

Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

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

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



Buy me a coffee

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



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

A table of contents for *Bibliotheca Sacra* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_bib-sacra_01.php

ARTICLE XI.

EXEGETICAL NOTES.

TRANSLATION OF THE AORIST TENSE IN THE INDICATIVE MOOD.

THE translation of this Greek tense is not always easy. In a true translation the aim is to express in one language as exactly as possible thought which has already been expressed in another language, and to give that thought as nearly as possible the same dress that it originally had. One can commonly carry out this purpose when translating the Greek Present, Future, Perfect, and Pluperfect. It is somewhat more difficult when translating the Imperfect. Often this tense may be rendered by the English progressive Imperfect. Yet in some verbs it is doubtful whether the form of the Imperfect had any different meaning from the Aorist. Again, in some contexts the English progressive form would lumber up the discourse, rather than give the nice descriptive touch that the Greek tense does, therefore the more vivacious narrative Preterite is to be employed. All this, however, is comparatively slight labor to the student; but he is often sorely perplexed about the rendering of the Greek Aorist. Must it always be by the English Preterite? It was not so translated by the Revisers of 1611, nor has it been by the Revisers of 1881. Yet no one seems to have given any principle which shall defend the occasional use of the English Perfect as the proper translation of the Aorist. There seems no defence but the "ear," which in some contexts revolts against translating the Aorist by the English Preterite. Thus as far as the argument goes, the literalists, such as the author of the *Emphatic Diaglott* and Robert Young (whose suggestions about the Revised Version have been sent over from Scotland), all have their own way.

A careful study of the tenses in each language would show on what principles we might proceed. Some suggestions have been made by Rev. J. A. Beet in the *Expositor* (First Series, Vol. xi. pp. 191 f., 296 f., 372 f.). The discussion is capable of further development, which may be briefly outlined as follows:

1. In general, the English Preterite corresponds to the Greek Aorist, and the English Perfect to the Greek Perfect.
2. In English the Preterite commonly needs some definite temporal or contextual limitation to specify the date of the act in past time. In Greek the Aorist has no such need.
3. If the Preterite is used without such a modifier it emphasizes the fact of occurrence, yet has no reference to the completion of the act. The

Aorist has no necessary reference to the completion, nor does it by itself emphasize the fact of occurrence. The context may give such emphasis.

4. The English Perfect denotes the completion of an act, and holds that fact in some sort of relation to the present. This relation may arise from the act that (a) the act is just completed; (b) the result of the act still endures; (c) the time of performing it is not wholly past; (d) the actor still lives; or (e) the circumstances under which the act was performed are still the same.

An examination of English idiom shows that the Perfect tense may express an action which has occurred at an indefinite time in the past, provided that the context gives some relations to present time, and stress is not laid upon the exact relations of time, or provided that frequent reference is made to the past and the mind remains in the present. The Greek uses the Aorist in such sentences.

The use of the Greek Perfect is much narrower. Its relation to present time is closer than in English. It is used (a) of actions just completed, and (b) of acts whose results still endure. In classic Greek the Perfect might be used with as much latitude as the English Perfect; but this is true only of poetry or impassioned oratory. The Greek Perfect has neither in classic Greek nor in the New Testament such latitude as the English Perfect. From these facts, ascertained by observation, the following principles may be laid down:

1. When the fact of occurrence is prominent, and there is no adverbial limitation to give the date of the action, the Greek Aorist is best translated by the English Preterite; e.g. Luke xix. 21, Ἐφοβούμην γάρ σε, ὅτι ἄνθρωπος αὐστηρὸς εἶ. αἶρεις δὲ οὐκ ἔθηκας, καὶ θερίζεις δὲ οὐκ ἔσπεις. Rightly the Revisions of 1611 and 1881 alike render the Aorists in the subordinate clause by the Preterites. "Thou takest up that thou *layedst* not down, and reapest that thou *didst* not *sow*." If the pronoun σύ had been placed in the subordinate clauses where the Aorists occur, the emphasis would have been changed, and English idiom would have required the Perfect tense as the proper rendering. The translation quoted may be open to other criticism; but it is not open in respect to the use of tenses.

2. When mere occurrence is indicated, and there are contextual indications of a past date, or a temporal limitation giving such date, the Aorist should be translated by the English Preterite. Illustrations of this can be found on every page of narrative in the New Testament; e.g. John xvii. 1, Ταῦτα ἐλάλησεν ὁ Ἰησοῦς. The whole context sufficiently indicates the date: "These things *spoke* Jesus." Also Acts i. 15, Καὶ ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις ταύταις ἀναστὰς Πέτρος ἐν μέσῳ τῶν ἀδελφῶν εἶπεν, "And in these days Peter stood up in the midst of the brethren, and said,"

3. When the contextual reference is to present time, and there are no adverbial limitations specifically datin; the action in the past, the Greek Aorist is commonly best translated by the English Perfect. Acts xii. 11.

Νῦν οἶδα ἀληθῶς, ὅτι ἐξαπέστειλε Κύριος τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἐξέλατό με ἐκ χειρὸς Ἡρώδου καὶ πάσης τῆς προσδοκίας τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων. "Now I know of a truth that the Lord *hath sent forth* his angel, and *delivered* me out of the hand of Herod, and from all the expectation of the Jews."

In Acts i. 11 is an instance where, as it seems to the writer, the tense by which the Revision of 1611 rendered *was* changed not for the better in the Revision of 1881: οὗτος ὁ Ἰησοῦς οὕτως ἐλεύσεται ὃν τρόπον ἐθέασασθε αὐτὸν πορευόμενον εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν, "This Jesus shall so come in like manner as ye *beheld* him going into heaven." In 1611 read *have seen* for *beheld*. It can be said in behalf of the Revision of 1881 that *to behold* ought to be used, rather than *to see*, and that the Perfect tense *have beheld* might to some minds suggest past continuance. To the writer, however, there seems to be no emphasis on the verb ἐθέασασθε, and that the rendering by the Preterite throws the action decidedly into the past so as to call for an adverbial limitation of time. The change, in verse 4, of *ye have heard* (1611) to *ye heard* (1881) as the rendering of ἠκούσατε, seems another instance of change for the worse.

In Rom. v. 12 is an opportunity to apply the same principles. There are three Aorists in this verse: εἰσῆλθε διῆλθεν ἥμαρτον; in 1611 the rendering is, *entered passed have sinned*; in 1881 the rendering is, *entered passed sinned*. It will not do to say that because the first two Aorists are translated by a Preterite the last should be translated in the same way. The last verb is not co-ordinate with the preceding one. The translation depends upon the interpretation. If it be held that the act ἥμαρτον occurred at some indefinite time antecedent to the preceding verbs, the Pluperfect is the better translation (Buttmann's *New Test. Grammar*, p. 199; Winer's *New Test. Grammar*, p. 275). If ἥμαρτον, though grammatically subordinate, be held to be coincident with the principal clause, then it should be translated by the Preterite. Again, if there is special stress, as seems to be the case, upon the ἥμαρτον, the Preterite is the proper rendering. If the principal clause had Present tenses, or even Perfect, or if there were bound up in the near context reference to actual present time, a Perfect as the translation of ἥμαρτον might be defended by English usage, but not otherwise.

Rom. v. 11 gives a good illustration of the necessity sometimes of translating an Aorist by the Perfect. δι' οὗ νῦν τὴν καταλλαγὴν ἐλάβομεν. "Through whom we *have now received* the reconciliation." This reference to the present time is not close enough to the ἥμαρτον, and the Present tense of verse 13 can do as little, for there ἐλλογείται is used to express a general truth for which the gnomic Aorist could as well have been used.

From these notes it will appear that the translation of the Aorist often involves fine and even subtle discrimination in the sense of the original

and of the uses of our own language. Any extended criticism of the work of the latest Revisers demands a long and patient study of the nature and capacity of the tenses in both languages.

DR. LADD ON ALLEGED DISCREPANCIES AND ERRORS OF THE BIBLE.

Justice to the subject and to our readers demands that we should devote a few pages to an examination of the critical methods so constantly pursued, and so superabundantly illustrated, in the volumes of Dr. Ladd noticed in our January number (pp. 197-202).

Dr. Ladd endeavors by induction to ascertain the character of the Bible for truthfulness in minor details. The ordinary and correct method of such an investigation is as follows: Having determined the general credibility of the writers and become satisfied of the general correctness of their writings, and having duly measured the import of Christ's promises to His disciples of special guidance and illumination, and having given due weight to the fact that the writers of the New Testament believed that they were so illumined and guided, and to the fact of the reception of these writings by the primitive church as of equal authority with the Old Testament, the Christian believer then considers the alleged discrepancies, to see whether they are positively proven or if they are not all susceptible of a reasonable explanation. As the result of prolonged investigation we affirm with perfect confidence, that upon close and candid examination nearly every alleged discrepancy in the Bible disappears, and that the few troublesome cases which remain can be explained by hypotheses which do no violence to the doctrine of plenary inspiration.

On the contrary, Dr. Ladd's principle of procedure seems to be, to affirm a positive and unexplainable discrepancy whenever one might by any possibility be supposed to exist; treating the Bible as if it had no positive claims upon our general confidence. The length to which Dr. Ladd goes, not only in suggesting, but in positively affirming, irreconcilable discrepancies in the Bible, has rarely, if ever, been surpassed. We open the first volume at random (pp. 400-403), and find what Dr. Ladd describes as a "brief classified statement" of the discrepancies in the Gospels, which contain "the complete refutation of the post-Reformation dogma of infallibility as applied to the historical contents of the Bible" (p. 400).

According to the text which is now received, Matt. xix. 17 makes Christ say in reply to the rich young man; "Why asketh thou me concerning that which is good? One there is who is good"; while in Mark x. 18 and Luke xviii. 19 Christ's reply reads: "Why callest thou me good? None is good save one, *even* God." Professor Ladd asserts that "both forms of the reply cannot be correct; and that in which Mark and Luke agree is doubtless the original one" (Vol. I. p. 401). On the con-

trary, we affirm that there is scarcely any difficulty at all in believing that both forms are correct. In order to warrant Professor Ladd's unqualified assertion, he must assume, without evidence and against all probability, that the evangelists give a complete account of all the conversation that took place between Christ and the rich young man; whereas, no one with any reasonable amount of historic imagination would ever think of assuming that the evangelists purport to give an exhaustive account of the transactions and conversations of their Lord. Any one at all familiar with the dialectical processes naturally pursued in such a private conversation as this between Christ and the rich young man, can easily see that in an interview of half an hour, or ten minutes even, there would be superabundant opportunity for the points of attack and defence to shift not only once, as they seem to have done on comparing Matthew and Mark, but a score of times, in ways that are not recorded.

On the same page Dr. Ladd finds a discrepancy between Matt. xix. 7 and Mark x. 3, because in the discussion between Christ and the Pharisees respecting divorce, Christ himself, according to one evangelist, appeals to Moses, and asks the Pharisees: "What did Moses command you?" while according to the other the Pharisees say unto him "Why, then, did Moses command to give a bill of divorcement?" It is possible to find a discrepancy here only on the assumption that all the conversation upon that occasion consists of the ninety-six words which Matthew has reported, with the addition of the few variations of Mark. This would reduce the interview to a period of about two minutes; whereas, if they had been ten minutes together, or even five minutes, there would have been ample time for variations which lead Professor Ladd to assert an irreconcilable discrepancy between Matthew and Mark. We submit that it is altogether probable that the interview continued for hours, and that the dialogue between Christ and the Pharisees, like a meandering stream, was shifting positions of attack and defence through the whole time.

The four forms of the inscription over the cross are adduced (p. 400) as another typical illustration of the irreconcilable discrepancies of the evangelists. Now the facts concerning this are simply these: According to John xix. 20, the inscription on the cross was written in Hebrew, Latin, and Greek,—that is, there were three inscriptions, and this is just what we have given by the different evangelists,—this, and nothing more. John records the inscription as "Jesus, the Nazarene, king of the Jews" (perhaps the Hebrew form); Matthew (xxvii. 37) gives it as "This is Jesus, the king of the Jews" (perhaps the Greek form); Mark (xv. 26) gives it as simply "The king of the Jews" (perhaps, or we may say probably, the translation of the Latin inscription); Luke (xxiii. 38) agrees word for word with Mark except that he adds the demonstrative pronoun "this," (οὗτος) which makes it read: "This is the king of the Jews,"—a freedom which is perfectly allowable in translating the two words of Latin, *rex Judaeorum*, which would suffice in that terse tongue.

Perhaps the most difficult of all the apparent discrepancies in quoting the Saviour's language, occurs in the instructions given to the twelve when first sent out on their apostolic mission, which we give in parallel columns :

MATT. X.

⁸ Get you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses; ¹⁰ no wallet for *your* journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff; for the laborer is worthy of his food. ¹¹ And into whatsoever city or village ye shall enter, search out who in it is worthy; and there abide till ye go forth.

MARK VI.

⁸ And he charged them that they should take nothing for *their* journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money in their purse; ⁹ but *to go* shod with sandals; and, *said he*, put not on two coats. ¹⁰ And he said unto them, Wheresoever ye enter into a house, there abide till ye depart thence.

LUKE IX.

⁸ And he said unto them, Take nothing for your journey, neither staff, nor wallet, nor bread, nor money; neither have two coats.

⁴ And into whatsoever house ye enter, there abide, and thence depart.

Here we have a report of certain words spoken by Jesus to his disciples upon one of the most important and solemn occasions of their lives. All told, Matthew gives to his entire summary of the discourse only thirty-six verses, while Mark and Luke content themselves with scarcely more than one sixth of that number. But are we warranted in supposing, much less in confidently affirming (as we must do to find a positive discrepancy), that the admonitions of Christ on that occasion were no more extended and particular and personal than they appear to be from these reports? As far as possible from it. On the contrary, we have every reason to believe that at such a crisis in their history there would be a prolonged conversation between Christ and his disciples. How dangerous it is to draw inferences from negative testimony in such a case, is illustrated in the reports given by the evangelists of the last interview between Christ and his disciples before his arrest. Had the accounts of Matthew, Mark, and Luke alone been left us, we should have known even less of what occurred at that memorable interview than we now do of the conversation which took place when the apostles first received their commission, and were sent out on their trial journey. But John has also left an account of the scenes preceding the arrest, and four whole chapters are occupied with reporting the most precious discourse of Jesus upon that occasion.

From this we can see how little warrant any one can have for narrowing down the discourse of Christ at the induction of the apostles into their office to the limits of the reports recorded by Matthew, Mark, and Luke. Now it cannot be denied that the impression made upon the mind by these three accounts is essentially the same; and a little attention will show that the apparent discrepancies can easily be accounted for, even

on the highest theory of verbal inspiration. To bring about this harmony we need only suppose that Christ's whole discourse occupied a half hour's time, and consisted of a few hundred words. The common impression made by each one of the accounts is, that the disciples were to be lightly attired, free from care, and wholly devoted to their work. No one familiar with the bold and powerful antitheses of the Sermon on the Mount should be troubled with finding in one part of the Saviour's discourse, on such an occasion as we are considering, the command to "take no staff," and in another part, "to take only a staff." Every word can come in easily and harmoniously enough on the supposition that a natural and insignificant occurrence took place during the discourse. Suppose, as the Saviour was proceeding, his eye fell on a poor disciple whose entire outfit consisted of a staff, a wallet, sandals, and a single tunic; that would naturally give a turn to the portion of the discourse, related by Mark; and with his eye fixed on him, he would say, "Take [αἴψωσθω] nothing for your journey, save a staff only; no bread, no wallet, no money in your purse; but go shod with sandals, and do not put on two coats." His eye falling on another who has not even a staff, he would naturally say, as reported by Matthew and Luke; Go forth just as you are: get (κτῆσησθε) you no gold, nor silver, nor brass in your purses; no wallet for your journey, neither two coats, nor shoes, nor staff. It is utterly immaterial whether you take a staff or not, only go forth devoted entirely to your spiritual mission. This is the true inference of the passage, rather than the conclusion of Dr. Ladd, that "the detail as to two tunics was impressed indelibly, while the command as to the staff was indefinite in their minds" (pp. 400, 401).

It is even easier to dispose of what Professor Ladd and the class of writers in whose company he is found say of the impossibility of harmonizing the two reports of the Sermon on the Mount. Dr. Ladd declares that they "are so essentially two different, and in some respects discrepant, accounts that no harmony is possible" (p. 402). These reports are found in Matt. v., vi., vii., and Luke vi. 17-49. That they are reports of two different discourses is possible; in which case there will be no occasion to consider the alleged discrepancies. But that they are reports of one discourse is probable from the extended and striking resemblance of the two. "The beginning and ending of both are the same; there is a general similarity in the order and often identity in the expressions" (Andrews' Life of Our Lord, p. 252). But, in considering the possibility of harmonizing the two reports, we should consider how brief they both are, even though long in comparison with the ordinary reports of the Saviour's addresses. Matthew's report of the sermon is comprised in one hundred and seven verses, while Luke's contains only thirty. Probably, however, even Matthew's account is not one quarter part of the whole sermon of our Lord as it was adapted in extemporaneous discourse to the varied wants of the vast multitude.

The apparent difference in *time* may arise from the fact that Matthew does not connect his facts in chronological order — a thing which as a historian he was under no obligation to do unless that were essential to the true understanding of the discourse. As to the apparent discrepancy in the *place* in which the sermon is said to have been preached, it is sufficient to remark that where the descriptions of the movements of a great multitude at such an exciting time is compressed by one evangelist into a single verse, and is expanded by another into only four verses, there is little reason to expect minuteness of topographical description. A mountain is a large place; and when Matthew (v. 1) simply says that “Jesus went up into a mountain, and when he was set his disciples came unto him. And he opened his mouth and taught them,” he has in no way or manner contradicted the more minute accounts of Luke, who casually mentions (vi. 17) a level place (τόπου πεδινού). There may be plenty of level places on the sides of a mountain.

We open at another place in Dr. Ladd's first volume, which happens to be where the author is illustrating what he regards as evidence of Christ's “uncritical use of the Old Testament” (pp. 68-71). Matthew xxiv. 37 sq. and Luke xvii. 27 report Christ as saying that in the “days which were before the flood they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage, until the day that Noah entered into the ark.” Professor Ladd sees here indications that Christ was “following a tradition of the flood which differed in some particulars from that of the Hebrew Scriptures” (p. 69), and calls upon the reader to “notice the features added to the narrative of Genesis; especially the word *πίνοντες* [drinking] in apparent contradiction of the narrative of Gen. ix. 20” (p. 69, note). How needless it is to find a discrepancy here will appear when the passage in Genesis is quoted: “And Noah began to be a husbandman, and he planted a vineyard, and drank of the wine, and was drunken.” How any one should infer from this that there was no drinking before the flood it is difficult to imagine; for the phrase “began to be a husbandman” cannot mean that this was the first time he had practised husbandry, but the beginning of it after the flood” (Tayler Lewis).

Dr. Ladd also thinks that in Christ's reference (Luke iv. 25-27) to the famine in the time of Elijah (1 Kings xvii. 9 ff.) “he seems to incorporate that divergent Jewish tradition which extended the duration of the drought to three years and a half, and which James also accepts, and employs the popular hyperbole which spoke of the drought as extending over the whole earth” (p. 69). On examination it appears that all this reference to “divergent Jewish tradition” and “popular hyperbole” in this case is purely imaginary and gratuitous. If the author had consulted his Greek Testament, or for that matter the Revised Version of 1881, or even that of 1611, he would have seen that Christ did not say over the whole *earth*, but over the whole *land*, this being a perfectly allowable

translation for the Greek word γῆ, and in James the presence of hyperbole is even less manifest since in the Greek, the word "whole" is absent. As to extending the drought to three years and a half, we see nothing in Kings that should prevent such an extension, since there it is simply said: "There shall not be dew nor rain these years" (1 Kings xvii. 1); and at the command of the Lord Elijah went up to the brook Cherith, and there remained until the brook dried up, which is said to have been "after a while"; whereupon the Lord commanded the prophet to go to Zarephath: "and it came to pass, after many days, that the word of the Lord came to Elijah in the third year, saying, Go, shew thyself unto Ahab; and I will send rain upon the earth" (1 Kings xviii. 1). It is not said that it is the third year of the famine, but the more natural inference is that it is the third year of his stay at Zarephath, which with the "after a while" would make the whole time neither very much more nor very much less than three years and six months. Instead of drawing from this instance, as Dr. Ladd does, the inference that Christ "thus manifests his entirely uncritical attitude towards the details of the narrative" (p. 69), the extreme advocates of verbal inspiration might infer that Christ's attitude was intended to be very critical, and that he intended to give the weight of his authority to a minutely accurate interpretation of the Old Testament account.

Another case introduced by Dr. Ladd will lead the way to some remarks concerning the correct view of the relation of words to things, and enable us to clear away some misconceptions as to the doctrine of plenary inspiration. Isaiah xxix. 13 contains a somewhat obscure sentence translated in our version, "And their fear toward me is taught by the precept of men" (literally, from the Hebrew, And their fear toward me has become a precept of men, taught). Christ in quoting this (Matt. xv. 9) follows very closely the translation of the Septuagint: "But in vain do they worship me, teaching as their doctrine the precepts of men." Upon this, Professor Ladd has to remark (p. 71) that Christ follows the Septuagint "in introducing the important word μάτην [in vain], which has no correlative in the Hebrew text. This is done apparently to justify his application of the prophecy as *περὶ ὑμῶν* [concerning you]." Now it is indeed true, as Professor Ladd says, that there is no single word here in the Hebrew corresponding to "in vain"; but he ought to know that in transferring thought from one language to another, the translator could make little progress if he were compelled to use only such words as were exactly correlative. The thought of a writer cannot be obtained by pulverizing his sentences and subjecting the product to chemical analysis. The thought of a sentence is largely conveyed by the collocation of the words, and by various unexplainable usages of speech peculiar to particular languages. Thought is often held in a sentence in solution, as sugar is in water, and only crystallizes into a word upon evaporation.

In the case under consideration, the "in vain" of the Septuagint is *implicitly* in the Hebrew sentence, and it falls within the proper province of a translation to bring it out *explicitly* in Greek. To serve God merely in obedience to human authority is to entirely miss the end of worship, and is utterly in vain.

On opening Dr. Ladd's volumes once more we fell upon a discussion of the genuineness of the Book of Daniel (Vol. i. p. 646). We had just been reading in the October number of the *Journal of Christian Philosophy* an Article by Dr. William Hayes Ward, entitled *The Historical Chapters of Daniel attested by Contemporary Records*, and could not well avoid being impressed by the contrast between the two writers, both in their style of procedure and in the conclusions at which they arrived. Dr. Ladd writes like a man vaguely recalling the impressions left by the perusal of some destructive criticism, but really unable to recollect just what the arguments were which convinced him that the Book of Daniel is a grain of historic wheat in a heap of chaff. Dr. Ward writes with that command of the subject which can belong only to one who is intimately familiar with the whole literature of exploration in the far East and who is himself an original investigator.

Dr. Ladd finds, in the first place, two slight chronological difficulties in the Book of Daniel. But he adds candidly: "We have already learned, however, that chronological difficulties do not of themselves discredit the historical character of the narrative in which they occur. Nor need we dwell," he continues, "upon the inherent improbabilities which are alleged against statements like those of ii. 48; iii. 1-30, against the royal edict of vi. 26 f., and against the conception of lions dwelling in a dark stone cavern (vi. 18 f.)." The change of person in Nebuchadnezzar's letter "is not strictly historical," and the Jewish and theocratic flavor of the alleged language of Nebuchadnezzar and Darius "suggests the author's imagination as its source. But then we must remember that the universal practice of both Testaments, and of all the writers of antiquity, admit of giving the speeches, and even the letters, of their historic personages in free and somewhat imaginative form. It seems strange enough that Belshazzar is represented as ignorant of Daniel, while the latter is represented as doing the business of this king, even in the third year of his reign, to say nothing of his famous services under Nebuchadnezzar. "But this discrepancy is scarcely so serious as that which occurs with reference to the first introduction of David to Saul" and "if the latter case does not warrant us in abandoning the entire first book of Samuel as unhistorical, the former case of itself will not utterly discredit the Book of Daniel."

So far, then, Dr. Ladd recognizes that the force of his objection may be parried. But three more serious difficulties remain in the face of which it is useless to think of maintaining the genuineness of the book. These are: (1) The silence of Berosus regarding the lycomania of Nebuchadnezzar;

(2) the fact that the Darius of Daniel "is unknown to history: his person seems rather quite excluded from history"; (3) the fact that four of the names of musical instruments of iii. 5 f. "are so purely Greek terms."

"We must conclude," says Dr. Ladd, "from the foregoing and other similar considerations, that the historical character of Dan. i.-vi. does not admit of by any means complete vindication. But, on the other hand, there is much in this book which even as competent Orientalists as Oppert and Lenormant consider as showing marked knowledge of ancient Babylonian customs; and many indirect proofs of historical accuracy are brought forward by writers like Keil and Rawlinson. It is possible, then, to hold, on historical grounds, with Delitzsch, that the earlier chapters of the Book of Daniel grew out of trustworthy traditions of Daniel himself." "Although, then, the present form of these chapters came from a writer in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes, and although the historical element cannot always with confidence be separated from the accretions of tradition, legend, and designed symbolism, we nevertheless seem warranted in recognizing the historical character of the book in that limited sense which belongs to others of the class we have been examining."

Dr. Ward, in his excellent article, propounds his thesis as follows: "Be this understood, that if the data of Daniel should be generally corroborated by the data of the monuments, it is proof positive that these chapters were, in substance, not written at the late date of Antiochus Epiphanes, in the second century B.C., but were written at or near the time of the event described. That must follow. Remember that the date of the fall of Babylon was 539 B.C., while the date of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes was 164 B.C., leaving a period of 375 years between the two dates. How would a writer in those days have succeeded in trying to play the archaeologist, and reproduce in a story of Daniel events that might have taken place nearly four hundred years before? A story with any verisimilitude could not have been written when the knowledge of customs and events had been lost, not to be recovered till in these last days when so many archaic records have been disinterred."

What are the facts? (1) Peculiar to the Book of Daniel is the mention of Belshazzar. He is unknown to all other writers Greek and Latin. But an inscription dug up within twenty-five years fully explains and confirms all that is said of him in the book.

(2) "There has within six years been found a tablet written by order of Cyrus himself, in which he says that he captured Babylon 'without fighting' (a notable statement!) on the fourteenth day of the month Thammuz." This was the very day when the orgies of the festival of the union of Ishtar and Thammuz culminated — the time for just such a feast as the Book of Daniel describes.

(3) The names of men and titles of their offices are wholly free from anachronisms. Not even does the common Greek word for general,

strategos, appear, "which at the time of Epiphanes had for a long while been naturalized into all the earlier tongues."

(4) The devotion of the Babylonians to dreams is correctly described. "How could a writer three centuries later have learned that this was so marked a peculiarity of just the century in which the story is laid?"

(5) The third chapter of Daniel tell the story of the colossal image of gold set up in the plain of Dura. "The entire story is full of Babylonian color. No antiquarian of the age of Epiphanes existed that could have written it. The plain of Dura still bears the name. Colossal images of gold were familiar at Babylon."

(6) "The punishment threatened by the king to those who refused to bow down and worship the golden image deserves a word of attention. The Assyrians were given to just such inhuman punishments. In this connection we may mention the other punishment by casting into a den of lions. Just such a cage, or den of lions, is pictured on the monuments. There is a local precision about the story which seems to indicate clearly a writer of that very period, who only could know that such was the custom of Oriental royalty, and that Assurbanipal had his cages of lions to provide the royal sport. The record mentions, it will be noticed, that the den was sealed with the king's signet. Quite a number of the signets of the Babylonian kings have been found, and are now in our museums. The Greeks did not use such signets as were used by the Babylonian and Persian kings."

(7) "One of the noticeable subordinate points in the story of the golden image of Dura, which gives it remarkable local color, is the astonishing development of the musical instruments mentioned, the cornet, flute, harp, sackbut, psaltery, and dulcimer, and all kinds of music. But an author must have been a veritable antiquary to know that at this very seventh century B.C. music had become a chief element in the worship of the gods."

Dr. Ward makes several other strong points upon which it is unnecessary to dwell. He has his own way of explaining the difficulties of the book. In his opinion the Aramaic portion is a late translation of a part, which was originally, like the rest, in Hebrew. He thinks that the names of the instruments in the original were not Greek. For "at the time of Daniel Greek had not at all invaded the East; it was still an Ionian language." We wholly fail to see the greatness of the difficulty presented by these four Greek names of musical instruments—a difficulty which in Dr. Ladd's eyes is insuperable, and which forces so careful a thinker as Dr. Ward into the untenable hypothesis that the Aramaic portion is only a targum. We are told in 1 Kings x. 22 that Solomon imported apes (פִּימָה) and peacocks (תְּרִיפִים). These words belong to East India. But the fact that at the time of Solomon the languages of the Malabar coast "had not at all invaded Palestine" does not preclude belief in the state-

ment that apes and peacocks were so imported and continued to be called by their East Indian names. We are not told, indeed, by the Book of Daniel that the musical instruments had been imported from Ionia; we are told only that they existed in Babylon under Greek names. But there is no violence in supposing that they had been imported. Indeed, it is altogether "likely that Babylon the city of merchants (Ezek. xvii. 4), had intercourse with the Greeks even before the fifth century B.C., and according to Strabo (xiii. 3, 2) a brother of the Greek poet Alcaeus served in the armies of Nebuchadnezzar" (D. G. Schaff).

Of Dr. Ladd's three decisive objections to the Book of Daniel, then, but one seems to us serious,— the present impossibility of finding a satisfactory place in history for Darius the Mede. The silence of Berosus regarding the lycomania of Nebuchadnezzar is important only under the principle that every statement of a biblical writer is to be assumed to be false unless expressly confirmed by some profane writer. The four Greek instruments and their names might have reached Babylon in several natural ways. And as to this difficulty about Darius the Mede, it may be said that twenty-five years ago we were in precisely the same difficulty about Belshazzar. He was "unknown to history; his person seemed, rather, quite excluded from history." But one stroke of the pick, turning up a buried inscription, silenced for ever all objections based upon the mention of Belshazzar, and converted that mention into a tower of strength.

Dr. Ladd's theory, that these chapters of Daniel contain a trustworthy tradition redressed and amplified in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes, is the very last theory that would be suggested by what we see upon the monuments. For it is precisely the *dress* of the book that most clearly belongs to Babylon and to the sixth century B.C. This "goodly Babylonish garment" was not woven four hundred years later in Palestine.