

### III

#### THE EVIDENCE: GRAMMAR

**P**ASSING from the text to the grammar we find that in this line of attack upon the Scriptures, the latest evidence is also against the critics.

#### THE ABSTRACT FORMATIONS IN *ûth*, *ôn* AND *ân*

In one of the standard introductions to the Old Testament<sup>122</sup> the assertion is made that the use of “the frequent abstract formations in *ûth*, *ôn* and *ân*” in the book of Ecclesiastes is among the proofs “so absolutely convincing and irrefutable” of the late date of the work, “that as Delitzsch exclaims: ‘If the book of Koheleth be as old as Solomon, then there can be no history of the Hebrew language.’ ” Since Prof. Cornill here cites Delitzsch as his authority, let us rule Cornill out of court as giving hearsay evidence and address ourselves to what Delitzsch says.<sup>123</sup> He was one of the greatest Hebrew scholars of his generation, and fifty years ago his testimony on a matter concerning the history of the Hebrew language was as good as possible. But a history of the Hebrew language was in his time not possible. Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Keil, and all those brilliant scholars

---

<sup>122</sup> Cornill, *Introduction to the Canonical Books of the O.T.*, p. 449.

<sup>123</sup> In his *Commentary to Ecclesiastes*.

of the nineteenth century are as much behind the times to-day as expert witnesses to the history of the Hebrew language as Professor Langley would be in Aeronautics, or a surgeon of the Civil War in comparison with a professor in Johns Hopkins. For since Delitzsch wrote the above, the Tel-el-Amarna Letters, the works of Hammurabi, the Hebrew of Ecclesiasticus, of the Zadokite Fragments, and of the Samaria Ostraka, the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Aramaic papyri and endorsements, and thousands of Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Phenician, Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Hebrew, and other documents throwing light on the Old Testament and its language have been discovered. These documents prove that the old-time alleged histories of the Hebrew language were largely subjective and fallacious; and that the presence of words with endings *ûth*, *ôn* and *ân*, is no indication of the age in which a document was written.

Thus as to *ûth*, or *ut*, we have abundant evidence to show that it was common in every one of the four great Semitic families of languages except Arabic, where the unborrowed form is seldom found.<sup>124</sup>

For example, in Assyrio-Babylonian, there are

---

<sup>124</sup> Wright in his *Arabic Grammar* gives four examples of forms of words with this ending. See Vol. I, p. 166. These four and four others, *rahabut*, *rahamut*, *subrut*, and *tarbut*, are certainly derived from the Aramaic. In a few cases, such as *ragrabuth*, *salabut*, and *darbut*, no Aramaic, Hebrew, or Babylonian equivalent has been found.

three of them in the seven creation tablets,<sup>125</sup> six in the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi,<sup>126</sup> thirteen in the Code of Hammurabi,<sup>127</sup> thirteen in Dennefeld's omen tablets,<sup>128</sup> fifteen in the Amarna letters,<sup>129</sup> eighteen to twenty in the inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I,<sup>130</sup> two in the incantations published by Thompson,<sup>131</sup> and ten in the astrological tablets of the same editor.<sup>132</sup> These inscriptions were written from 2000 B.C. to about 625 B.C.

In the pre-Christian Aramaic we have five words with this ending in the Sendschirli inscriptions from north Syria of about the year 725.<sup>133</sup> The Aramaic portions of Daniel and Ezra each have four and the Sachau Papyri four or five.

In the Old Testament we find from 41 to 55 words of this form.<sup>134</sup> These forms are found in every one of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon except the Song of Songs, Ruth and Lamentations. Unfortunately for the argument that the ending denotes lateness, nine of these words occur in Isaiah, eighteen

---

<sup>125</sup> King, *The Seven Tablets of Creation*, pp. 252, 254, 262.

<sup>126</sup> King, *The Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, 259-296.

<sup>127</sup> R.F. Harper, *The Code of Hammurabi*, 147-191.

<sup>128</sup> *Babylonisch-Assyrische Geburts-Omina*, 220-232.

<sup>129</sup> Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, 1-34.

<sup>130</sup> Lotz, *Die Inschrift Tiglath-pileser's*, I, pp. 204-218.

<sup>131</sup> *The Devils and Evil Spirits of Babylonia*, II, 165-179.

<sup>132</sup> *The Reports of the Magicians and Astrologers of Nineveh and Babylon*, II, 113-152.

<sup>133</sup> Wrba, whl a, wrkz, wkl m.

<sup>134</sup> Fifty-five, if we count the forms in *ûth* from verbs whose third radical was *waw* or *yodh*.

in Jeremiah, seven in Proverbs, seven in Samuel-Kings, one in Hosea and one in Amos, two in Ezekiel, two in Deuteronomy, two in H and four in JE. Of the documents that some or all critics place after the captivity, Ezra has two words ending in *ûth*, Nehemiah three, Chronicles three, Haggai one, Daniel one, Job one, Psalms five, P two, Esther one, and Ecclesiastes five or six.<sup>135</sup> Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the parts of Zechariah, Proverbs and Isaiah, placed by the critics in post-captivity times have no words with this ending.<sup>136</sup>

In all the biblical documents claimed as post-exilic by the critics, the only words with this ending, not occurring in exilic or pre-exilic documents, and found in documents alleged by anyone to be from the Maccabean times are *twcl y youth* (Ps. cx. 3),<sup>137</sup>

---

<sup>135</sup> Of these words the only ones not found in the documents which the critics place before the exile are *twrb* [ (Ezra and Nehemiah), *twrbj th* (Dan. xi. 23), *twml h* (Job vi. 6), *twl ya* (Ps. cx. 3; Ecc. xi. 9,10), *twkal m* (Ps. lxxiii. 28, and Haggai i. 3), and *twl lwh*, *twl ks*, *twrj v*, *twl pv* in Ecclesiastes.

<sup>136</sup> The words ending in *uth* in Is. xl-lx occur in xli. 12, xliix. 19, l. 1,3 and liv. 4. All of these passages are put by Duhm and Cheyne in the original work of Deutero-Isaiah. (LOT, p. 245.) Proverbs xxx and xxxi, according to Dr. Driver, "doubtless of post-exilic origin," have no words ending in *uth*.

<sup>137</sup> Cheyne puts this psalm in Maccabean times. Christ according to Matthew xx. 44, Mark xii. 36 and Luke xx. 42 and Peter according to Acts ii. 34, ascribe it to David in terms as explicit as language can employ. Matthew xxii. 44 introduces the citation from Psalm cx. 1 by saying: How then doth David in spirit call him Lord? Mark xii. 36 says: For David himself said by

twrvj th *league* (Dan. xi. 23), and four words in Ecclesiastes.

Ecclesiasticus (180 B.C.) has four words in *ûth* not occurring in Biblical Hebrew<sup>138</sup> and the Zadokite Fragments (40 A.D.) have two.<sup>139</sup>

It is evident, therefore, that this ending is no proof of the date of a Hebrew document, nor in fact of a document in Babylonian, Assyrian, or Aramaic. The ending simply denotes *abstract* terms. In the account which Bar Hebræus gives of the life of Mohammed, he has but one abstract ending in the account of his active career and seven in the account of his doctrine.<sup>140</sup>

So in the Bible the books treating of concrete events, whether early or late, have but one or two of these words;<sup>141</sup> whereas those treating of more abstract ideas have more words with this ending whatever the date.<sup>142</sup> JE, the earliest part of the Penta-

---

the Holy Ghost. Luke xx. 42 says: David himself saith in the Book of Psalms. Lastly, in Acts ii. 34 Peter, in his great sermon on the day of Pentecost says: For David is not ascended into the heavens: but he saith himself, The Lord said unto my Lord, etc. Reader, what think ye of Christ? Whose son is he? What think ye of the Holy Ghost? Was Peter filled with Him? (Acts ii. 4) See further in my articles on the Headings of the Psalms in the PTR for 1926.

<sup>138</sup> Wl ka, twlj b, twrbg, and twhmt.

<sup>139</sup> Twyr[ and twrv[.

<sup>140</sup> See the *Chronicon Syriacum*, Paris, 1890, pp. 97-99.

<sup>141</sup> Josh. two, Jud. one, 1 Sa. Two, 2 Sa. Two, 1 K. two, 2 K. two, 1 Ch. two, 2 Ch. three, Ezra two, Neh. three, Dan. one.

<sup>142</sup> Thus, Prov. has seven, Is. nine, Jer. eight, Ecc. Six (Ecclus. Eleven).

teuch, according to the critics, has four words ending in *ûth*,<sup>143</sup> whereas P, the latest part, has only two.<sup>144</sup>

That Hebrew nouns ending in *n* (*nûn*), i.e., the forms in *ôn* and *ân*, should be considered late is even less justifiable than in the case of *ûth*. For there are about 140 of such nouns in Hebrew occurring in all ages of the literature; and they are found, also, in Babylonia, Assyrian and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and Aramaic. Besides in many cases, as in *nkl v*, the nouns cannot have been derived from the Aramaic, simply because they have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age.<sup>145</sup>

#### THE USE OF THE HEBREW TENSES

Leaving the morphology and coming to the syntax, we find that here also the critics of the Old Testament cannot support their charges by the evidence. The charge that the *Hebrew perfect forms* of the verb employed in Ex. xx and Deut. i, show that these chapters were written after the conquest of Canaan, breaks down when we learn that Hebrew perfects are often equivalent to English future perfects, or even to an emphatic future.<sup>146</sup>

---

<sup>143</sup> *Twd*[, *twdbk*, *twbml* a and *twkl* m.

<sup>144</sup> *Twd*[ found also in JE. and in Jos. xiii. 21, 27, 30, 31 a word found also in Hos. i. 4, 1 Sam. xv. 28, 2 Sam. xvi. 3, and Jer. xxvi. 1. The opinion of Delitzsch was probably founded on the numerous occurrences of this ending in the version of Onkelos, where there are sixty, or sixty-one nouns with this ending (see Brederick's *Konkordanz*).

<sup>145</sup> For a further discussion of these endings, see p. 147f.

<sup>146</sup> Called in Hebrew grammars the perfect of certainty.

Again it is charged that the frequent use of *wau conjunctive*<sup>146a</sup> with the perfect in Ecclesiastes is a proof that the book is one of the latest in the Old Testament. The discovery of the Hebrew of Ben Sira has broken the force of this argument; for we find that in it the *wau converse* is used with the imperfect 120 times and 33 times with the perfect as against only 5 examples of *wau conjunctive* with the perfect. Moreover, the Zadokite Fragments have *wau converse* with the imperfect 85 times and with the perfect 35 times, as against *wau conjunctive* 16 times with the imperfect and only 3 times with the perfect.

Again the critics have failed to explain how the use of this construction in Ecclesiastes can be due to the time when the work was written in view of the fact that Daniel which they put at about the same time as Ecclesiastes has about 200 cases of *wau converse* with the imperfect and 75 with the perfect, and only about 5 of *wau conjunctive* with the perfect. Again, if the use is due to the time, why is it that it is found only in Ecclesiastes and not in the so-called Macabean psalms and the numerous other documents which the critics assert to be late? Again, how explain its presence twice in Judges v which many critics consider to be the earliest document in the Old

---

<sup>146a</sup> The Hebrew forms Perfect and Imperfect refer to the character of the action as regards completeness and not as to time. The Hebrew conjunction *Wau* or *w*, usually with a change of accent and vocalization, has the power of changing the sense of a Perfect to that of an Imperfect, or the sense of an Imperfect to that of a Perfect.

Testament; or that the perfect occurs with *wau conjunctive* in Num. xxiii, xxiv seven times, to two times with *wau conversive*? It will not do to attempt to invalidate this explicit testimony of Ben Sira, the Zadokite Fragments, Daniel and the writings alleged by the critics themselves to be from definite periods by saying that it is impossible otherwise to bring some of the uses of Ecclesiastes within the period of some critic's definition of what were the limits of use in good Hebrew for the perfect with *wau conjunctive*; for the probability certainly is that whoever wrote Ecclesiastes knew more about those limits than any of our modern professors. Shades of Jean Paul, Carlyle, and Walt Whitman! Ye could not have written in the 19th century, for no other mortals wrote like you.

## THE SYNTAX OF THE NUMERALS

Whatever may be the explanation of the Priestly Document's use of the phrase "a hundred of" instead of "a hundred,"<sup>147</sup> it is certainly no indication of the *age* of the document nor of an authorship different from that of J, E, D, and H.

Starting out with the thesis that "statistical data besides genealogies are a conspicuous feature" in the narrative of P,<sup>148</sup> the critics in order to sustain their

---

<sup>147</sup> I.e., of the use of the *construct*, (tām) instead of the *absolute* (tām).

<sup>148</sup> LOT, 127.



thesis violently and without any evidence ascribe nearly all of the passages containing the word for “hundred” to P, with the result that the word occurs according to their claims 50 times in P, and only 5 times in E, twice each in J and D and once in H. Of these 60 cases, one in J, three in E, one in D and one in P occur before *wau*, where the use of the construct state would be of course impossible. Ruling these out as having no bearing on the discussion, we have remaining 49 cases in P, two in E, and one each in D, H, and J. The example in H where the construct *me’ath* is found before *mikkem* is accounted for by the fact that the genitival relationship might have meant “your hundred” instead of “a hundred of you.” The case in J (Gen. xxvi. 12) cannot indicate the age of the document, since the same phrase occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament.<sup>149</sup> Of the two cases assigned to E, the one in Josh. xxiv. 32 is a citation from Gen. xxxiii. 19. This verse is one of four (Gen. xxxiii. 18, 19, 20 and xxxiv. 1) which the critics, without any support from manuscripts or versions, or elsewhere, arbitrarily divide up into six different portions. The word *keshîta* which occurs here and in the citation in Josh. xxiv. 32 is found nowhere else except in Job xlii. 11. In combination with the

---

<sup>149</sup> That is, followed by *my*[v, the phrase meaning “a hundred fold.” The only analogy to this is in 2 Sa. Xxiv. 3 (parallel to 2 Ch. xxi. 3) “a hundred times”; but in these passages *mym*[p is used.

word for hundred it occurs only in Gen. xxxiii. 19 and in the citation of it in Josh. xxiv. 32. The only instance remaining outside of P is that in Deut. xxii. 19 where it speaks of "one hundred (pieces of) silver." This is paralleled exactly only in Jud. xvi. 5.<sup>150</sup>

Of the forty-nine cases where the word "hundred" is used in P, 22 are in apposition or the absolute state, as in "a hundred sheep," while 27 are followed by the genitive, as in "a score of sheep." Of the former, four may be ruled out (Ex. xxvii. 9, 18, xxxviii. 9, 11) because they are followed by the preposition *b* (*b*), one (Ex. xxvii. 11) because it is followed by an accusative of specification, one, (Num. vii. 86) because it stands at the end of the sentence, and one in Num. ii. 24 because it stands absolutely for "a hundred." Of the remaining fifteen, thirteen stand absolutely, the term for shekels having been omitted; so that only two cases are left where the common genitival construction (with *tam*) might have been used. These occur in Gen. xvii. 17 and xxiii. 1, places in P where "hundred of" could possibly have been used instead of "hundred." In both of these cases it is used before the noun for year, which is remarkable, because P

---

<sup>150</sup> In Jud. xvii. 2 we have an example similar to that in Deut. xxii. 19 except that the definite article is used before the word for silver. In Neh. v. 11 the word *tam* is used before the noun for silver accompanied by the definite article.

usually (17 times in all)<sup>151</sup> employs “hundred of.” P also has “hundred of” three times before *talent*,<sup>152</sup> four times before the word for *thousand*,<sup>153</sup> twice before *day*,<sup>153a</sup> and once before *base*.<sup>154</sup>

Outside of P, hundred before the noun is found in Josh. one time, Jud. four, J one, E two, D one, 1 Sam. two, 2 Sam. four, 1 Ki. Five, 2 Ki. four, Isa. two, Ezk. Ten, 1 Chron. six, 2 Chron. four, Ezra two, Esth. Three, i.e., twenty-four times in the literature preceding the exile, twelve in Isaiah xl-lxvi and Ezekiel, and fifteen in the post-exilic books.<sup>155</sup>

<sup>151</sup> Gen. v. 3, 6, 18, 25, 28, xi. 10, 25, xxi. 5, xxv. 7, 17, xxxv. 28, xlvii. 9, 28, Ex. vi. 16, 18, 20 and Num. xxxiii.39.

<sup>152</sup> Ex. xxxviii. 25, 27<sup>2</sup> (twice with the article). As to the use of *rbk* we find it as early as 2 Sam. xii. 30, 1 Kings ix. 14, 28, x. 10, 14, xvi. 24, xx. 39, 2 Kings v. 5, 22, 23<sup>2</sup>, xv. 19, xviii. 14<sup>2</sup>, xxiii. 33<sup>2</sup>, and as late as 1 Chron. xix. 6, xx. 2, xxii. 14<sup>2</sup>, xxix. 4<sup>2</sup>, 7<sup>4</sup>, 2 Chron. iii. 8, iv. 17, viii. 18, ix. 9, 13, xxv. 6, 9, xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3, Ezra viii. 26<sup>2</sup>, Es. iii. 9. With *ham* it is used in 1 Kings ix. 14, x. 10, 2 Kings xxiii. 33, 2 Chron. xxvii. 5, xxxvi. 3.

<sup>153</sup> Num. ii. 9, 16, 24, 31. Before *ḥl* a we find *ham* 1 Kings xx. 29, 2 Kings iii. 4<sup>2</sup>, 1 Chron. v. 21, xxi. 5, xxii. 14, xxiv. 7, 2 Chron. xxv. 6.

<sup>153a</sup> Gen. vii. 24, viii. 3.

<sup>154</sup> Ex. xxxviii. 27.

<sup>155</sup> *Ham* is used elsewhere as follows: before *bkr* (2 Sam. viii. 4, 1 Chron. xviii. 4), *ḥm* [p, (2 Sam. xxiv. 3, 1 Chron. xxi. 3), *hma*, (1 Kings vii. 2, Ek. xl. 19, 23, 27, 47<sup>2</sup>, xli. 13<sup>2</sup>, 14, 15, xlii. 8), *ḥabn* (1 Kings xviii. 4), *vya* (1 Kings xviii. 13, 2 Kings iv. 43, Jud. vii. 19, xx. 35). *Hnv* (Isaiah lxv. 20<sup>2</sup>), *ḥsk* (Jud. xvi. 5, xvii. 2 [with article]), De. Xxii. 19 *ḥpymx* (1 Sam. xxv. 18, 2 Sam. xvi. 1), *ḥax* (1 Kings v. 3), *hnydm* Es. i. 1, viii. 9, ix. 30), *ṭwl r* [ (1 Sam. xviii. 25, 2 Sam. iii. 14), *ḥr* [v Gen. xxvi. 12 (J), and *ḥfyvq* Gen. xxxiii. 19, Jos. xxix. 32 (E).

"Hundred of" is used only three times in the post-exilic books.<sup>156</sup>

The extra-biblical evidence is as follows:

The Mesha inscription in Moabitic, which is a form of Hebrew, has the phrase, "a hundred of cattle" (ʾyrqn tam). The date of this inscription is the early part of the ninth century B.C. The Siloah inscription from about 700 B.C. has the phrase "a hundred of cubit."<sup>157</sup> Unfortunately neither construction is found in *Ben Sira*, nor in the *Zadokite Fragments*. In the Egyptian *Pyramid Texts* the numeral preceded the noun; but in the records of about 1530 to 1050 B.C. the numeral is put before the noun in the genitival construction.<sup>158</sup> In the *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, *me-at* (= tam) occurs twice; once in 25:10 before *eru* "copper" and once in 19:39 before *lim* "thousand."<sup>159</sup> We thus see that the earliest Hebrew records and the Egyptian and Babylonian documents nearest to the time of the Exodus support the previous use of "hundred of" as we find it in P.

But neither do the critics have support in the later Semitic documents for their theory that the use of "hundred of" before the noun indicates lateness for the document in which it occurs. In Syriac the

<sup>156</sup> Neh. v. 11, 2 Chr. Xxv. 9, Es. i. 4.

<sup>157</sup> See Lidzbarski, *Nordsemitische Epigraphik*, pp. 106, 114, 416, 439.

<sup>158</sup> Erman, *Aegypten*, 63, and *Aegyptische Grammatik*, § 142, 122-126.

<sup>159</sup> Winckler, *Tel-el-Amarna Letters*, pp. 48, 80.

numeral stands in apposition either before or after that which is numbered.<sup>160</sup> The Biblical Aramaic and the inscriptions and papyri afford no examples affecting the question.<sup>161</sup> The New Hebrew follows the biblical usages.<sup>162</sup>

From all the above testimony it is evident that there is no basis in the use of the word for "hundred" for concluding that P may not have been written by Moses.

#### THE EXPRESSION: X THE KING

The charge is made that the Hebrew of Daniel "resembles not the Hebrew of Ezekiel or even of Haggai or Zechariah but that of the age *subsequent to Nehemiah*." One of the alleged proofs of the charge is that in Dan. i. 21 and viii. 1 the name of the king *precedes* the title. That this order is a proof of lateness in Daniel is affirmed in the words: "So often in post-exilic writings, the older Hebrew has nearly always the order (דוד) ° | מ | j "the king David,"<sup>163</sup> The following tables will give the number of times the orders "the king X" and "X the king" are used in the books written before or after 550 B.C.

<sup>160</sup> See examples in Nöldeke, *Syriac Grammar*, § 237.

<sup>161</sup> Ham is used three times in the *Sachau Papyrus*, but always as a noun in the sense of the Roman "century," or company of a hundred men.

<sup>162</sup> Siegfried u. Strack, *Neuhebräische Grammatik*, § 73.

<sup>163</sup> LOT, 506.

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

Before 550 B.C.			After 550 B.C.		
	The king X	X the king		The king X	X the king
1 Sam.	1	1	1 Chron.	4	9
2 Sam.	10	2	2 Chron.	15	9
1 Kings	29	2	Ezra	2	2
2 Kings	14	2	Neh.	0	2
Isaiah	6	0	Hag.	0	2
Jeremiah	10	2	Zech.	0	1
Ezekiel	1	0	Est.	9	0
			Dan.	0	2
Total	61	9	Total	30	27

Since 12 of the citations from Chronicles are in parallel passages in Samuel-Kings, the 30 instances of the phrase "the king X" in the later writings may be reduced to 18; so that the proportion will be: "The king X" 61 to 18, "X the king" 9 to 27. The evidence, therefore, that the order "X the king" is often used in post-exilic writings and that the order "the king X" is "nearly always used in the older Hebrew" amounts to a mathematical demonstration. But a demonstration of what? Why, of the minute historical accuracy of Daniel, Haggai, Zechariah, Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, and of the unassailable character of the sacred scriptures. For mark you, the early writings before 550 B.C. follow the Egyptian order "the king X,"<sup>164</sup> and the later writings follow the Babylonian and Persian order "X the

---

<sup>164</sup> See the scores of examples in my article on "The Titles of Kings in Antiquity" in the PTR for October, 1904, and January, 1905.

king.”<sup>165</sup> In Hag. i. 1, 15, Zech. vii. 1, Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1, Neh. ii. 1, v. 14, and Dan. i. 21, viii. 1, we have exact copies of the Persian and Babylonian order.

Again, it is a matter of wonder that the author of the “Literature of the Old Testament” should have used this particular testimony to prove that Daniel did not resemble Haggai and Zechariah but was “subsequent to Nehemiah”; for the books of Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra and Nehemiah all use the exact phrase which is produced as evidence that Daniel is later than they. Besides, the critics have not produced a single example from the Hebrew literature which they place in the age subsequent to Nehemiah to show that the form “X the king” was used by the Jews subsequently to Nehemiah. Neither Ben Sira nor the Zadokite Fragments have it;<sup>166</sup> nor does it occur in Isaiah xxiv-xxvii, Jonah, Joel, Ecclesiastes, nor in any of the psalms, nor in the book of Proverbs. Nor in this case can the critics resort to the subterfuge of asserting that Daniel is late because the passages in Ezra and Nehemiah in which the phrase occurs are insertions into the genuine works of Nehemiah; for unfortunately for them, the phrase in every

---

<sup>165</sup> See the numerous examples given in the articles just referred to. For the Persian Kings *cf.* especially my articles in the *Sachau Denkschrift* (Berlin 1912) and the PTR for January, 1917.

<sup>166</sup> The nearest to it is the phrase “Nebuchadnezzar the king of Babylon” in the Zadokite Fragments, pp. 1, 6.

case appears in the parts of Ezra and Nehemiah which they themselves admit to be genuine.<sup>167</sup>

Reader, if the most plausible, and probably the most scholarly, of all that school of modern critics that delight to assail the integrity of the scriptural narratives and to use so frequently the modest appellation "all scholars are agreed," will make such palpable blunders in a matter as to which there is abundant evidence to show that the Scriptures are right, what dependence will you place on him when he steps beyond the bounds of knowledge into the dim regions of conjecture and fancy? If, when we can get abundant evidence, the documents of the Bible stand the test of genuineness and veracity, and the charges of the critics are proven false, upon what ground of common sense or law of evidence, are we to be induced to believe that these documents are false or forged when charges absolutely unsupported by evidence are made against them?

#### THE INFINITIVE WITH THE PREPOSITIONS *b* AND *k*

One more charge of the critics in the sphere of syntax will be considered because it covers several

---

<sup>167</sup> Thus Ezra vii. 7, viii. 1 are in the so-called second section of Ezra embracing chapters vii-x as to which Dr. Driver says: "There is no reason to doubt" that it "is throughout either written by Ezra or based upon materials left by him" (LOT, 549). The phrase occurs in Neh. ii. 1, v. 14. Dr. Driver says: "Neh. i. 1-vii. 73<sup>a</sup> is an excerpt to all appearances unaltered, from the memoirs of Nehemiah" (LOT, 550).



books and because it is reiterated in LOT.<sup>168</sup> It is that Daniel's and the Chronicler's use of the infinitive with the prepositions *b* "in" and *k* "as" indicates a date subsequent to Nehemiah. Two specifications are made; first, that this type of sentence is rare in the earlier books, and secondly, that the earlier books place the infinitive clause later in the sentence. Two witnesses only need to be called to answer these assertions. First, Ezekiel. He wrote between 592 and 570 B.C.<sup>169</sup> and his prophecies were arranged evidently by his own hands."<sup>170</sup> His book is the one document of the Old Testament that the critics accept in its entirety, their theories being built largely upon it. Now, in this book there are 49 instances where *b* alone is used with the infinitive in the early part of the sentence, just as in Daniel and Chronicles, let alone those where *k* is used.<sup>171</sup> Since Ezekiel was written before 570 B.C., thirty-five years before we claim that Daniel was written, why is the use of the phrase seven times<sup>172</sup> by Daniel a sign of a date subsequent to Nehemiah 440 B.C.? The second wit-

---

<sup>168</sup> E.g. pp. 506, 538.

<sup>169</sup> LOT, 278.

<sup>170</sup> *Id.* 296.

<sup>171</sup> To wit, i. 17<sup>2</sup>, 18, 19<sup>2</sup>, 21<sup>3</sup>, 24, 25, iii. 18, 20, 27, v. 16, x. 16<sup>2</sup>, 17<sup>2</sup>, xii. 15, xv. 5, xvi. 34, xviii. 24, 26, xx. 31<sup>2</sup>, xxi. 34, xxiii. 37, xxiv. 24, xxvi. 15, 19, 27, 33, xxviii. 25, xxix. 7, xxxii. 15, xxxiii. 8, 13, 14, 18, 19, 33, xxxviii. 14, xlii. 14, xliii. 8, xlv. 19, xlvi. 10<sup>2</sup>, xlvii. 3, 7.

<sup>172</sup> To wit, viii. 8, 23, x. 9, xi. 4 and xii. 7.

ness we shall call is Ben Sira, who wrote about 180 B.C., just about sixteen years before the month of June 164 B.C., when some critics assume that Daniel was written. In the 62 pages of the Hebrew as it is found in Smend's edition (57 in Strack's) we have but six sure examples of this usage, as compared with seven in the 10 pages of the Hebrew of Daniel, and forty-nine in the 85 pages of Ezekiel. That is, Ben Sira has about 10 per cent of one example per page as against 60 for Ezekiel and 70 for Daniel.<sup>173</sup>

---

<sup>173</sup> These two witnesses should be sufficient to convince anyone that the charges in LOT about the infinitive with *k* and *b* are false. However, if anyone is yet unconvinced, I have made a complete concordance of all the examples of the use of the infinitive with *b* and *k* that are found in the Old Testament. There are more than 400 with *b* and 250 with *k*.