

O. T. H. 122

Daniel was not written till Maccabean times. All it says about Belshazzar is purely imaginary. There was never such a man as Belshazzar, and then in the inscriptions which had been taken to the British museum in the various business documents there, there was found a sufficient number of tablets mentioning the name Belshazzar to prove his existence, mentioning Belshazzar as a member of the royal family, to prove his relationship to Nabonidus, and then, further, showing--eventually tablets were found showing his power in the kingdom at the end of the reign, tablets sufficient to prove that Belshazzar was indeed the actual reigning king even though theoretically simply simply co-king along with his father, Nabonidus. Professor Dougherty of Yale University in 1928 in the/Oriental Research series wrote a book on this entitled "Nabonidus and Belshazzar". If we had another hour in this semester I might detail to you something of the book. As it is you can find it in the library if you are interested further now or later on but I mention to you simply the outstanding feature of it that Professor Dougherty was convinced and gave evidence that seemed conclusive that Belshazzar was the second ruler in the kingdom and then Professor Dougherty says the book of Daniel has an accuracy which is not paralleled in any other ancient writing, because we have no other ancient writing telling of this history after the actual time of the events described up to the time of Josephus which is built on the book of Daniel which mentions Belshazzar or recognizes his power in the kingdom, and he says, "Not only does the book of Daniel recognize Belshazzar's power but it recognized there was a dual rulership because twice in that chapter in Daniel we had it said that Daniel if he explained the writing on the wall will be made the third ruler in the kingdom, recognizing the dual rulership of Nabonidus and Belshazzar, a most remarkable evidence of the accuracy of the Biblical account.

- - - -