERSTOOD. "Many shall run to and fro," traversing the book, and comparing its several sayings in order to see their full meaning. So must we do with Scripture (John v. 39; Acts xvii. 11). There are truths so clear that the most foolish can understand them (Isa. xxxv. 8); and all men can practise them without hesitation (Hab. ii. 2). But there are large and deep truths which must be sought to be found. 1. When truths are thus obtained, they are *better understood* and *more valued* than when they are learnt without effort. 2. The very act of searching is a *useful exercise* of patience, zeal, and spiritual thoughtfulness. 3. *Experience* proves the success of this method of learning truth. The difficulties of Scripture attract thought. Scripture is a mine of inexhaustible treasure. Men run to and fro through it now more than they ever did, and its truths are fresher and brighter than ever (Matt. xiii. 52).

III. THE KNOWLEDGE OF SCRIPTURE IS PROGRESSIVE. The knowledge is increased. Scripture repays the searching it calls for. 1. *Experience* increases the knowledge. History illustrates revelation. Providence explains Scripture. Thus gospel history explains the deeper spiritual truths of Messianic prophecy. 2. Our own *spiritual growth* leads to the increase of knowledge. Scripture contains more to the advanced Christian than it does to the young disciple of Christ (John vii. 17). 3. The *progressive life of the Church* leads to enlarged knowledge of Scripture (1) by accumulation of experience, thought, and study of the Bible; (2) by the correction and mutual criticism of various minds in different ages; (3) by improved methods of inquiry superseding the errors of patristic exposition and scholastic theology.

Ver. 8.—*The end.* I. ALL EARTHLY THINGS HAVE AN END. This world is marked by change. All things are temporary and transient. But the order of change itself will change. The whole present system of life will pass away. Life is a process, a preparation, a series of changing events which is to end and give place to an entirely different order. 1. *Pleasure* will end; therefore live for higher interests. 2. *Sorrow* will end; therefore be patient and hopeful. 3. *Temptation* will end; therefore be brave. 4. *The opportunity for work* will end; therefore be diligent now (John ix. 4). 5. *This life* will end; therefore be prepared for the life beyond. 6. *This world* will end; therefore take account of the other world in judging of the mysteries of present Providence.

II. WE ARE ALL CONCERNED WITH THE END. 1. Though the world passes away, *we remain*. The soul's life outlasts all earthly things. It is therefore of great moment to us to be right for the end. 2. The end is the *most important* thing to be considered. We all work for ends. Passing things are used as means to obtain some end. We have not yet rest and satisfaction. We look for such blessings at the end of life (Micah ii. 10). 3. The *character* of the end will determine our estimate of present things. We value the process according to our estimate of the result. If it is right, at the end the hard and dark questions concerning things as they are may be waived. "All is well that ends well" (Rom. viii. 28; 2 Cor. iv. 16—18).

III. THE END IS PARTLY HIDDEN, PARTLY REVEALED. 1. The *principles of government* which determine the end are revealed; the moral conditions of the end are made known. We cannot plead ignorance as an excuse for negligence. Enough is revealed to guide and urge us in the right way (Matt. vii. 13, 14), and to cheer the Christian with boundless hope (1 Cor. xv. 24, 25). 2. The *external condition*, the detail of events, the destiny of individual souls, and the final issues of eternity, are not revealed. Therefore we walk by faith.

IV. THE END IS ALL KNOWN TO GOD. God knows the end from the beginning (Isa. xlv. 10). It cannot *surprise* him. It cannot frustrate, but can only fulfil, his purposes. 1. It is foolish as well as wicked to expect to reach a happy end by *opposing* God's ways, since the end is with him. 2. If we are following in his ways, we need

have no fear for the end. He will provide the best that infinite love can give (John xiv. 2).

Ver. 13.—*In view of the end.* Daniel is the apocalyptic prophet of the Old Testament. To him, more than to any other man, were given visions of the vast future and the destined end of the present world. Such revelations must have made a deep impression on the man himself. The right use of that impression is here indicated.

I. IN VIEW OF THE END WE SHOULD LIVE OUR PRESENT LIFE QUIETLY, FAITHFULLY, AND PATIENTLY. The vision of the end is not to distract our attention from present duties, but rather to inspire us for them. The neglect of practical Christianity for millenarian speculations is contrary to the purpose of revelation. The idea that we must omit any earthly duty in order to be ready for heaven is a delusion. He is most fit to die who is most fit to live. He who does his work best here is most ready for his rest hereafter. And he who feels most truly the power of the world to come will serve most faithfully in the present world. 1. We should be *simple and calm*. The true view of the end is not disturbing and exciting. It brings before our mind visions of rest and peace, the anticipation of which should impart a quiet simplicity to our spiritual life. 2. "We should be *faithful to our mission*." "Go thy way"—do not go out of thy vocation. Serve God there. Prepare for the end in thy natural condition. If the end is thought of, it should inspire the more earnestness in present work, because (1) this is a preparation for the end; (2) we are cheered in this by the prospect of the end. We can walk with more energy and gladness if we know that in going our way we are nearing light and home and rest. 3. *We should be patient*. Daniel is admonished to go on his way till the end. This implies patience. He that thus "waiteth" is blessed (ver. 12). We do not know when the end will be. We cannot expedite it. It is best that it should delay till God's time. Since his time is best, impatience is foolish.

II. A SUFFICIENT REVELATION OF THE END IS GIVEN TO US FOR GUIDING OUR COURSE HERE ARIGHT. We need have no feverish anxiety about the future if we are truly Christian. Though there is much mystery, there is light for guidance and encouragement. This reveals important facts, viz.: 1. There will be *rest*—the rest of the grave (Job iii. 17), and the sleep in Jesus (1 Thess. iv. 14). 2. There will be a *resurrection*. Daniel will awake from the sleep of the grave to "stand in his lot" (ver. 2). This is confirmed by the teaching (John v. 28, 29) and example of Christ (1 Cor. xv. 12). Whatever may be the external conditions of the resurrection, the essential fact is life after death, with the possession of all our powers and faculties. 3. There will be a *discriminating allotment* of destinies in the future life. Daniel will stand in his lot. Every man will go to "his own place" (Acts i. 25). The place is first determined (1) by merit; (2) by fitness; (3) by the natural development of the future out of the present (Gal. vi. 7); but finally assigned according to the righteous judgment and forgiving grace of God (Acts xvii. 31).

HOMILIES BY VARIOUS AUTHORS.

Vers. 1—3.—*The shining of the clear and the converting.* "And they that be wise shall shine," etc. (ver. 3). Here are two types of humanity and two destinies. There is a likeness both in the types and in the destinies, such as we might expect from the parallelism of the text; at the same time, there are differences. The one type is in advance of the other; so is the Divine recognition in the one case as against the preceding. In the one case we have an attribute of soul, in the other an activity. The first is followed by a radiance like that of the open sky; the second, by a brilliance like to that of the stars.

I. THE CLEAR. Turn to the Hebrew, and it will soon be seen that the essential idea in the word translated "wise" is that of a clear eye with a clear outlook. Cleave to this idea, and let it determine our description of the character here set before us. In such a character: 1. *The soul is clear*. Not absolutely here on earth, but relatively in contrast with the former state. Transparent. Pure (Matt. v. 8). No moral taint of such a kind as to destroy the vision of spiritual and eternal things (John viii.

12). 2. *The eye is clear.* 3. *The atmosphere is clear.* (Eph. v. 8.) 4. *The objects of choice are clear.* In time; in eternity. 5. *The choice of means is clear.* All the present is subjected to the future. Herein lies ever *true wisdom.*

II. **THEIR SHINING.** Perhaps the text refers mainly to the shining of immortality. We may bear in mind that the shining of the clear-seeing saint—of the saint who is indeed a seer—is not a question of time or place, of æons or worlds, but one of character. The shining will then be *here* as well as *there.* How, then, does the saint shine? Of what sort is the radiance of the open day-sky? The light of the sky is: 1. *Brilliant.* No light in all the landscape can exceed the brilliance of the sky. No light in all the world of intelligence and morals can exceed that of saintliness. 2. *Soft.* No element of pain in it. 3. *Diffused.* 4. *Victorious.* Clouds may dim the face of the sky. So calumnies, misunderstandings, imperfections, failings, may obscure character. But the light shines through the cloud, and continues after the cloud has passed away. 5. *Ministering.* The sky is like an angel of God in the sweetness and beauty of its service. What *relief* to the sick and to the nursing, who out of their lattices watch for the morning! What *cheer* to the strong! What *health!* Sunlight is health. The sun arises with “healing in his wings.” So the “Sun of Righteousness.” So they that are like him. What *power* to work! The sky holds, as it were, the candle to every worker on earth. How we value *dying daylight!* So wistfully watch we the expiring radiance of the saints we love. 6. *Borrowed.* Not its own, but the sun’s. So the light of the saints is not theirs, but God’s.

III. **THE CONVERTING.** In order to preach truly and intelligently from this passage, the following points should be observed: “They that turn to righteousness” is the translation of a single word in Hebrew—a verb, of the hiphil conjugation, participial form, plural number, construct case. The verb means “to be right or righteous;” in the hiphil conjugation, “to make one right or righteous.” Here, then, we have the activity of the saint, going forth in this form of instrumentally making men righteous, implying a turning away from wickedness, and doing this in the case of “many.” Turning the sinner to God, so as to be “justified by his grace,” would not exhaust the meaning; it goes beyond that, to the securing at least the elements of personal righteousness in him. *How can we instrumentally convert?* 1. *By luminosity of life.* 2. *By word from the lip.* Not necessarily a pulpit-word or a class-word, but a friendly word, and that of the simplest kind. 3. *By unconscious co-operation with others.* Henry Martyn never knew that he was the means of converting a single soul; but he translated the Bible into Persian, and prepared the way for others. “They that sow, and they that reap, shall rejoice together.” 4. *By prayer.* 5. *By gifts of money sustaining the labours of others.* (Some suggestions and illustrations of a useful character may, perhaps, be found in a characteristic sermon by Dr. Talmage on the text, in the first series, published by Nicholson and Sons, Wakefield.)

IV. **THEIR BRILLIANCE.** “As the stars for ever and ever.” Here we have some of the ideas we had before, but with variations, additions, and enlargements. Without becoming pedantic, we make use legitimately of the richer knowledge astronomical of our time. In the destiny of the active aggressive worker we have: 1. *An intense brilliance.* Strictly, daylight is more brilliant than the light of stars; for it obscures it by day, or rather outshines it. But this would not be the popular impression, and on that this Bible-text is based. 2. *A diversity of splendour.* “One star differeth,” etc. Not only the most eminent workers are to shine, but others in their proportion and degree. 3. *A distinguishing separateness.* Think of the distinctive glory of each worker. Here it is not difference of degree, but of type and kind; e.g. Martin Luther, George Fox, Madame Guyon, Elizabeth Fry, etc. 4. *Yet oft a clustered glory.* In appearance the stars congregate in clusters; in actuality are marshalled into systems. The fellowships of earth, of heaven. A unity of power. 5. *A growing radiance with nearness of view.* “’Tis distance lends enchantment to the view” has no application here. The stars are suns, whose magnificence dawns with our approach. So with the glorified and consecrated in the Church. 6. *A ministration of light and heat and life.* 7. *A subservient splendour.*

“For ever singing as they shine,
The hand that made us is Divine.”

8. *A brilliance unlike that of the stars.* Their light does now oft go out. The light of all may fade and die. But these saintly workers shine on "for ever and ever."

Many motives to Christian service may be urged; but here behold its supreme attractiveness! Contrast with this that other destiny (ver. 2), "Shame and everlasting contempt."—R.

Vers. 4—13.—Precept and promise. "But go thou thy way," etc. (ver. 13). From ch. xii. 4 to the end we have the epilogue to the last vision of the book. In the epilogue are many interesting matters, which will no doubt be developed in the Exposition. We here lay hold of the closing words of all, suggest them for homiletical treatment, and indicate their meaning. No more than this.

I. A PRECEPT. "Go thou thy way till the end be." Here the old man of near ninety years is bidden to continue in the path of well-doing until death; for *that* is "the end" referred to.

II. PROMISE. Threefold. Of: 1. *Rest.* In the grave. After that long, toilsome, noble life. 2. *Resurrection.* וְקָם־מִמָּוֶת: To rise up from the rest of the grave. 3. *Inheritance*; i.e. with the saints in light. "Lot" has primary reference to the inheritance of Israel in Canaan; and so secondarily to the antitype, Heaven.—R.

Vers. 1—4.—Prophetic events in perspective. Nature is full of types. The leaf is type of the tree. The dawn is a type of the resurrection. The same law that moulds the dew-drop moulds the earth. History likewise is full of types. The banishment from Eden is a type of exclusion from heaven. The redemption of the Hebrews from Egyptian bondage is a type of the redemption of the race by Jesus Christ. Both prosperous and adverse events in human history serve as types. This is the key to the present paragraph in Daniel.

I. RIGOROUS TRIALS FOR ISRAEL APPEAR IN THE VISTA OF THE FUTURE. Not only are great deliverances pre-announced, but great disasters also. It is thought by some persons that it is of no advantage to discern the approach of trial. But to be forewarned is to be forearmed. Every earthly battle is a symbol of the decisive battle between good and evil—between Christ and Satan. The time of trouble which the angel predicted was a fitting type of the time of trouble which Jesus Christ predicted, viz. the overthrow of Jerusalem. Of each it might truly be said, as each arose to view, "it was a time of trouble," such as had not hitherto been known.

II. SEVERE TRIALS BRING TO LIGHT SUPERIOR SOURCES OF HELP. Had it not been for the captivity and oppression of Israel, Daniel would not have fasted and prayed, and if he had not made his tearful appeal to God, he would not have known of the distinguished beings who were enlisted in Israel's defence. When raised to the eternal home, we shall learn that trials had served on earth our highest good. They drove us near to God. They brought the revelation of his available help. Greater are our champions (if we are friends of truth) than all our foes. "The great Prince standeth for us." Here is type again. Even the Fall shall result in greater elevation. Recovered holiness is a richer acquisition than unmolested innocence.

III. EVERY ACT OF DIVINE DELIVERANCE POINTS ONWARD TO OUR RESURRECTION AND ASCENSION. There is no room for question that the awakening and reappearance of the dead, referred to by the angel, was a resurrection of social and national life under Judas Maccabæus. A new wave of life was to pass over the people. Those who had been long repressed, trodden in the dust, who had hidden in holes and dens for very life, then reappeared. In very similar language Ezekiel predicted that God would "bring his people out of their graves, and would lead them to their own land." Yet this revival of life under the Maccabæan princes was type of a better resurrection. The language spoken to Daniel had both a near and a remote application. In its fullest signification it will be verified only in the great resurrection at the last day.

IV. RESURRECTION WILL SERVE TO MANIFEST CONTRASTS OF CHARACTER. A sudden accession of prosperity to a man is a good test of his worth or his worthlessness. With our present grossly material natures, it is comparatively easy to dissemble motives, feelings, and intentions before our fellow-men. But it is possible that the resurrection-body will be refined and transparent, so that angels and men may be able to see us through and through. What an incentive have we here to acquire sterling

excellence of character! By-and-by no secrets will be permitted: will this be to us a joy or a grief? All varieties of character will be reduced to two. Minor distinctions will be obliterated in view of the great distinction. Honour will be life; shame will be death.

V. DISTINCTIONS OF CHARACTER WILL MEET WITH DISTINCTIVE DESTINIES. For the present the coming destinies of men are, in part, concealed. But we may be quite sure that eventually every man will, like Judas, "go to his own place." In *all* God's arrangements there is admirable and exquisite fitness, and it shall be seen at last that character will gravitate to its proper destination. Those among the sons of men who are truly wise—who love and pursue wisdom—shall gradually gain a clearness and brightness of soul. The hidden excellence shall be at length fully manifested; "they shall shine" as the clear lustre of the eastern sky. Wisdom, that has matured and ripened into benevolence, shall shine as the "stars," and that perpetually.

VI. LARGER UNFOLDINGS OF THE TRUTH ARE RESERVED FOR THE FUTURE. In each succeeding age men have still to say, "We know in part." It is, without question, best for us here that revelation should be gradual, and that attainments of knowledge should be secured by successive steps. It would be lavish waste (such as we see nowhere in God's universe) if God should reveal *at once* to men all that he intends to make known on earth. The thing would be impossible. There must be an eye to perceive, as well as objects to be presented. We should be blinded with the excess of light. God reveals himself and his redemption through *human* as well as through angelic agencies. Though every prophet must be in advance of his contemporaries, in order to be a prophet; still he must not be *greatly* in advance. The stream of revelation must be stayed for a time; "the book must be closed and sealed." Time is allowed to reduce known truth to practical advantage. In later times, teachers shall be multiplied, and truth, unfettered, shall spread through wider and wider circles. "Wisdom and knowledge shall be the stability" and the glory of future ages.—D.

Vers. 5-13.—*Certainty among many uncertainties.* Among many shifting factors in the great problem of human life, one factor at least is fixed, viz. that the interests of the righteous are secure. Their fate is linked to God's. All events shall have but one effect on them. This is the granite rock that retains its stable glory amid the restless, seething sea.

I. IT IS A CONSOLATION TO KNOW THAT THE ANGELIC RACES ARE INTERESTED IN HUMAN WELFARE. As Daniel looked with a more intent gaze, he perceived other angelic forms in close proximity. So when God opened the eyes of Elisha's servant, he saw a host of heavenly cavalry encircling his master. Devout research is ever well rewarded. The angels have not attained one common level of knowledge. They inquire one of another; become each other's teachers and each other's helpers. The same topics that interest good men interest angels also. The same impatience to penetrate future events, which men feel, angels also in some measure cherish. They especially take an interest in the Church of God. They sympathize with us in trial, persecution, and suffering. They desire to see God, in the progressive revelations of himself.

II. FORMS OF SOLEMN ASSEVERATION ARE EMPLOYED BY THE ANGELS TO GIVE US STRONG ASSURANCE. This illustrious angel raised himself to a particular posture, employed special gesticulation, and uttered a special form of words, with this one view, viz. to persuade his auditors of the *authority* with which he spake, and of the *certainty* that his words should be performed. Thus God commands his highest servants to accommodate themselves to human infirmities. Nothing on his part shall be wanting to enlighten and ennoble men. The eternity of God is pledged for the fulfilment of prophecy. As the eternal God lives, it shall be done.

III. OBEDIENCE ENLARGES THE CAPACITY TO RECEIVE. To hear and to understand are not identical. Perhaps we really understand nothing. We see not things *as they are*, but only as they are related to us. Feeling, affection, inclination, assist greatly the understanding. It is possible that God might tell us fully and lucidly the future course of this world, and still we might be only bewildered. It is the voice of fatherly kindness that says to his child, "Go thy way." Perform all thy common

duties. The future is "closed and sealed." "A good understanding have all they that keep his commandments." There is solid happiness for every man who can calmly wait the larger unfoldings of God's will. Food for real hunger there always shall be; but provision for imaginary wants will not be forthcoming.

IV. TRIALS HAVE THE MOST OPPOSITE EFFECTS ON THE RIGHTEOUS AND ON THE WICKED. No amount or severity of outward trial is, in itself, competent to improve or soften men. "Though a fool be bruised in a mortar, yet will not his folly depart;" "Who can bring a clean thing out of an unclean?" The hottest fire of suffering cannot. Hence God saith, "Why should ye be stricken any more? Ye will revolt more and more." Notwithstanding exile, bondage, defeat in war, desolations of every kind, "the wicked will still do wickedly." The voice Divine at last will speak. "He that is filthy, let him be filthy still." But the effect upon the righteous is the very reverse of this. The fire, that hardens clay, melts the wax. Not a few shall discover that the fire only removes the dross—separates vile elements from the sterling—and produces lustre and renown. Under this severe and searching discipline, true Israelites shall be purified and made whiter than snow. Purity of character shall bring with it greater clearness of vision; while, on the other hand, persistence in sin will tend to darken intellect more and more, until it shall be submerged "in the blackness of darkness for ever."

V. LOSS OF RELIGIOUS ORDINANCES IS THE GREATEST OF EXTERNAL CALAMITIES. This is, in reality, a greater calamity than the desolations of a war or the ravages of a plague. God's calculations of human epochs date from his withdrawal from his temple. The suspension of the daily sacrifice—*this* marks the commencement of an era. Men are wont to reckon epochs from the rise or fall of human dynasties. Not so God. His interest in human affairs centres in the temple. The profanation of the temple by setting up idol-worship there—this marks the opening of a dark and tempestuous day. This chastisement is a fitting type for a yet greater woe. The number seven has long time been a signature and symbol for perfection and rest; therefore the broken period of three times and a half betokens the very opposite—disquietude, turmoil, woe.

VI. ASSURANCE TO THE RIGHTEOUS OF PERSONAL AND PERFECT SECURITY. Whatever disasters shall befall the wicked, or whatever tempests may roll over the heads of the righteous man, *this* is certain—"Thou shalt rest, and stand in thy lot at the end of the days." This is a fixed and definite end, which the Divine Being has set before him, and every arrangement of Providence is adjusted with a view to this end. This is the inheritance which God himself has chosen for us, and secured by promise, oath, and blood. If Israel, in possession of the earthly Canaan, could sing, "We have a goodly heritage," much more can the redeemed in heaven chant that joyous strain. The lot is *already* apportioned unto us. The Divine attributes are pledged to us for its enjoyment. No event, nor force, nor personal being, in the broad universe, can prevent the grand consummation, "Thou shalt stand in thy lot." The kingdom has been prepared for us "before the foundation of the world." "If children, then heirs; heirs of God, and joint-heirs with Jesus Christ."—D.

NOTE.

To be added after the words "foreign yoke," page 264, col. ii. :—

One of the proofs brought forward by Kneucker for the Flavian date of Baruch is the reference to the king's son in Bar. i. 12, "We shall live under the shadow of Nabochodonosor, and under the shadow of Balthasar his son." This, he thinks, refers to the fact that Titus was associated with his father in the empire. We think the more probable reference is to the association of Philadelphus with his father Soter in the kingdom. We are restricted to this date, because neither in the history of the Lagids nor in that of the Seleucids is there another instance of a monarch associating his son with him on the throne. Further, at this time Judæa was subject to the Ptolemies.

Moreover, there were many elements of disturbance present in Jerusalem at the time. The Jews thought themselves treacherously treated by Soter (Jos., 'Ant.,' xii. 1), consequently, Jews who wished to live peaceably themselves and preserve their fellow-countrymen from further disaster would be eager to take any means to quiet the spirits of the unruly; hence the composition of the prophecy of Baruch. As Kneucker's date is impossible, as above shown, we are thus compelled, as it seems to us, to assume that the first three chapters were composed almost immediately after Ptolemy Soter associated his son with him on the throne.

HOMILETICAL INDEX

TO

THE BOOK OF DANIEL.



CHAPTER I.

THEME	PAGE
National Retribution	29
Administration serving and served ...	30
Moral Heroism	31
Decadence of Israel	31
Training for Imperial Office and Work	32
A Noble Purpose the Root of True Renown	36

CHAPTER II.

A King troubled with Bad Dreams ...	77
Character revealed by Trial	78
Divine Might and Divine Wisdom ...	78
Divine Omniscience	79
The Image and the Stone	80
The Revelation lost	81
The Dream found	83
The Universal World-Powers	83
The Everlasting Kingdom	85
The Soul in the Presence of Great Meroy	86
The Failure and Discomfiture of False- hood	86
A Specific Remedy for Human Distress	88
"Special Blessing demands Special Praise"	90
A Good Man becomes both King and Saviour	90
Needful Preparations to receive Divine Revelation	91
Human Sovereignty	92
The Establishment of a Permanent Kingdom	93
The Kingly Worth of a Good Man discovered	94

CHAPTER III.

THEME	PAGE
"The Burning Fiery Furnace"	117
Brave Carelessness	118
The Divine Presence	119
The Ceaseless Creation of Gods	120
Principle illuminated by Fire	121
The Saviour in the Fire	122
Salvations demonstrate the Saviour ...	123
Man has a Religious Nature	124
Attempted Coercion in Religion a Failure	125
The Working of Base and Bitter Envy	126
A Critical Alternative	127
The Church's Triumvirate	128
The Brief Reign of Violence	129
The Unexpected Fruits of Persecution	129
Total Reversal of Fortune's Wheel ...	130

CHAPTER IV.

The Testimony of Experience	149
The King's Madness	150
Pride humiliated	151
The Comeliness of Confession	152
Human Greatness, its Rise, Fall, and Restoration	152
Reproof by the Saintly	153
Revelation in the World of Soul	154
Royal Witness for God	156
True and False Prophets	156
A Vision of Self-Buin	157
Prophetic Counsel	158
The Sudden Collapse of Pride	159
Light at Eventide	160

CHAPTER V.

THEME	PAGE
The Writing on the Wall ...	174
Natural Religion ...	175
"Found wanting" ...	175
The Downward Road ...	176
The Crisis of Awakening ...	177
The Representative of God ...	178
The Dissolving of Doubt ...	178
At the Bar of God ...	179
Blasted Merriment ...	180
Good Counsel in Perplexity ...	181
The Value of a Good Man ...	182
The Word of God verified ...	183

CHAPTER VI.

The Lions' Den ...	196
Habitual Prayer ...	197
"The Law of the Medes and Persians" ...	198
Strength of Soul ...	198
Angel-Ministration ...	200
The Murderous Plot of Envy ...	201
Piety in Perilous Circumstances ...	202
"One Thoughtless Act brings much Sorrow" ...	204
The Tables turned ...	205

CHAPTER VII.

Godless Kingdoms ...	227
God's Books ...	227
The Kingdom of the Son of Man ...	228
Brute Rule ...	229
The Enthronement of Christ ...	230
The Great Antagonist ...	231
A Vision of Human Violence ...	233
The Real King-Maker ...	234
Godly Obedience the Basis of Permanent Dominion ...	235

CHAPTER VIII.

The Triumph of Evil ...	250
Subtle Sin ...	251
Modes of Supersensual Vision ...	252
Two World-Empires ...	252
The Scourge of Israel ...	253
Prophecy's Sure Fulfilments ...	254
The Effects of Visions Divine ...	254
The Temporary Triumph of Violence ...	255
The Place of Angelic Ministration ...	256

CHAPTER IX.

THEME	PAGE
Confession of Sin ...	276
Prayer for Pardon ...	277
Prayer answered ...	277
Redemption promised ...	278
The Nation's Advocate at God's Bar ...	279
A Section in Time ...	280
Times as Evidence ...	282
The Close of the Jewish Economy ...	283
The Omnipotence of Prayer ...	284
Prayer opens Wider Horizons of God's Kingdom ...	286

CHAPTER X.

Fasting ...	298
Divine Encouragement ...	299
The Vision of the Christ ...	300
War in the Realm Supernatural ...	301
Man's Foolish Terror in the Presence of a Heavenly Visitor ...	302
Variety of Angelic Service ...	304

CHAPTER XI.

Successful Dissimulation ...	325
Evil Prosperity ...	326
Strength in the Knowledge of God ...	326
Purged by Trial ...	327
Self ...	328
The Roll of the Universal Church ...	328
Revolutions in Earthly Empires ...	329
The Chequered Fortunes of Earthly Empire ...	330
The Specious Success of a Bad Monarch ...	332

CHAPTER XII.

The Resurrection ...	342
Stars of the Church ...	343
Progressive Knowledge of Scripture ...	343
The End ...	344
In View of the End ...	345
The Shining of the Clear and the Converting ...	345
Precept and Promise ...	347
Prophetic Events in Perspective ...	347
Certainty among Many Uncertainties ...	349