

Union Seminary Magazine.

Vol. X.

April-May, 1899.

No. 4.

I.—Literary.

MR. KIPLING'S VERSE.

It has rarely happened in the history of literature that a great writer has been equally great in poetry and in prose. Men who have talent only may do two things equally well; the man of genius is apt to do but one thing, but to do that one thing passing well. One of the unwritten reasons for denying that Bacon wrote Shakespeare's Plays is the difficulty of believing that the *Essays* and *Hamlet* were born of the same brain. Nevertheless, in the opinion of the world, Rudyard Kipling has accomplished the improbable, and, if popularity be an adequate test, has achieved not only supreme but equal excellence in story and in song.

It is at this late day perhaps a trite remark that Mr. Kipling has been happy in his command of subjects. He leads us into unknown lands and shows us men and deeds that are strange to us. His poetry—less, perhaps, than his prose, but still to a marked degree—borrows interest from its far-off background and setting.

Mandelay, with its "old Mulmein Pagoda" is as attractively novel to us in our clanging Western world as is Mowgli, the Jungle Man; and the "*Ballad of East and West*," that stirring tale of a time "when wolf and gray wolf meet," is only another "*Plain Tale from the Hills*," done in incomparably virile verse. Kipling's best work is popularly supposed to be in the noble *Recessional Hymn*,

PROBLEMS IN THE HISTORICAL SECTION OF THE BOOK OF DANIEL.

REV. EDWARD MACK.

Pastor of First Presbyterian Church, Norfolk, Va.

Rationalism, like its father, walketh about seeking whom it may devour. The book of Daniel, as it stands exposed on the border-line of canonicity, was quickly pounced upon by the devourer. Formerly, conservatism appeared to regard with deplorable indifference the fate of this inspired book, showing much timidity in resisting the ravages of the destroyer. There has been manifested by some a spirit of contentment that faith has enough and to spare without Daniel, or of consolation over even the mangled remains of the once historic Daniel. Let it be admitted that this book is the most vulnerable of the Old Testament; if a plausible defense can be made, the necessary result must be increased confidence in all the Scriptures. Checking the enemy at the outposts, the central citadel will be out of reach of assault.

And the trustworthiness of the book of Daniel is far from being a lost cause. Truth, equipped with spade and spectacles, is on the enemy's trail. Ever-increasing knowledge of the secrets of the past causes us to believe that Daniel will come from the exceedingly hot furnace without the smell of fire, and from the critic's den unharmed, to be exalted among the princes of the Bible cause. In the following presentation of some of the facts in the case no claim to originality is made. These facts are given in the firm belief that they overwhelmingly favor the composition of the book in the days of Daniel, rather than in the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The advocates of the latter period show a naive indifference to the serious obstacles in the way of their theory, and too plainly manifest the secret of their hostility to its origin in the days of Daniel, that is, its wonderful prophecies.

Our attention is called, at the beginning, to the striking testimony which modern criticism bears to the genuineness

of Daniel by its general admission of the unity of the book; for although divisive analyses have been proposed, no such weapon formed against it has ever prospered. This is the more remarkable in view of the peculiar temptations offered the dissecting critic: diversity of material, of language, of scene and of personal pronouns, and an astonishing range of dates. Surely such unity of authorship implies a mind of the first magnitude, such an one as Daniel. It is well to observe that this is not a purely prophetic book. Its association in the Canon with Esther and Ezra proves this, and reveals its true character. It is partly historical, partly biographical, partly prophetic. Prophecy is not preponderant, neither is the history connected nor composed at one time. It is a collection of chapters from a noble life and with one purpose—leaves from the diary of Daniel.

The literary problem of the book first offers itself for examination; and before this even the wisdom and confidence of the modern sceptic have faltered. Two languages were used by the author: the first, a part of the second and the closing chapters, beginning with the eighth, are Hebrew; the remainder Aramaic. It has not been told us what could induce a writer of the time of Antiochus Epiphanes to make use of both languages, particularly pure Hebrew, which for centuries had not been the language of the people, and which contains the portion of the book that would have been most interesting to Antiochus. But we can well understand why Daniel would write the things that interested Jew, Chaldean and Persian in a language familiar to all, and the things that concerned the Jew only in the language peculiar to the Jew. Thus the literary phenomenon of the book, most natural and suggestive in the sixth century, becomes inexplicable, if not absurd, when referred to the second. Let us applaud and hold to the honest decision of Archdeacon Farrar, an opponent of the traditional Daniel, that the language of Daniel is similar to that of Ezra, certainly an indication that the book is nearer the sixth century than the second.

But what shall we do with the non-Hebrew words, at which criticism takes offense and which are put in evidence for late authorship? In the third chapter three Greek

words occur repeatedly. They are the names of musical instruments. And we are asked to believe that Greek words and articles were an impossibility to the empire of Nebuchadrezzar! Surely a brave assumption! From the ancient dawn of their history the Greeks have been a musical people, the Babylonians were not, and the law of "supply and demand" is venerable. It is not a new thing for those who have, to sell or give to, or to be robbed by, those who have not. Moreover, the Babylonian empire bordered the Greek states and was in constant communication with them. In Asia Minor and Phoenicia Greek life and customs were quite prevalent, and Nebuchadnezzar was no stranger in those lands. Centuries before his day the ships of Phoenicia searched all the coasts of the Mediterranean for articles of commerce, laid them on the wharves of Sidon and Tyre, whence the ancient express-trains, swift and hardy camels, bore them to the heart of Asia. It is hardly fair to belittle the enterprise of any land for the sake of a theory. The annals of clay tell us that centuries before Daniel Babylonian merchants enriched themselves by importing the greatest variety of articles from far distant lands. Greece was not an unknown land in Daniel's day; for Homer lived over two hundred years before that time, Solon was older than Daniel, in less than half a century Darius would meet the Greeks on their own soil, after little more than a century ten thousand Greeks will march with unbroken rank almost to the walls of Babylon, and the sunset of Babylon was the sunrise of the golden day of Greece. Already in the Song of Solomon, centuries older than Daniel, there is a trace of Greek. Well might the shade of the great king appear to defend the majesty of his empire against this folly of our age! With as much reason one might say that Italian instruments with Italian names are impossible to American orchestras until Italy rules America.

There are several Persian words in the book, and these also are seriously put forward as proof positive that it was not written in Daniel's time. But these words, as a rule, signify officials and political institutions, and for fifteen hundred years there had been close relations between Babylon

and Elam, the country of Cyrus. Indeed, there had been more than one Elamite dynasty in Chaldea, and Nebuchadnezzar had an Elamite queen, so that we ought to be more surprised if we should find the total absence of that country's words and institutions. It is important to remember that the Assyrians and Babylonians exhibited a marked deficiency for government, upsetting dynasties and losing empires with astonishing rapidity, while the Persians were masters of the art; also that when Daniel wrote (chap. 1:21), the Persians ruled in Babylon, and every official was such by the grace of Cyrus. Daniel, therefore, would have violated the customs of language, if he had not used at times present names for past institutions. To reject this book on account of fifteen Persian and three Greek words is not reason, but pure trifling.

Leaving the question of language and taking up the historical problems, we are at once prejudiced in favor of the book's genuineness and historicalness by its frequent coincidences with independent records of Babylonian life. The removal of the temple vessels from Jerusalem into the temple of Bel, where they were guarded with sacred care; the seizure of young Jews of royal birth and their introduction into the Chaldean universities; the high position of woman in Babylon; the custom according to which an usurper confirmed his right to the throne by marriage into the royal family, on account of which Belshazzar could claim descent from Nebuchadnezzar; the erection of the king's image with national festivities and personal vain-glorying; the change of the names of persons just coming into prominence, are exact transcripts from the records of Babylon. The author's thorough knowledge of the manner of capital punishment is sufficient to justify confidence; for under the Babylonians a frequent method was consignment to fire, but under the Persians, who were fire-worshippers, this is substituted by exposure to wild beasts.

The first alleged historical difficulty, that we shall consider, is the reality of the man, Daniel. He is an historical fact, as an unassailable witness declares. If any book of the Old Testament is beyond the malice of the destructive critic, it is the book of Ezekiel, an older contemporary of

Daniel; and Ezekiel thrice mentions Daniel as an exceedingly wise and just man. This malady of Ezekiel has worried the wise doctors; and, in their opinion, requires a surgical operation to save the authenticity of the book. But if the believer claimed the same privilege of the knife, how quickly a few careful incisions might also relieve the book of Daniel of every supposed difficulty! The fact is, that when Ezekiel gave the first of these testimonials, Daniel had been in Babylon more than a decade, and was already famed for his wisdom.

Another trouble is the imaginary contradiction in the first and second chapters with regard to the beginning of Nebuchadnezzar's reign. In the first chapter we read that Nebuchadnezzar, "king of Babylon," came and besieged Jerusalem, and after its surrender directed the master of the eunuchs to remove some of the most promising children of the royal blood to Babylon, where they were to be put on special diet and training *for three years*, after which they should stand before the king. But in chap. 2:1 Daniel appears before the king to make known his dream *in the second year* of his reign. We may rest assured, that the most ordinary intelligence would save a writer from such a glaring blunder, and that the able author of this book had good grounds for his statements. The explanation is not far to seek. The first chapter was written long after the event, and more than sixty years after the coronation of Nebuchadnezzar; it was quite natural, therefore, for the historian to give him the title by which he was afterwards known, just as we speak of the "youth of the Emperor Napoleon." In addition to this, there was good reason for calling Nebuchadnezzar king at the time of his siege of Jerusalem; he was the vicegerent of his father, in accordance with the ancient custom by which kings associated their sons with them. As David had Solomon crowned, so we know that Nabopolassar took Nebuchadnezzar into the government with him, and he could properly be called king before his father's death and his own accession to sole power, to which the date in the second chapter has reference. The facts are these: In 606 B. C. the great conqueror besieged and took Jerusalem, sent Daniel and his companions back

to Babylon, and then marched rapidly toward Egypt to follow up the victory at Carchemish with the complete subjugation of the country of the Nile. While in this Egyptian campaign he received news of his father's death, and hastened to Babylon, where he was proclaimed king about 604 B. C. Taking his second year as sole ruler as 602, Daniel would have had about four years in Babylon, in which to pass his final examinations preparatory to standing before the king; and any contradiction or difficulty in time is removed.

The so-called "first captivity," supposed to be recorded in the first chapter, is another fault that the ready sceptic finds with the record of Daniel, who assigns to the third year of Jehoiakim (B. C. 606), what Jeremiah (52-28) records of the brief reign of Jehoiachin, eight years later. But the real trouble is to be found in the effort to make Daniel say what he did not say. We find no reference to a general deportation of captives in the first chapter, as has too often been assumed; but merely that a limited number of hostages, "certain of the children of Israel," were removed. This mistake has led to the larger error of fixing the wrong dates for the seventy years' exile, which did not begin with the year of Daniel's removal nor end with the first year of Cyrus. Jeremiah uttered the prophecy of the exile after the carrying away of Daniel and his companions—compare Jeremiah 25: 1 with Daniel 1: 1; and he distinctly dates the seventy years from the *desolation* of Jerusalem, which was accomplished about B. C. 587. And while Cyrus issued the edict for rebuilding the temple and for the restoration of the Jews, in reality both were accomplished in the sixth year of Darius the Great, about B. C. 517, for which we have scriptural warrant, Ezra 6: 15-19. Thus a careful reading of Daniel's record, instead of revealing conflict with other narratives, helps us to remove a common blunder, and to give to the seventy Sabbatic years their historical limits, from the destruction of the temple to its restoration.

The names of persons in the book of Daniel have given occasion for much adverse criticism, and it is claimed that some of them had no historical existence, while oth-

ers were not correctly written by the author. As none of the ancients were thoughtful enough to leave us an exhaustive biographical dictionary of the age, we may be pardoned for rejecting any sweeping assertion that rests merely on modern information. In the great empire of Babylon it would not have been strange to find men whose names were not pure Semitic, nor is it such folly to suppose that the records of quite prominent men of that time have not survived the rough handling of many centuries. But enough can be gleaned from history to give higher claim for reliability to Daniel than to the modern sceptic. The great king's name, as it is found in Daniel, has given offense, and it is said that any man, who wrote in Babylon in the sixth century B. C., would have known that his name was not Nebuchadnezzar, but Nebuchadrezzar. But this objection loses its force when we find that the book of Kings, completed before the return from captivity, and Jeremiah, written during that king's reign, use the same form as Daniel; indeed, Jeremiah uses both forms interchangeably, and in the same chapter (29:1-21). If one is good Babylonian the other was certainly good Hebrew.

Both the name and the dominion of Belshazzar have been questioned on the ground that profane history has recognized no such king, and on the contrary gives quite a different name to the last Babylonian king: Nabonidus, whom Cyrus conquered and captured, but did not put to death. But the records of the burnt clay have proved that Daniel was wiser than the ancient historians, even than the modern skeptics: When Cyrus' army invaded Babylonia, Nabonidus was not in Babylon, but was looking after his interests in another part of the kingdom. Who then was in authority in the capital city at the time of its fall? According to the custom of those days, to which we have already referred, the king's son would be his vice-gerent, if he had a son. Several inscriptions give the name of the son of Nabonidus as Belshazzar, and in one inscription Nabonidus himself accords to Belshazzar a most important place. He was therefore entitled to the name of king, but according to the book of Daniel was not alone in his dominion, as he could reward the interpreter of his dream

with only the *third* place in the kingdom. The violent death of Belshazzar is in thorough accord with what we know of Cyrus from the clay tablets. He was not a Persian monotheist, but an Elamite and a polytheist, according to the testimony both of Isaiah and the inscriptions. His policy was not to interfere with, but to foster, the religions of conquered nations. In his Babylonian campaign he claimed to come as the avenger of the gods, whom Belshazzar had outraged by removing their images from their own cities to Babylon, and by devoting their sacred vessels to profane use. Many of the Babylonians also were offended by such conduct, and thus the army is admitted by treachery, and suddenly, into Babylon, as the book of Daniel intimates. It was the sword of the avenger, therefore, that cut down the impious Belshazzar in the very act of defiling the consecrated vessels; and after that time his name is not recorded.

The most difficult name in this book is "Darius, the Median;" and it is maintained that the writer has woefully confused historic names and facts; that he has reflected Darius the Great into the years before Cyrus; called him a Mede, although he was a Persian, and given Ahasuerus, or Xerxes, as his father, whereas Xerxes was his son. Two answers to this objection have been given. 1. The first is that this is truly Darius the Great, the capture of Babylon, recorded in the fifth chapter, terminated a revolt that was stirred shortly after his accession in 522 B. C., and Daniel was loved and exalted by him, as by Cyrus. This is the view of Professor Sayce. But the fatal objection to it is that while it may be harmonized with profane history, it is out of harmony altogether with the book of Daniel. The Darius of Daniel was sixty-two years old when he took Babylon, but Darius the Great died in 486, at the age of sixty-three; the former was king of Chaldea, and had Babylon for his capital; the latter was king of Persia and had his capital at Shushan; one is always called "The Mede," while the other was a Persian and Media was a subordinate kingdom. At the beginning of the reign of Darius the Great, Daniel would have been about ninety-five years old, and it is altogether improbable that the most

important portfolio of the empire would have been placed in his hands. 2. Therefore the other answer is more satisfactory: that there was a Darius who ruled in Balylon immediately after its capture by the army of Cyrus. The very word "Mede" points to this, and is always used of him to distinguish him from another of the same name. An ancient historian narrates that Nebuchadnezzar once predicted the taking of Babylon by a Persian, whose assistant would be a Mede. Still more suggestive are the words of Cyrus himself, who records in his annalistic inscription that he appointed governors in Babylon. The number of provinces over which Darius had authority—one hundred and twenty—and the grand phrases in which he proclaims his wide dominion—chapter 6: 25-26, are not inconsistent with the narrow limits of Babylonia, when we consider that always the Chaldean empire was not a unit, but a confederation of many cities, each of which had its own history, god and governor. Nabonidus, whose dominion was more circumscribed than that of Darius the Mede, was wont to style himself "the ruler of the four zones," and king of the four corners of the earth." Let us not blame Daniel, if Darius had acquired the habits of the time.

Finally, the prophetic portions of Daniel have been savagely attacked by the higher critics, the record of the supernatural knowledge of the future being used to prove late authorship, with the assumption that such accurate information must succeed the events. It is the supernatural, however, that is the question at issue, and the thing to be proved cannot be made a part of the proof. It is impossible to enter now the discussion of prophecies that human wisdom has never satisfactorily interpreted. It will be sufficient to notice the folly of the rationalistic claim that Daniel departs from all the rules of Old Testament prophecy and exhibits the features of the apocryphal era by describing the distant future, and by using exact numbers. Two of the oldest specimens of prophecy, Jacob's Blessing and Balaam's Visions, deal with the far away future; and Jeremiah prophesied the time of the restoration from captivity in exact numbers, even before the captivity had begun. Ezekiel, an associate of Daniel, is much given

to exact numbers in his visions of future things. And the theory of the composition of the book in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes puts the seventy prophetic weeks beyond reasonable explanation. It has been found, indeed, that the assignment of the book to that late age furnishes the sober student ten times more and greater difficulties, than its honest and truthful acceptance as the work of Daniel, one of the best and greatest men of all history.

SOME REMARKS ON PHILLIP SCHAFF'S ACCOUNT
OF THE MODE OF BAPTISM IN
THE APOSTOLIC AGE.

PROF. THOS. C. JOHNSON.

[*Concluded.*]

Dr. Schaff argues for immersion in the Apostolic Church, in the *fourth* place, "from the general custom of the ancient church, which prevails in the East to this day." In describing the form of baptism employed in the period 100 to 312, Dr. Schaff says that it was by immersion; and describes it as follows: "The immersion consisted in thrice dipping the head of the candidate who stood nude in the water. Single immersion seems to have been introduced by Eunomius about 360, but was condemned on pain of degradation, yet it reappeared afterward in Spain, and Pope Gregory I. declared both forms valid, the trine immersion as setting forth the Trinity, the single immersion the Unity of the Godhead. The Eastern Church, however, still adheres strictly to trine immersion. Baptism by *pouring* water from a shell or vessel or from a hand on the head of the candidate while he stood knee-deep or waist-deep in the water, occurs also and was probably considered equivalent to immersion. But baptism by *aspersion* or *sprinkling* was exceptional and applied only to infirm or sick persons; hence called *clinical* baptism. The validity