

The Bible Student and Teacher

Volume IV

FEBRUARY, 1906

Number 2

BELSHAZZAR AND DARIUS THE MEDE

Prof. Robert Dick Wilson, D. D., Theological Seminary, Princeton, N. J.

In the following pages we shall attempt to show that the statements of the Bible with regard to Belshazzar and Darius the Mede are not contradictory to those of the monuments.

In Aramaic, the word **malkatz** is the equivalent of the Assyrio-Babylonian words **sarru**, **malku**, **pahatu**, **bel pahate** and **hazannu**. Each of these would also be a **sheleet**, or ruler; and the **pahatu**, **bel pahate** and **hazannu** would be called **rabr'been**, or magnates of H king (comp. Dan. v. 1). Any one of these Assyrian words might be rendered into H Hebrew, also, by **melek**, "king".

We have only to look upon Nabonidus as the **sarru**, or better the **sar sarrani** (king of kings), and upon Belshazzar as simply **sarru**, **malku** (or even **pahatu**, **bel pahate**, or **hazannu** of the city), to account for the fact that Belshazzar is in Daniel called **malkatz**.

In like manner, Cyrus could be "king of kings", "king of lands" or "sar Babili", while Darius the Mede was **malkatz** of the city, or province, of Babylon.

In Nabonidus' prayer to Sin the moon-god, we learn that his first born son was Belshazzar (KB III.^{II} 96). In the Annals of Nabonidus, the son of the king is said to have been present in Accad with the soldiers, or army, accompanied by the nobles, or chiefs (**rabuti**). See "Beitrag zur Assyriologie", article by Hagen, pages 218, seq., Col. II lines 5, 10, 13, 19, 23. Perhaps we may infer from line 13, that he was at Dur-karasu, above Sippar on the Euphrates. In Tammuz (Col. III, line 12), a battle was fought between Cyrus' army and the army of Accad. On the fourteenth of Tammuz, Sippar was taken (line 14). On the sixteenth, Ugbaru (Gubaru, Gobryas) who is called the governor of the land of Gutium (**amel pahate mat Gu-ti-um**) and the soldiers of Cyrus, entered Babylon (line 15). Afterwards, but in the same month (i. e., Tammuz, the 4th month), Nabonidus was taken in Babylon (line 16). Cyrus entered Babylon on the 3rd of the 8th month (line 18) and made Gubaru the governor in Babylon (**amel Gubaru amel pihatisu, pahate ina Bahili iptikid**, line 20). In the night of the 11th day of the 8th month, Gubaru attacked [Esakkil, or some part of the city where the son of the king was] and put to death the son (?) of the king (lines 22, 23) who was lamented by the Babylonians from the 27th of Adar to the 3rd of Nisan of the following year (line 23).

that Haeckel quotes in favor of his opinions changed their views many years ago. Among these was the late Professor Virchow, of Berlin, the most eminent physiologist in Germany. After having long held the materialistic grounds of Haeckel, he later on in a famous lecture, given at Berlin on the "Freedom of Science", discarded his former views, including also evolutionism, so far as it professed to establish the descent of man from the ape. His words were, "It is all nonsense; you are as far as ever you were from establishing any connection between man and the ape." Du Bois Reymond, another follower of Haeckel, has taken a back track, and has reaffirmed the soul of man, the spiritual principle in man, and the supernatural element of man.

Wundt of Leipsic, also, the man who probably stands highest as a psychologist in Germany, and who in his early days was a thoroughgoing materialistic writer, resolving man very much into brain or brain functions, now writes a book in which he states that he regards his early book as the great crime of his youth, which it will take him all the rest of his life to expiate.

What an object-lesson of intellectual arrest! The human mind during the 19th century has apparently reached its highest limit, in German metaphysics and philosophy: and this under the most favorable conditions. It seems as if this trial and the results are sufficient to show conclusively, the fact of intellectual arrest, as to the competency of the human powers to find and know God.

Is it not time to assume, and to act upon the assumption, that the experience of the ages has confirmed the claim of Christianity to be the final religion? There is not the slightest probability left, after this age-long and universal failure, that rationalism will ever be able to give any satisfactory explanation or solution of the problems of human destiny. Henceforward it should be clearly understood that the presumption is on the side of Christianity and that the burden of proof rests upon those who undertake to question its claims.

"THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY":* A REVIEW

Prof. Willis J. Beecher, D.D., Theological Seminary, Auburn, N. Y.

At the outset Dr. Clarke announces that he has never been "an expert in Biblical studies". The announcement is needless. If he had been an expert this book would never have been written, though some other book might have been. Dr. Clarke is a man of mental ability. He makes a good many statements from which he would have abstained if he had been an ex-

*THE USE OF THE SCRIPTURES IN THEOLOGY. The Nathaniel William Taylor Lectures for 1905, given before the Divinity School of Yale University. By William Newton Clarke, D. D., Professor of Christian Theology in Colgate University. Charles Scribner's Sons, 1905. 12mo, pp. x, 170. \$1 net. Digitized by Google

pert; for example, his statement (page 15) concerning the "Scriptures, which Christ expressly threw into the background." When he is actually making appeal to the Scriptures, Dr. Clarke displays a simple, straight-forward conviction that their testimony is true; while scattered here and there through the volume are statements in which he expresses his acceptance of the criticism that regards the Scriptures as largely untruthful (e. g. pages 6, 146, 166). If he were an expert he would confine himself to one or the other of these two contradictory positions. Though not an expert he is a partisan, the whole book being an argument against the commonly received doctrines of the authority of the Bible.

The principle which he presents for guiding us in our use of the Scriptures in theology is this: we are to differentiate the Christian parts of the Scriptures from those that are not Christian, and use the Christian parts only as authoritative. He says that some parts of the Old Testament writings are Christian and some parts pre-Christian or non-Christian; that some parts of the New Testament are Christian and some parts pre-Christian or post-Christian or non-Christian; that some parts of the teachings attributed to Jesus himself are Christian and some parts not, and that probably parts of the actual teachings of Jesus were themselves pre-Christian or non-Christian (e. g., pages 108-111). What we are to do, alike in the teachings of Jesus, in those of his disciples, in those of the New Testament writers, and in those of the Old Testament writers, is to distinguish for ourselves which items are Christian and which are not. We are to do the same thing of course with sources outside the Bible, but "the Bible is unquestionably the main source of Christian theology", and at all events, the Bible is the subject that Dr. Clarke is discussing.

Contrast his proposition with another that is not verbally very unlike it, namely, that it would be wise for us to focalize our theological study of the Scriptures on those parts that appeal to us as distinctively Christian, whether found in the New Testament or in the Old, in the words of Jesus or of others. Dr. Clarke sometimes so states his proposition that it almost merges into this. For example, he says (page 166), that in Sunday School work "the lesson-makers must face the difficult problem of distinguishing the Christian element in the Scriptures from everything else, and setting it forth in its own superiority and spiritual power."

The harm which the book is likely to do is largely due to the fact that by relatively slight changes it might be transformed into a particularly fine presentation of a particularly valuable principle of Scripture study. Indeed, a great deal of his reasoning is germane to this other proposition, and is not germane to his own.

He declares that the Protestant doctrine that 'the Scriptures are the seat of authority in theology is no more tenable than the doctrine that the Church is the seat of authority (page 22). The seat of authority is, he says,

the Christian part of the Scriptures, as distinguished from the other parts, "All else", he says, "we must regard as not only passing, but past" (page 125).

"We are required to draw this line through the ancient writings, and use for theology only what lies on one side of it, and remand to history what lies on the other" (page 91).

This principle, he says, compels us to "retire" large parts of the Scriptures from theological use. The Biblical accounts of the making of the world and man, and of the origin of sin, are to be thus retired. (pages 88-90). "Theology will need no section on the inspiration of the Scriptures" (page 155).

Among the matters to be retired are all views of sacrificial theology as heretofore held (pages 121-124), and those concerning the typical and antitypal values of the Old Covenant (pages 116-120). The doctrine that Jesus is the Messiah that was expected must go into retirement (pages 102-107). He was "not the Davidic king, long hoped for but never born". "The fulfilment of the pre-Christian advent-hope ought not to have come, and could not come". The doctrine of the coming of Christ as judge of the living and the dead, though taught, as Dr. Clarke admits, by Jesus himself, is among the non-Christian elements that are to be retired (pages 107-114). These are illustrative instances, but the implication is that we ought to retire the larger part of what has hitherto been accepted as Christian theology. The following is a fine statement of this conclusion:

"We shall cover the field by smaller books than our fathers used to write—not because we know less of God, but because we know more, and what we know is more concentrated in eternal reality" (page 126).

Such is the principle for the use of the Scriptures which Dr. Clarke lays down. At once the question arises: **How shall we know which parts of the words of Jesus, and which parts of the other Scriptures, are Christian and therefore authoritative?** To this his reply is, for substance: By the exercise of private judgment, such exercise of it as Protestantism declares to be both the right and the duty of all Christians. As each one of us must take the responsibility of understanding the Scriptures for himself, so each one must take the responsibility of deciding for himself what parts of Scripture are Christian and therefore authoritative. This is plausible, but it is illusive.

He anticipates that **objections** will be raised—that men will say:

"The position is no position, but a moving point The method is subjective, and each man is left to make a Christianity for himself. You take away our objective standard, and you take away our Christianity itself, through uncertainty as to what it is" (page 73).

In reply he denies that his principle takes away the objective standard. He asserts that the Christian parts of the Scriptures, as recognized by men in the exercise of their individual judgment, constitute a standard

quite as objective and quite as definite as when the whole Bible is taken as a standard.

“When we say that Christianity is a body of truth discerned by the powers that are given us for discernment of truth, have we not set forth a standard? . . . Surely we have in the significance of Jesus Christ a real standard of what Christianity is, not subjective, and perfectly intelligible” (page 74).

Comparing this alleged standard with the Bible, he says of the latter:

“It contains too much; . . . its highest part I am proposing as a standard for Christianity” (page 75).

But this “body of truth discerned”, this “highest part” of the Scriptures, is not an objective standard unless it is a concrete fact. As long as it is a mere abstract term of reasoning, it is not a standard. We can not measure other things by it until we know what the truths are of which it consists. Dr. Clarke apparently acknowledges this, for he devotes some pages to calling “attention to the definiteness of that body of truth” which constitutes the standard (pages 77-87).

Note the nature of the “standard” thus set forth. It is “a body of truth” which the author has “discerned” in the Scriptures, and which he summarizes in a stated form. As a standard how does it differ from the Thirty-nine Articles, or the Nicene Creed, or the Westminster Catechism? Each of these is a body of truth which Christian men have discerned in the Scriptures, and have uttered in stated form. Dr. Clarke would certainly not ask me to accept as the standard of Christianity a creed formulated by some Church; have I any better standard in a creed formulated by myself, and changeable when my mind changes?

We find nothing reassuring when we read what Dr. Clarke has to say concerning the contents of the body of truth which constitutes the standard. He tells us that it is “no shadowy and elusive thing”, but that it “stands perfectly solid and strong” (page 77). But when we look to see what this solid thing is, by which we may test even the words of Jesus, and learn which are authoritative and which not, we are put off with three or four well worded repetitions of the precious commonplaces of the gospel.

Dr. Clarke’s position would have been more tenable if he had omitted all this ambiguous phraseology about an objective standard. His actual view of the matter appears when he says:

“Authority belongs in the relation between God and us, and only there” (page 157).

From his point of view there is no proper objective standard. There is only the fact that our mental acquirements and experience and habits affect the decisions we make in new cases that arise. Dr. Clarke formed certain habits of thought and feeling concerning God and Christ, under the influence of the Scriptures, in the time when he believed them to be a

divine revelation. Some of these habits persist, and now constitute his "standard". Under the influence of agnostic views of the Scriptures, a person's alleged standard is likely to be very different.

From the beginning to the end of the volume Dr. Clarke presents his theory as a polemic against what he calls the "doctrine of equality in the Scriptures" (page 19). He says of the Bible (page 12) that "the Church has formed the habit of using it as alike throughout"; and that it takes "the ground that the inspiration of God made the disciple-writers equal to the Word made flesh in witnessing to the truth" (page 16). He rivals the most prejudiced of newspaper scribblers in reiterating the charge that it is customary to count any sentence of the Bible as of the same value with any other. This caricature of the received view he uses for a background against which to set up his principle of an authoritative Scripture selected out of the Scriptures.

Opprobrium heaped upon the doctrine that all Scripture is the word of God is like that heaped upon our American Declaration of Independence for saying that all men are created equal. It is based on the false assumption that equality of character as Scripture implies equality in details and applications. Talk of this kind is buncombe, but some men take it seriously, and we must not be too impatient with it. Some one has explained the meaning of the Declaration of Independence to be that each person has an equal right with every other to be unequal to others. No one needs to be told that the Scriptures are multifarious in character. To say that all Scripture is equally the Word of God is to imply that each part is the Word of God according to its own character, and for the uses for which it is fit. This doctrine forbids the idea that every sentence is to be used like every other sentence, instead of implying that idea. Perfectly intelligible, even to those who disbelieve it, is the doctrine that all Scripture is equally that body of literature which God, by providential leading and by inspiration of the Spirit, has caused to be produced as his especial revelation to men. Among the ten thousand who have published their ideas on the subject, there have been of course those whose ideas were mechanical and wooden, but the idea of the equality of the Bible is capable of being rationally held, and it is so held by the great body of its supporters.

Let the issue be joined between this theory of the use of the Scriptures in theology and that advocated by Dr. Clarke. He says certain true things, in which we can heartily agree with him. We agree with him in magnifying the authority of Christ as compared with the writers of Scripture or with any one else; though we insist on not ignoring the fact that in the Biblical records concerning Christ "we have practically all that we know of his history and his words" (page 3). If he were correct in saying that his principle "admits to theology all that Christ revealed concerning God, and all that is true if that is true" (page 84), we would accept his principle. We agree with him in finding the revelation through Christ not in the

recorded words of Jesus only, but also in other parts of the Old and New Testaments. We agree with him as to the importance of emphasizing those things in the Scriptures that we can clearly see to be Christian. With great pleasure we agree with him, in opposition to men whose company he prefers, in recognizing the resurrection of Christ as a reality (page 103), in recognizing the authority of the fourth Gospel (page 78), and in recognizing in history "the onward-moving God, leading men toward better knowledge of himself", as distinguished from "a purely human development" (page 132). Finally, we agree with him as to the correctness and the importance so far as it goes, of the Apologetic which appeals to our human judgments of value in proof of the worthiness of the teachings of Christ concerning God.

On the other hand, we disagree with Dr. Clarke both as to the expediency and the legitimacy of selecting certain sections of Scripture as authoritative, and laying aside the remainder as non-authoritative.

He makes much of the argument from expediency—the advantages of going upon his theory as contrasted with the other. "It comes with power to render theology very largely independent of Biblical criticism" (page 145). On the other theory "We are compelled to grasp at words. Precision is indispensable" (page 146). Dr. Clarke comes to set us free from this bondage to precision in our thinking. And so through a long list of specifications. We can not accept this. Real advantages come, of course, from emphasizing the obviously great things in the Scriptures in preference to other things; but we need not set aside the other things in order to secure these advantages. The attempt to set them aside brings in new difficulties. If we assume that some words of Christ are Christian and some are not, and that we have to decide between them, we take up a load compared with which all burdens of criticism are light. The cheap disposal of a puzzling question is apt to be poor stuff, like other cheap things. There is no way to get rid of the problems but by solving them.

The proposed "principle" is illegitimate as well as inexpedient. One might consistently set aside the Scriptures in their entirety, and then use whatever in them appeals to his judgment as worthy. But no absurdity can be greater than that of affirming that the teaching of Christ is authoritative when he says that he is the Savior of men, and non-authoritative when he says that he is the Christ whom the prophets foretold; authoritative when he says that he came from God, and non-authoritative when he says that he will come again in the judgment; authoritative in what he says concerning God the Father, and non-authoritative in what he says about God's revealing himself through Moses and David and the other writers of Scripture. If Jesus is supremely authoritative then his judgment as to what truths are authoritative is to be preferred to mine or that of any other man.

It is false strategy, in Christian Apologetic as in other warfare, to regard it as sufficient to defend one strong position, while permitting the enemy to occupy all the enfolding outworks. When the Japanese had captured the auxiliary fortresses, then Port Arthur surrendered.

THE VALUE OF FACTS TO THE HISTORIAN

Rev. Henry B. Master, Fort Wayne, Ind.

In the fourteenth century, when Albert I. of Austria was striving to annex the three Waldstadte, Uri, Schwyz and Unterwalden, to his own domain, he appointed as his bailiff a certain man named Hermann Gessler. Among many other acts of oppression this Gessler included the placing of the ducal hat of Austria on the summit of a pole, passing which all the citizens of Altorf, were commanded to uncover their heads. It was the failure of a certain William Tell and his young son to obey this command, which led to the seizure of both and their subsequent appearance for judgment before Landvogt Gessler. The latter, having heard that Tell was marvellously skilful as a crossbowman, caused an apple to be placed upon the head of William Tell's son, at which the father was then compelled to shoot, the penalty of missing the apple being death. How Tell cleft the apple without injuring his child; how he defied the tyrant; how he escaped from the boat in which he was being transported to Gessler's prison-fortress, and afterwards shot his enemy through the heart—these are all further details of the well-known story. No one who has read it as dramatized by Schiller will ever forget it. This, however, is the way in which the tale was formerly told. Once upon a time it was accepted as a fact and the great archer himself was as real a person to many as any other character in history. But the progress of modern historical methods has utterly discredited the whole story. Both Hermann Gessler and William Tell have been proven to be fictitious characters. The events connected with their names have been shown to have no right to a place in Swiss history. The facts which have led the historians to these conclusions are as follows: While the story is dated in the year 1307 no account of it is found in Swiss history until a century and a half after that time. Identically the same tale, the principals of course bearing different names, is found in the book of a Danish historian, Saxo Grammaticus, written more than a century previous to the year 1307! Mr. John Fiske says that "there can be little doubt that the story is older than the Christian era, and in the course of its wanderings has been attached now to one locality and now to another."

It is rather interesting to observe the attitude of the historians toward this legend since it has been shown to be unhistorical. They will have nothing to do with it! Despite its high ethical worth, its splendid picture