

These tablets = they had picked out the tablets that had interesting stories or some had literary records - - - but there were thousands of them that were simply legal contracts, and lists of sheep, and the number and area of property and all that sort of thing. There had been no archaeologist who had time to read all of this. They had just glanced over it and picked the ones that seemed most interesting. So Pinches went to these and he picked out every one he could find that seemed from the reign of Nabonidus, because in those days they always had dates of things by the name of the king. He found quite a number from the reign of Nabonidus. Then he took these and began to read them carefully and after a time he came to one having the very name Belshazzar in it. So he found that in the reign of Nabonidus there was a man by the name of Belshazzar.

Then he came to a tablet which said a certain man rented a certain house for three years as agent for Belshazzar the king's son. This showed Belshazzar was in the royal family. Then he went on and found tablets in which the oath was taken in the name of Nabonidus and of Belshazzar and also another statement except in the name of god or of a reigning king. So here was pretty good proof that Belshazzar was king along with his father Nabonidus. Today that is accepted by all archaeologists as facts. Prof. Dougherty of Yale University wrote a book in Yale Oriental Research called Nabonidus and Belshazzar in which he gathered together the evidence on this and shows the facts are that Belshazzar == that Nabonidus was the last king, but that Nabonidus retired for a number of years to Tema, an oasis in the Arabian desert, and left his son Belshazzar as co-king with him but actual ruler. That Nabonidus was nominal ruler, but Belshazzar was the actual ruler during these last years.

So your list of kings lists Nabonidus but Belshazzar was just as much king as Nabonidus and the references to him as king here is true. Then Prof. Dougherty said: He went through all ancient accounts of the fall of Babylon that he could find. He found that from the time of the fall of Babylon right up to the time of Josephus there was no account he could find that had the facts about Belshazzar in it. These facts were forgotten, but there they were in the clay tablets that lay buried all those centuries. We find correct in Josephus but Josephus of course at c. 100 A.D. based it on the book of Daniel what he had. So Dougherty said the book of Daniel is superior to all other ancient writings that were preserved and passed on. It remembers the name of Belshazzar, the fact he was actually king, and the fact there was a dual rulership in the kingdom. Now how many people do you think in the last couple years who read this book thought there was a dual rulership in the kingdom? Yet three times this morning I read to you verses which said You are to be made the third ruler in the kingdom. What does that mean? It does not explain the situation but when you know the situation you see how exactly it fits with it. Nabonidus is the first ruler; Belshazzar is the second, and he would have made Daniel the third ruler. Three times this reference is made and I suppose in the last 2000 yrs. hardly anybody noticed that little phrase to wonder just what did it mean. But it's preserved with all these historical facts through all these many years that has only been rediscovered just now.