

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_churchman_os.php)

## ART. V.—THE CUNEIFORM RECORDS AND THE FALL OF BABYLON.

TO all lovers of the Bible Professor Sayce has rendered incalculable services by his labours in the field of Assyriology, and by those many able writings in which he has pointed out the various important lights which the archæological discoveries of recent years have shed over the Old Testament Scriptures, and the remarkable confirmations which they have afforded of the general accuracy of the Bible narrative.

In reviewing the Book of Daniel, however, in his work, "The Higher Criticism and the Monuments," Professor Sayce comes to the conclusion that the cuneiform inscriptions of the age of Cyrus contradict the account of the Fall of Babylon which has come down to us from the classical authors of antiquity, and has been accepted as the true one down to the present day, and also contradict the account of the same event which would seem to be implied in the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel.

The point at issue between Professor Sayce and the general tradition and history of antiquity may be put in this way: The classical authorities say that the Babylonians, after one encounter with the troops of Cyrus, in which they were worsted, retired within the apparently impregnable walls of Babylon, within which there had been stored up provisions sufficient for many years: that upon this Cyrus invested Babylon; he commanded his soldiers to dig deep trenches surrounding the city, as if he were throwing up lines of circumvallation, but contrived that these trenches should be dug in such a way that, at a moment's notice, the waters of the river Euphrates could be turned into them, and the depth of the river so much reduced in that part where it flowed through the city that his soldiers should be able to advance up the bed of the river and enter the city through the unguarded river-gates. The Babylonians, secure within the walls of Babylon, "took no heed," Herodotus says, "of the siege," whilst Xenophon says they "laughed at the Persians and turned them into ridicule," in consequence of which the work of digging the trenches was conducted without any attempt on the part of the besieged to interfere with it; and the siege was carried on consequently "without fighting." This bloodless character of the siege is an important point to remember. To dig these trenches was not such a very difficult operation in the purely alluvial soil of Babylonia, which, in the vicinity of the great rivers Tigris and Euphrates was entirely free from rock or stone; and Herodotus states expressly that Cyrus, in carrying out his design, made use of channels which, for a

similar purpose, a queen of the Babylonians had dug years before.

But when the trenches were dug, Xenophon relates, Cyrus selected a night on which he heard there was to be some great feast in Babylon, at which the Babylonians were wont to drink and revel all the night, and as soon as darkness fell, taking a number of his troops, he opened the trenches; the water poured into them, and soon the river became fordable. Then Cyrus commanded his lieutenants, Gôbryas and Gadatas, because they were acquainted with the streets of Babylon, to lead the troops up the now shallow bed of the river, enter the city by the river-gates, which they seem to have expected to certainly find open, and lead the way by the shortest possible route to the palace of the King. This they did, and Cyrus appears to have followed. The city was that night *en fête*—Babylon was holding high festival. The soldiers who entered with Gôbryas and Gadatas struck down some of those they met, and a shouting arose. The soldiers of Gôbryas joined in the shouting, as if they were revellers like the rest; and so they pressed on through the streets to the palace. There they struck down the guards at the palace-doors; a tumult arose, and the King sent some of his attendants out to see what it was. The moment the doors were opened, Gôbryas and his men burst in and penetrated to the hall where the King was. They found him standing up with his sword already drawn; but, soon overpowered by numbers, he fell, sword in hand, slain by the soldiers with Gôbryas.

Such appears to have been the tragic end of King Belshazzar. His attendants were slain defending themselves as best they could.

But Cyrus instantly sent cavalry through the city, and caused proclamation to be made in Aramaic that the Babylonians should keep within their houses, and that if any ventured out they should be slain.

Then, Xenophon says, Gôbryas and Gadatas first thanked the gods because the impious King was slain, and next they kissed the hands and feet of Cyrus.

But when it was morning, Cyrus commanded the Babylonians to give up all their arms, which was done. The towers of the city were surrendered to him, and thus, almost without fighting or bloodshed, great Babylon was his.

And so there is little or no exaggeration in the boast of the cuneiform inscriptions of Cyrus, which we shall presently discuss, which say that without fighting and battle the great god Merodach, as they put it, caused Cyrus to enter Babylon.

Now, Professor Sayce declares that he has discovered that the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions of the age of Cyrus

show that all this hitherto received account of the fall of Babylon is wrong; that, in point of fact, there was no siege whatever, no night surprise of the city, no king slain.

In the "Higher Criticism and the Monuments," p. 522, he writes: "The inscriptions of Cyrus have revolutionized our conception of the history of his reign. There was no siege and capture of Babylon. The capital of the Babylonian empire opened its gates to his general, as Sippara had done before. Gôbryas and his soldiers entered the city 'without fighting.' . . . All this is in direct opposition to the story of the conquest of Babylonia, as it has hitherto been received. According to Herodotus it occupied a long space of time. Babylon itself was besieged by Cyrus for months, and was taken only by a stratagem. The Persian invader drained off the waters of the river, and his army, under shelter of night, crept into the city through the empty channel. Herodotus was repeated by historian after historian, and the Book of Daniel seemed to set its seal upon it. But we now know that the siege never took place." And again, on page 531, he says: "The same monumental evidence which has vindicated the historical accuracy of the scriptural narrative in other places has here pronounced against it. The story of Belshazzar's fall is not historical in the modern sense of the word 'history.'"

The ancient documents on which Professor Sayce principally relies in making these statements are a Babylonian clay tablet to be seen in the Assyrian and Babylonian Room in the British Museum, inscribed in cuneiform characters, first translated by Mr. Pinches, of the British Museum, in the year 1880, and a clay cylinder, known as the Cyrus cylinder. The tablet gives, in the form of annals, a summary account of the reign of Nabonidos, the last king of Babylon, and his conquest by Cyrus, and it will be referred to in this article as "the annalistic tablet," the other as "the Cyrus cylinder." The important portions of the tablet, bearing upon the fall of Babylon, will be given presently, but first just one word about the political situation at the moment.

At the time when Cyrus, in his career of conquest in Western Asia, marched against Babylonia, the King of Babylon was named Nabonidos—called by the Greeks "Labynetos"—and was in the seventeenth year of his reign. Belshazzar was his son, and would appear to have been associated with his father, towards the end of that father's reign, in the kingly power. His name very frequently occurs in the cuneiform inscriptions as "the son of the king." In one of these inscriptions Nabonidos calls him "his eldest son, the offspring of his heart"; several contract tablets record business trans-

actions of "Belshazzar, the king's son," and we also have records of his offerings to the temples of the gods. The annalistic tablet informs us that for several years in succession he was in command of the army in Northern Babylonia, whilst his father Nabonidos remained in Babylon. Subsequently he and his father would appear to have exchanged places—his father taking command of the army in the field, whilst the son Belshazzar remained in Babylon, where he was on the night that the city fell. In connection with the fall of the city the annalistic tablet, as we shall see presently, appears to record his death.

Professor Sayce, indeed, says that Belshazzar would seem to have been dead, or at least to have disappeared from history, before Cyrus entered Babylonia. But, in making this statement, Professor Sayce would seem to have overlooked a remarkable cuneiform tablet—the translation of which is given by Mr. Pinches in his article "Belshazzar," in the new edition of Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"—which records that on the fifth day of the month Ab (July-August), in the seventeenth year—which was the last year of Nabonidos—Belshazzar paid a sum of money on behalf of his sister, who is named, being tithe due by her to the offertory-house at Sippar. This inscription proves clearly that Belshazzar was still living in the last year of his father Nabonidos.

At this point it may be remarked that Pusey, the learned and able defender of the Book of Daniel, had no opportunity in his lectures on the subject of discussing these particular inscriptions which we are considering. The third edition of his lectures is dated 1869, whilst this annalistic tablet was not decyphered until 1880. He was fully aware, however, that the name of Belshazzar had been found in the cuneiform inscriptions, and quotes the one already referred to—in which the father, Nabonidos, calls his son "the offspring of his heart." "Rationalists must now," he writes, p. 404, "retract the assertion that 'the last King of Babylon has a false name in Daniel,' since it is now an admitted fact that the name of Belshazzar occurs on Babylonian cylinders, as that of the eldest son of Nabunahit (the Nabonidus of Berosus, the Labynetus of Herodotus), the last King of Babylon, and being associated with his father in the empire, and slain at Babylon. . . . The fact," he continues, "that Belshazzar was slain is illustrated," and then he quotes from both Sir Henry and Professor Rawlinson, "by the inscription of Behistun, in that the impostor, who caused the Babylonians to revolt against Darius Hystaspes, and who personated the heir to the throne, did not take the name of the eldest son, Belsharezer, but of the second son, Nabukudururusur." "Berosus," continues Pusey, "then gives

the history of the open campaign of the father, Nabonetus, who, having been defeated, shut himself up in Borsippa, and was there taken after the capture of Babylon." The view of the history taken in this article coincides with that of Pusey.

But now it is time to particularly notice the important passages in the annalistic tablet which bear on the actual fall of Babylon. I shall give them, for the most part, according to the rendering of the original translator of the tablet—Mr. Pinches—and shall call your attention to some very important differences in the version given by Professor Sayce.

The document would seem to be a brief abstract, drawn probably from the annals of the Babylonian kingdom, but composed by priestly scribes, the flatterers of the conqueror Cyrus. It is much concerned about the various movements and processions of the Babylonian idols, but its references to political and military events are brief and laconic in the extreme. The inscription is also imperfect in parts. There is a great gap or lacuna between the eleventh and the last year of the reign of Nabonidos. When the tablet becomes again legible, it states that the lower sea (the Persian Gulf) revolted; and then, after recording that certain of the idols were moved from some of the cities down to Babylon, in the Babylonian month Elul (corresponding to our August-September), the next sentence goes on to mention certain events which happened in the month Tammuz (June).

It will thus be seen that between these two sentences in the inscription there is an interval of eight or nine months—that is to say, from August to the following June. About the events which may have occurred during this period the inscription is absolutely silent. And yet that period must have been a critical moment in the history of the Babylonian kingdom, and events of supreme importance must have been passing. It shows how precarious it is to rest any proof of a negative on the capricious silences of a document such as this.

The next sentence in the tablet records: "In the month Tammuz (June), when Cyrus had delivered battle against the soldiers of Accad, in the city of Ripe, on the banks of the river Nizallat, when the men of Accad also had delivered battle, the men of Accad raised a revolt—some persons were slain."

This would appear to be the engagement mentioned by Herodotus, in which the Babylonians were worsted.

"The warriors, on the 14th day, Sippar, without fighting, took—Nabonidos fled."

King Nabonidos seems to have been in command of the army which was worsted, and to have taken refuge in Sippar, whence he subsequently fled.

"On the 16th day, Gôbryas, governor of the country of

Gutuim and the army of Cyrus, without fighting, to Babylon descended."

In regard to this last sentence, there is a difference in this translation given by Mr. Pinches and the version of Professor Sayce, which is of crucial importance. The words which Mr. Pinches translates "to Babylon descended" Professor Sayce renders "entered Babylon." If this latter were the proper translation, then, of course, all would be over, and Babylon would have surrendered, without fighting, to Gôbryas, the lieutenant of Cyrus, on the 16th of the month Tammuz (June).

And this is what, Professor Sayce maintains, did occur. On the other hand, the translation of Mr. Pinches, "without fighting to Babylon descended," would merely mean that Gôbryas and the soldiers of Cyrus marched down to Babylon without experiencing any opposition, and took up a position outside the walls.

I hope to be able to show reason for believing that this was what really took place.

The Babylonian word in the original, the translation of which is in question, is the word "erêbu." I have had some correspondence with Mr. Pinches on this subject, and he says that "erêbu" means "to descend," "to enter," and "to set" (of the sun). "The translator," he says, "uses his judgment in his choice between the first two possible renderings, and often the preference for the one or the other hardly changes the sense." In this case, however, it makes the greatest possible difference—in fact, it is of crucial importance. The preposition in the sentence, it may be remarked, is "ana" "to," which does not seem to involve any idea of "entering." The translation, "to Babylon descended," would therefore appear to be a sufficient rendering of the passage. Now, if it were said that Gôbryas, in time of peace, "to Babylon descended," or went down, it would no doubt be natural to understand from those words that he not only went down to Babylon, but entered the city. It is quite different, however, when these words refer to a time of war. If in this present time of peace we were to say that a Frenchman went down to Strasbourg, we might well infer that he not only went down there, but that he entered the city. But if in the time of some future war between Germany and France it were said that a French general went down to Strasbourg, we should hardly feel justified in assuming from those words that he entered that city, so strongly fortified, even though it should happen that he arrived there without fighting. We should require a more definite statement than the words, "went down to Strasbourg," before we should feel justified in assuming that he entered the city. *In point of fact, by pressing the words of the passage in question to this*

more extended signification of "enter," Professor Sayce begs the whole question at issue, and on this forced interpretation bases the very drastic conclusion to which he comes, that all classical history and tradition on the subject of the fall of Babylon has been utterly at fault.

The annalistic tablet next has the following passage: "Afterwards Nabonidos when he (Gôbryas) had bound, into Babylon he took."

We are not told how long "afterwards" this event occurred, but it agrees with what is mentioned by the classical writers—namely, that Cyrus spared the life of Nabonidos, to whom he subsequently allotted a habitation in Carmania. The annalistic tablet goes on: "In Marchesvan"—the Babylonian month answering to our October-November—"In Marchesvan, the third day Cyrus to Babylon descended—the roads before him were dark," or, according to Professor Sayce, "dissensions were allayed before him." You will observe that an interval of three months—from Tammuz (June) to Marchesvan (October-November) separates the arrival of Gôbryas before Babylon from this arrival of his master Cyrus. Professor Sayce, on the assumption that Babylon had been actually taken possession of by Gôbryas in the month Tammuz, writes: "Three months later Cyrus himself arrived, and made his peaceful entry into the new capital of his empire. We gather from the contract-tablets that even the ordinary business of the place had not been affected by the war." And in a note he says: "Even after the entrance of Gobryas into Babylon on the 16th of Tammuz (June) the contracts made there continued to be dated in the reign of Nabonidos." He then gives the dates of certain contract-tablets published by Dr. Strassmaier, which shall be fully considered presently.

Now, in this passage also the words in the original are "Ana Eki erêbu," and Professor Sayce renders them once more "entered Babylon." Mr. Pinches, on the other hand, translates them, "Ana," to; "Eki," Babylon; "erêbu," descended; which would seem to be a literal and natural translation, and would merely mean that on the 3rd of Marchesvan (October-November) Cyrus took up a position outside the walls of Babylon, where his army had been already, for the last three months at least, encamped under the more immediate command of Gôbryas. During that time the troops had been employed, we may assume, in digging those trenches by which Cyrus intended, when a favourable opportunity offered, to render fordable the part of the river which flowed through Babylon. That opportunity presented itself on the night of a great festival—a night which I hope to show was the night of the 11th of this very month Marchesvan.



It would seem that it was on that date really that Babylon fell, as will, I trust, appear from the passage we are about to notice, from the dating of the contract-tablets, and from other considerations.

This passage which I am about to particularly notice records an event which occurred in this month Marchesvan, but in the annalistic tablet is somewhat out of its proper chronological position. It is a passage of supreme importance, but, most unfortunately, is somewhat mutilated. According to Professor Sayce's version, it runs: "The 11th day of the month Marchesvan during the night Gôbryas was on the bank of the river . . . the wife of the King died." Whilst Mr. Pinches' translation is: "On the night of the 11th of Marchesvan Gôbryas [descended] against [Babylon], and the son of the King died."

I called the attention of Mr. Pinches in an interview which I had with him last year in London to this difference in the two translations, and he said that he was writing a paper which he was to read at the Norwich Church Congress, and that he would make some remarks on this point. The following are the remarks accordingly which he made in his paper:

"Finally, I have a few words to say anent my translation of the part of the Babylonian chronicle referring to the capture of Babylon. The translation which I adopted some years ago, and which I do not as yet see any reason to abandon, is: 'On the night of the 11th of Marchesvan, Gôbryas [descended] against [Babylon], and the son of the King died.' Two words are here restored—namely, 'descended' and 'Babylon'—but as there is hardly any doubt that those or similar expressions stood in the original when it was in a complete state, and as the sense seems to demand some such completion, this restoration can hardly be regarded as unreasonable. Sayce restores this passage, 'Gôbryas [was] on the bank of the river,' apparently referring to the fact that the city was taken by draining the river-bed. In whatever way the lacuna is to be filled up, however, one thing is certain, and that is, that on the 11th of Marchesvan Gôbryas did something 'against' or 'upon' some place, and some royal personage died. . . . As this event took place in 'the night,' it is not going too far to say that it probably refers to the event narrated in Daniel, which tells us that Belshazzar, King of the Chaldæans, was slain in the night, after he had held a high festival. According to the Greek writers, Nabonidos, father of Belshazzar, surrendered to the army of Cyrus, who gave him a habitation in Carmania, where he died. Nabonidos, by his surrender, may be regarded as having abdicated, and his son would then become by his birth-right King. It does not, therefore, matter whether we read

(as I did on first translating the tablet) 'the King died,' or, as I now propose, 'the son of the King died.' Belshazzar would in either case be meant. . . . This improved translation presupposes that Belshazzar was holding out in some part of Babylon, and, if it be the right rendering, shows that Daniel v. 30 is substantially correct."

From all this, then, it would appear that there is the very strongest reason for believing that it was not on the 16th Tammuz (June), as held by Professor Sayce, that Babylon fell, but three months later—on the night of the 11th Marchesvan (October), and that on that night King Belshazzar, the son of King Nabonidos, was slain. And this view receives further strong confirmation from the dating of those contract-tablets of the merchants of Babylon, already referred to, published by Dr. Strassmaier, and mentioned by Professor Sayce. Professor Sayce himself notices that many of these contract-tablets, although drawn up subsequent to the 16th Tammuz, the date on which, according to his own supposition, Babylon had surrendered to Gobryas, the lieutenant of Cyrus, were, nevertheless, dated still in the seventeenth year of King Nabonidos. He attempts to account for this by assuming that the supposed surrender of the city to the general of the conqueror Cyrus caused so little excitement that the mercantile community of Babylon went on for three months calmly dating their contract-tablets in the reign of Nabonidos as if nothing had happened.

One may well ask: Does this seem likely? Is it likely that Gobryas would allow the new sovereignty of his master over Babylon to be thus so contemptuously ignored, even if we could conceive the merchants of Babylon to have been guilty of such folly.

In opposition to this view of Professor Sayce's, and in support of my contention that it was on the night of the 11th of Marchesvan that Babylon fell, I would call attention to the dating of these tablets, which will show that all the tablets which are dated earlier than the 11th Marchesvan are dated in the seventeenth year of King Nabonidos; whilst all the tablets which are dated later than the 11th Marchesvan are dated in the "accession year of Cyrus," showing that it was on the night of the 11th Marchesvan that the kingdom passed into the hands of Cyrus.

To this state of things I called Mr. Pinches' attention, and he said that he had always considered that the dating of these tablets was of the greatest importance in determining the exact date of the fall of Babylon; and he subsequently alluded to the subject in the paper which he read at the Norwich Church Congress in the following words:

“It is to be noted that the contract-tablets point to the 11th Marchesvan as the date when the Babylonian empire ceased to exist, and the country yielded up its independence into the hands of the Persian conqueror.”

The following are the dates of the contract-tablets in question. Professor Sayce, it is to be remembered, holds that Babylon surrendered to Góbryas on the 16th Tammuz (June). That event, if it had happened, would have terminated the reign of King Nabonidos. And yet we find a number of contract-tablets, subsequent to the 16th Tammuz, still dated in the 17th year of Nabonidos. There is one, for instance, on the 22nd Tammuz (June), another on the 5th Ab (July-August), and another (to be seen in the case at the British Museum), for sale of a slave, dated the 21st Ab, in the city of the King's Palace, in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon. And yet Professor Sayce maintains that Nabonidos had been deposed a month before.

A tablet dated the 5th of this same month Ab, “in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos,” records that Belshazzar paid arrears of tithe, due by his sister to the offertory-house at Sippar—a transaction already referred to. This Belshazzar might have done through his servants or agents, even though, as is most probable, he was at the time himself besieged in Babylon, and even though Sippara was in the hands of the enemy.

Again, in the next month, Elul (August-September), there is a contract-tablet dated 3rd Elul, in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon”; another, dated 5th Elul, in the same year, “in the city of the King's Palace, Babylon”; and others dated the 11th, 18th, 21st, and 28th Elul, “in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon.”

Surely Babylon cannot have been held for Cyrus—as yet. On the 3rd Marchesvan the annalistic tablet records: “Cyrus to Babylon descended” (not “entered Babylon,” as Professor Sayce has it).

There is a contract-tablet in this month also, even after Cyrus “to Babylon descended,” dated the 10th Marchesvan, “in the seventeenth year of Nabonidos, King of Babylon.”

On the very next night—the night of the 11th Marchesvan—that occurrence took place, recorded in the passage which Mr. Pinches translates: “On the night of the 11th Marchesvan Góbryas descended against Babylon and the son of the King died.”

And after this occurs the first tablet dated in the “accession year of Cyrus.” It is a tablet—to be seen in the case in the British Museum—referring to workmen's rations, and it is dated the 24th Marchesvan, in the “accession year of Cyrus.”

From this time forward there does not occur any contract-tablet dated in the reign of Nabonidos, but there is one in the next month, Chisleu (November-December), dated "Babylon 7th Chisleu in the accession year of Cyrus."

From the dating of these tablets the conclusion would seem to be almost irresistible that it was on the 11th Marchesvan that Babylon fell.

It is a curious circumstance also to be observed that the month Marchesvan would be the exact period of the year most favourable for executing the stratagem conceived by Cyrus of draining the river, having regard to the annual flooding of the Euphrates. In his work "Ancient Monarchies," Canon Rawlinson writes:

"The Euphrates first swells about the middle of March, and is not in full flood until quite the end of June. It then continues high for about a month, and does not sink much until the middle of July, after which it gradually falls until September. The rainy season of Chaldæa is in the winter time. Heavy showers fall in November, and still more in December, which sensibly raise the level of the rivers." Thus, in October, the Babylonian month Marchesvan, the river Euphrates would be at its lowest level.

The annalistic tablet goes on to say that Cyrus established peace to Babylon, and that Gôbryas, his governor, appointed governors in Babylon; whilst the Cyrus cylinder says, "his city of Babylon he spared."

All this agrees with what Xenophon relates, that Cyrus, almost immediately after entering the city, proclaimed peace to the Babylonians if they remained within their houses; and the next morning confirmed that proclamation of peace provided they delivered up their arms. The cylinder says: "The men of Babylon—all of them the nobles—and the high priest bowed themselves beneath him; they kissed his feet, they rejoiced at his sovereignty." And, in remarkable agreement with this, Xenophon relates how, on the day after Babylon was taken, Cyrus held a reception, and the Babylonians came to pay him homage in unmanageable numbers.

And now to recapitulate.

I have endeavoured to show in this article that there is no contradiction, practically speaking, between the Babylonian cuneiform records of the fall of Babylon on the one hand, and the account which has come down to us from the classical writers of antiquity on the other. I have tried to show that it was not, as asserted by Professor Sayce, on the 22nd Tammuz (June), without any previous siege, in the absence of Cyrus, and by absolutely peaceful surrender to his lieutenant, Gôbryas, that Babylon fell; but, on the contrary, three months later—

which three months gave time for a siege—on the 11th Marchesvan (October), when Cyrus was present, and by a night attack led by Gôbryas, in which the son of the King, Belshazzar, was slain, that the city fell into the hands of Cyrus. All this is in agreement with the classical records of antiquity. And although the Babylonian cuneiform inscriptions say that Cyrus took the city without fighting, yet the classical account practically agrees with this, because the siege, according to that account, was a mere feat of engineering, unmolested by the enemy, and, therefore, unaccompanied by fighting or bloodshed; whilst in the night surprise of the city there was practically no resistance, and only King Belshazzar and a few of his immediate attendants were slain.

And, therefore, I submit that there is no necessity for the reconstruction of that account of the fall of Babylon which has come down to us from antiquity, and that the words of the fifth chapter of the Book of Daniel stand unrefuted—"On that night was Belshazzar the king of the Chaldæans slain."

The whole subject has a most important bearing on the historical character or otherwise of the Book of Daniel. The pronouncement of Professor Sayce, which I have quoted in the early portion of this paper, has already been eagerly adopted, not to say pounced upon, by those who assail the historical character of the Book of Daniel, as if his dictum were finally decisive of the whole question. And no doubt the lead of so eminent a writer will be very extensively followed.

For my own part, however, I think that it is never wise to tie ourselves on to any great names, however illustrious. The greater number of questions of this sort will be found, when we look closely into them, to turn, not so much on abstruse questions of erudite scholarship, as on considerations of logic and common sense.

It requires, indeed, a skilled expert to translate these cuneiform inscriptions, but when they have been translated, we can all then form a judgment as to whether the conclusions attempted to be drawn from them really follow or not.

It requires a skilled huntsman to find the fox and turn him out of covert, but when he is once fairly afoot, every horseman in the field can ride after him.

ANDREW C. ROBINSON.

