

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 *The Churchman* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php

Sacrifice of the Mass, which prevailed in this country till the era of the Reformation. We must remember that there was till then no difference in doctrine between this country and any other part of the Western Church. The word "Rome" summed up to our forefathers the whole mass of superstitions which they swept away. To say that they did not repudiate the Sacrifice of the Mass is simply, literally, and absolutely untrue.

WILLIAM SINCLAIR

Notes and Queries.

THE FALL OF BABYLON.

THERE are reasons why difficulties should attach themselves to the chronological position of the Fall of Babylon. The event occurs at a period—say the heart of the sixth century, B.C.—over which there hangs a cloud of uncertainty. First, the three entries in the Parian marble, numbers 43, 44, 45, containing all historic notices during the period between 556 B.C. and the year 512 B.C., have had their numeral figures obliterated. Next the three characters with which the name of Cyrus is associated, namely, Deputy Prince of the Tributary Province of Persia; Sovereign King of the Independent Monarchy of Persia; and, lastly, King of Babylon, have got tangled together, so as to be taken one for the other. Next, the accession of Cyrus to the Independent Monarchy of Persia does not appear in the astronomical canon of Claude Ptolemy. Profane history, however, supplies one good clue to the Fall of Babylon. The war taken up by Croesus, King of Lydia, against Cyrus is supposed to have been waged with a view of avenging the defeat and deposal of Darius, King of Media, which war terminated in the capture of Croesus and conquest of Lydia some eight or nine years prior to the capture of Babylon by Cyrus.

But sacred history can always be relied on as a satisfactory source of information, inasmuch as the penmen of Holy Scripture give signs of having registered the annals of the Hebrew nation in strict observance of distinct and well-defined chronological laws. Between the accession of Nebuchadnezzar to the throne of Babylon, or rather between the announcement of Babylonian supremacy by the prophet Jeremiah (xxv. 12) in the first year of Nebuchadnezzar's reign, and the gathering together of the people in Jerusalem after the return of the forty-two thousand three hundred and threescore children of the province who returned from Babylon under Zerubbabel, Prince of Judah, under the decree of "Cyrus, King of Babylon," and "King of Persia" in the first year of his reign (Ezra i. 1, and v. 13). Between these two events the penmen of the sacred Scriptures have supplied us with some ten or twelve well-defined and chronicled equinoctial events, which can be distinctly tabulated in consecutive order to the very year of their occurrence.

The fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel gives us the impression that "the queen" there mentioned is the queen dowager of Nebuchadnezzar. But if the Fall of Babylon is an accomplishment of Jeremiah's predictions (Chapter xxv.) it could not have taken place within twenty-five

years of Nebuchadnezzar's death, since he reigned forty-four years. How, then, could such "queen" be Nebuchadnezzar's relique? Add to this the fact that prior to his accession to the throne of Babylon Nebuchadnezzar was of an age to be sent to Jerusalem and besiege the city (Daniel i. 1).

The penmen of the sacred Scriptures do not withhold necessary information; it has therefore to be accounted for that the names of Nabonadius and Cyrus do not appear in the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel. Neither do the inspired penmen indulge in needless information; and yet we are informed that Darius was three score and ten years old at the death of Belshazzar.

The slaughter of Belshazzar when "Darius the Median took the kingdom" is supposed to precede the accession of "Darius the son of Ahasuerus of the seed of the Medes" to be "King over the realm of the Chaldeans." This accession of Darius is supposed to precede the defeat and deposal of Darius by Cyrus, Deputy Prince of the Tributary Province of Persia. This defeat and deposal of Darius by Cyrus is supposed to precede the accession of Cyrus to the sovereignty of the Independent Monarchy of Persia. And this accession of Cyrus to the Monarchy of Persia is supposed to precede the capture of Babylon by Cyrus.

If the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel contains a narrative of the Fall of Babylon, are we not bound to show that the several predictions relative to the decay of the Babylonian Empire by the prophet Isaiah (xiv. 22; xlv. 26, 28; xlv. 1) and by the prophet Jeremiah (xxvii. 6, 8; l. 1, 32; li. 1, 58), were all accomplished in and by one great national event?

The recurrence of the word Belshazzar in the Book of Daniel involves the identity of the person in each case, and this, again, involves the origin and construction of Babylonian names and titles.

When the Bible gives us a chronological period—say of 400 years, or of 430 years, or of 120 years, or of 65 years, or of 70 years—it usually supplies us with one end of the period, but leaves us to find the other end of the period in the best way we can, which way is not always very obvious.

A change of dynasty has been known to take place in the history of a nation without the break-up of that nation. A change of dynasty took place at Memphis when "there arose up a new king over Egypt which knew not Joseph," yet Egypt was not on that occasion destroyed. A change of dynasty took place in the history of Nineveh, when Arbaces, the first representative of the Median Dynasty, ascended the throne of Nineveh, but the Assyrian Empire was not broken up for more than 200 years afterwards, and are we quite sure that no such event took place in the history of Babylon?

REV. THEODORE BUDD.

NOTE UPON THE REV. A. C. ROBINSON'S PAPER IN "CHURCHMAN" FOR OCTOBER, ENTITLED, "THE CUNEIFORM RECORDS."

THIS is an acute and, to my mind, convincing attestation of events recorded by Daniel which happened at the Fall of Babylon. Now, I do not think that the writer means to assert that Darius the Mede never reigned in that city. Indeed, what would it avail to establish Daniel's accuracy on *one* point, if he be grossly unhistoric on another quite as vital? Yet the paper certainly *reads* like an admission that the accession of Cyrus took place on the day that Belshazzar died! Inasmuch as a paper of mine has been accepted by the editor of the CHURCHMAN, which strongly upholds Daniel's account of King Darius, some comment by me on this phase of the subject seems quite in order.

I therefore must point out that the contract-tablets dated, "In the accession year of Cyrus," in nowise help us to the *date* of that year. That is to say, they cannot yield the faintest presumption that Cyrus, on conquering Babylon, at once claimed the empire he had won. Room may well be made for Darius's brief year's reign.

The sole argument (if it be worthy of the name) to the contrary is the absence of tablets dated "In the 1st year of Darius." Doubtless, should such an one spring to light, it would be warmly welcomed. But if it befall otherwise, surely nobody need feel disconcerted. A satirist has remarked upon "the admirable punctuality" with which the Empress Helena, when exploring in and around Jerusalem, invariably turned up this or that sacred relic she had determined to find. At this time of day we scarce believe that we simply have to rummage old Babylon for a specially required tablet, when—hey, presto!—the very thing most obligingly leaps into view. In cuneiform discovery we must expect many a "hiatum valde defendum."

CUTHBERT ROUTH.

THE CUNEIFORM RECORDS AND THE FALL OF BABYLON.

I have read the remarks of Professor Sayce on my article on the above subject in regard to the force of the idiom *erébu ana*, which, he says, has only the sense "to enter." Delitzsch, to whom he refers ("Assyrisches Handwörterbuch"), says it appears that *erébu* has the meanings of *eintreten, hineingehen, oder kommen, einziehen, eindringen*, with the prepositions *kirib, ana kiribi* ("within"), *ana* ("to"), and *ina* ("in"), as well as with accusative alone. I feel very reluctant, having no pretensions to being an Assyriologist, to enter into any discussion on a technical point like this, on which scholars who are so eminent in that science have given their opinion. Still, I may perhaps be permitted to urge that it seems to some to be rather unreasonable to suppose that the prepositions, *kirib, ana kiribi* ("within"), *ina* ("in"), and *ana* ("to"), should all, when used with *erébu*, have the same force. I would also call attention to the following passage, in which *ana* has unquestionably the force of going "up to" a city, not then entered, but which was subsequently besieged and taken. As the verb, however, is not *erébu*, "to descend," but *ag-dhi-rib*, "to approach," the quotation may perhaps not be considered to precisely touch the point. The passage, which is taken from an inscription on the bronze gates discovered some years ago by Mr. Rassam at Balawat, recording the exploits of Shalmanezer II., is as follows: "*Ultu al Zaban at-tu-sir*" (From Zaban I departed), "*ana al Me-Tu-wr-na-at ag-dhi-rib*" (to the city of Meturnat I approached), "*a-si-bi*" (I besieged), "*ak-ta-sad*" (I captured), "*ti-duki-su a-duk*" (its soldiers I slew).—*Transactions Soc. Bib. Arch.*, vol. vii., p. 99. The same construction is repeated in four other similar passages of the same inscription, in each of which the preposition "*ana*" is used in the sense of approaching "up to" a city, which was afterwards besieged and taken. This, I would urge, would seem to indicate that the sense of "entering" may perhaps not be necessarily involved even in the idiom *erébu ana*. In any case, I would say that whatever force of "entering" there may be in the idiom would probably be sufficiently satisfied by the fact that Gôbryas, on the occasion referred to—even according to the view advocated in my article—"entered" the suburbs of Babylon outside the walls.

ANDREW C. ROBINSON.

