

His great love on the cross won *me*, body and soul, to His love and service? Have I flung away self-will, pride and enmity, and yielded myself a glad captive to the loving Christ who died? His cross draws us, His love beckons us. God pleads with all hearts. He who has made peace by so costly means as the sacrifice of His Son, condescends to implore the rebels to come into amity with Him, and "prays us with much entreaty to receive the gift." God beseeches us to be reconciled to Himself.

A. MACLAREN.

THE BOOK OF DANIEL IN THE LIGHT OF
RECENT RESEARCH AND DISCOVERY.

II.

BELSHAZZAR appears in the Inscriptions as "the eldest son" of Nabonidus,¹ and there need be no hesitation in identifying him with the "son of the king" who was with the army in Accad.² What became of him? We can follow the fortunes of Nabonidus, in spite of the blank between the eleventh and sixteenth year of his reign, and notwithstanding the difficulty of deciphering much of the text. Captured in Babylon, to which he had fled, Nabonidus died within the year (possibly at Borsippa, on the right bank of the Euphrates).³ Can we trace anything of the fortunes of Belshazzar? I venture to think that we can.

After the battle of Rutum the "men of Accad revolted." News of the battle in the south and its results had been

¹ *Expositor* for March, 1885, p. 221.

² Pinches, in *T. S. B. A.*, vii. 150.

³ *Berosus*, Fr. 14. The language of the Inscription may bear the sense that Nabonidus fled (without specifying the place), and that when captured he was taken into Babylon; but I have adopted the interpretation supported by the Cyrus-cylinder. See, further, note 4, p. 435.

conveyed to the north. The country rose, and the Babylonian army in Accad, unequal to the task of coercing the revolters, fell back towards Babylon, or was dispersed. It may be presumed that Belshazzar would endeavour to join his father; and Babylon, with its vast enclosed circuit, would be the place in which the families and court attendants of both would best find accommodation.¹ Hence the inference may be permitted that Nabonidus and Belshazzar would endeavour to effect a junction there. Babylon fell "without fighting or battle," says the third Inscription, and the statement is true in the main; but the language of the annalistic tablet introduces a qualification of possibly some importance if it may be connected with Belshazzar. At the end of the same month Tammuz (June), on the 16th day of which Gobryas, governor of the land of Gutium, and the army of Cyrus, descended to Babylon, "the rebels of Gutium (Kurdistan) closed the gates of (the temple) Es-saggil." Who were these men? What was this temple? The tablet intimates that the rebellion was fruitless and eventually subdued: "neither in that temple nor in any other temples of the country was there found a weapon for its defence." And yet it was not till three months after the so-called capture of Babylon that Cyrus either could or did himself come to Babylon; not till the month Marchesvan (October) did he, "before whom the roads were dark, make peace to the city and promise peace to all Babylon." May not the resistance of these rebels of Gutium in some degree account for the delay in the triumphal entry of the conqueror?

If I may conjecturally piece together the succession of

¹ For Belshazzar's pomp, see Daniel v. 1, 2. The vastness of what was understood by Babylon is represented (on the lowest estimate) as a square of above 10 miles, and consequently an area of above 100 square miles; or double the space of London. The Euphrates divided Babylon into two portions as the Thames divides London. Cf. *Herod.*, i. 178, etc., and the notes of Rawlinson and Sayce in their respective editions.

events, I would read their order and history somewhat as follows:—

The rebels of Gutium—rebels, that is, in the eyes of Cyrus and Gobryas—consisted of the soldiers of Belshazzar's army returned from Accad. On entering Babylon with their commander, his family, and his court, they threw themselves into the temple of Saggil, on the left bank of the Euphrates. This was one of the two temples which Babylonian kings, and notably Nebuchadnezzar, had always made objects of restoration. This temple, or "the temple of the lofty head," formed a prominent feature in the royal quarter or palatial enclosure which, as occupied by Nebuchadnezzar, consisted of the old palace (the modern mound of Amram), the new palace (the Kasr), and the celebrated hanging gardens. Belshazzar's party "closed the gates of the temple" when the news of the capture of Nabonidus at Borsippa or elsewhere reached them,¹ and defied their foes for three months. They were well barricaded, and they had provisions. In their security they indulged in the feasting and revelry described in Daniel v.; and in the midst of that revelry the troops of Gobryas forced the defences and "Belshazzar was slain." Further resistance ceased with the death of the soldier-king. "All the people of Tintir, and all the people of Accad and Sumir, nobles and priests who had opposed the king, he (Cyrus) crushed beneath him, and they came and kissed his feet."

These occurrences, as I have conjectured them, fall into a consistent order; and I venture to think the conjecture less violent than that which makes Nabonidus and Belshazzar one and the same person confounded by Jewish and Greek historian alike. The two men stood to one another in the relation of father and son.

¹ Cf. the language of Jeremiah li. 11. "One post shall run to meet another, and one messenger to meet another, to show the king of Babylon that his city is taken at one end, the passages are stopped, the reeds burned with fire, and the men of war affrighted."

Further, the treatment and reminiscences of these events in the Biblical narrative and the cuneiform record respectively is what might have been expected. The book "Daniel" makes no mention of Nabonidus, whose neglect of the gods of Babylon was notorious, but it emphasizes the impiety of Belshazzar, whose defiant treatment of the God of Israel was sternly denounced and punished (Dan. v. 22, etc.). The annalist-tablet, on the other hand, connects the last scenes of the fall of Babylon with Nabonidus, and—so far as that record is perfect—ignores Belshazzar: and it does so as giving prominence to the king best known to the natives of the land. Bearing in mind that the information gathered from the cuneiform writings may yet be largely increased by the discovery and decipherment of other tablets, it is unwise to consider those to hand either exhaustive or contradicting the statement of the Biblical Book. To my own mind the narratives still remain independent of each other. Daniel, a Hebrew eye-witness, naturally records facts relating to that one of the chiefs of the Babylonians with whom he was brought into contact, and whose conduct was an outrage upon the religion of Israel. The Babylonian annalist not less naturally records the capture of the to him better known king, and passes over one whose conduct to Israel was, from a Babylonian point of view, no outrage at all.

Darius—"Darius the Median" (Dan. v. 31; xi. 1), "Darius, the son of Ahasuerus, of the seed of the Medes" (ix. 1), is represented in the book Daniel as having received (v. 31, not "took") the kingdom of Babylon at the hands of another after the capture of the city (B.C. 538), and as having been made king (ix. 1). No specific mention is made of the superior king from whom he received his rank, but this was probably Cyrus.

Who was this Darius? In the *Speaker's Commentary* I ventured to describe him as a "historic character of whose

existence no record other than that contained in Scripture had as yet been found." This the annalistic tablet in some degree modifies. I still find it difficult, if not impossible, to identify him with Astyages, or with Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521), or with Darius Nothus (B.C. 424, said to have been an illegitimate son of Artaxerxes);¹ and the words "son (or, descendant) of Ahasuerus" may, in my humble judgment, be either a later addition of a Hebrew scribe or copyist intended to identify Darius "the Median" with some better known prince of that name; or, they are words recording a parent's proper name unknown and unfamiliar in the time of Daniel, though afterwards famous as the title of a king. The annalistic tablet furnishes a record which, if it does not clear up the question of the name, yet attests the accuracy of the facts as recorded by Scripture. When Cyrus himself descended to Babylon and established peace both in the city and in the province, he "appointed Gobryas to be governor in Babylon together with others."² This Gobryas had been previously mentioned as the governor of Kurdistan and as the actual captor of Babylon. The name occurs again in Herodotus as that of a leading Persian general of the time of Darius Hystaspis;³ and if one and the same person be meant, he must have been a man in the prime of life at the time now under consideration. He appears to have stayed in Babylon but a few months only, and his departure is obscurely⁴ connected with the death of Nabonidus.

¹ It would be tedious to give my reasons as regards these and other identifications. I may perhaps take the liberty of referring the student to my Excursus to Daniel v. in the *Speaker's Commentary*, iv. p. 309, etc. The identification with Darius Nothus is more recent than those noted in the Excursus, but the date assigned to this prince is against his identification with the Darius of the time of Daniel.

² EXPOSITOR for March, p. 223. Sayce renders "over the (other) governors." (*Fresh Light*, etc., p. 145.)

³ *Herod.*, iii. 70 (see notes by Rawlinson and Sayce).

⁴ The tablet is fractured or illegible here. Pinches reads, "In the month of Marchesvan dark, the 11th day, Gobryas unto . . . and the king died" (*T. S. B. A.*, vii. 144; so Budge, *Babyl. Life and History*, p. 78). Sayce's read-

Who succeeded him? May it not have been one of the "others," or "Darius the Median" of Daniel? Such an appointment would be popular in the army of Cyrus; it would be less humiliating to the Babylonians than that of the general who had actually led the troops into their city; and his age, 62 (Dan. v. 31¹), was that of a man of experience and presumably of tact and governing capacity. Whether he retained the post longer than his "first year," and until Cambyses, "king of Babylon," assumed it as sub-king under his father Cyrus, "king of the world," remains a matter of conjecture; but for the time he held it, his position would be that of a viceroy or petty king, superior to that of a "governor," but not that of one assuming the authority of the highest royalty.

The "deification" of Darius (Dan. vi. 7) and the worship of a living man implied in it, has often been illustrated from the customs of that day.² In our own age a practice analogous to it has from time to time been pointed out in other parts of the great Asiatic continent; and some record of this may not perhaps be unacceptable.

Take, for example, the religious customs of the Indian province of Berar as they have been noted and explained

ing is different, "On the 11th day of the previous Marchesvan, Gobryas (was appointed) over (Babylon) and the king (Nabonidus) died" (*Fresh Light*, etc., p. 146). His words in brackets are conjectural. Where so much is conjectural, other conjectures have been hazarded. (1) Was the king who died not Nabonidus, but Belshazzar? This would tally with the account according to which Cyrus sent Nabonidus away to Carmania, where he died in peace (Berosus in Josephus, *Contra Apionem*, i. 20). (2) Were Gobryas (or Ug-bryas) and Darius one and the same person? This is of course possible, but does it not imply that the present text of the Book Daniel has been more deliberately altered than we have any right to assume? To alter Abed-nebo into Abed-nego is one thing; to read Darius instead of Gobryas is another and a very different thing.

¹ Daniel v. 31 should be separated from the fifth chapter, and form—as in the Hebrew text—the opening verse of chapter vi. Darius the Mede had nothing to do with the death of Belshazzar.

² See *Speaker's Commentary* on Daniel vi. 7-9 (c). The reference to the singularly apt parallel of Deioces the Mede should be *Herod.*, i. 99 (not 199).

by one of England's most able civil servants.¹ A regular process of theogony, or the generation of local gods, is going on there; and hero-worship forms an essential element in the devotions of the people. If at first sight the religion of the Hindu population presents a confusion as heterogeneous as the conglomeration of sects, tribes, races, hereditary professions, and pure castes is fortuitous; closer observation has taught men that the popular religion is perceptibly following certain modes of generation, transmutation and growth. And if these modes be, speaking generally, from lower to higher kinds of belief; religious caste is yet sufficiently "fissiparous," by some isolating doctrine, ritual, and superstition, or by some novel and exclusive worship of a new god or deified man, to foil the dissolution of tribal and political distinctions, or to prevent their amalgamation. The Indians worship every created thing, but especially men and women. Nothing impresses the primitive or uncultivated mind so much as human personality or character. It is this which accounts for that remarkable and still flourishing offshoot of Buddhism, the Jaina faith, which is nothing else but the worship of deified men; it is this which explains the hero-worship of General Nicholson during his life-time in spite of his violent persecution of his own devotees; it is this which explains how the Hindu constantly turns his men into gods, and his gods back again into men, and induces him to worship some living man in whom the god actually resides.² Only lately the S. P. G. missionary of Ahmednagar, the Rev. H. F. Lord, came across an actual instance of this superstition.³ In a certain village in his circuit, the people met on the Tuesday of each week to worship a living man. At about five o'clock on the evening of that day the departed spirit of a relative was said

¹ Lyall's *Asiatic Studies*, chap. i.-iii.

² Cf. Lyall, pp. 19, 42-44.

³ See *Mission Field* (S. P. G.), for August, 1884, p. 269.

to take possession of him. People came from considerable distances to worship him, to "ask petitions" (cf. Dan. vi. 7), to seek cures; and at his feet as a god they laid their offerings of incense and gifts.

J. M. FULLER.

King's College, London.

*THE AIM, IMPORTANCE, DIFFICULTIES, AND
BEST METHOD, OF SYSTEMATIC THEOLOGY.*

FOURTH PAPER.

IN previous papers I have endeavoured to show that the true aim of Systematic Theology is to reproduce, amid the infinite imperfection of all human knowledge of the Divine, yet as correctly and as fully as we can, Christ's own conception touching Himself and His work. This we sought to do by careful study and comparison of the conceptions of Christ reflected in the extant writings of His earliest followers.

Our method was that of strict historical research. We nowhere assumed infallible or special authority for the Bible; but we tested its authority and trustworthiness according to the principles of human credibility. Nor did we take account of the opinions touching Christ and His work held by His followers in later ages.

The results of this study, each student will determine for himself. To me, the manifold and far-reaching harmony, underlying very marked diversities in detail, in the New Testament, is abundant proof that these writings are a correct report of the teaching of Christ; and for His disciples' confident assurance that He rose from the dead, and for the effect upon the world of their assurance, I can