

against the Assyrian oppressors, how could they get the name just correct? After all, what is the point of that? There is a great spiritual lesson in it anyway, whether the facts actually happened or not,- at least that is the way the modernists would speak of it, the \_\_\_\_\_ even more so. But we believe this is God's Word, and true, and we believe that it was written by Daniel and why should it have this seeming inaccuracy?

Well, Prof. P\_\_\_\_\_ of the British Museum was not satisfied, and so he went into the Musuem there and he began examining tablets,- and you know the British brought back just hundred, thousands in fact, of tablets from Babylon, and put them in the British Museum, and there were too many for anybody to read. Occasionally they found things of great importance that had been in the British Museum fifty years, and when some \_\_\_\_\_ working in Babylon seemed to find something of little importance. Prof. Meister of the University of Berlin took a crack at the \_\_\_\_\_ and at the British Museum at the same time. He said, "Excavation of the British Museum is more profitable than excavation of Babylon" (laughter).

Well, Prod. P\_\_\_\_\_ began studying these tablets, and he found the tablets from the reign of king Nabonitus, the last king of Babylon; and as he went through them he found a tablet which had the name Belshazar,- at least there was such a man at that time. And then after a while he found a tablet which recorded the rent of a house, a legal document, recorded the rental of a house for three years by a man who said he was doing it as agent for Belshazar the king's son. That connected Belshazar up with the royal family. And then he found tablets in which the oath was taken in the name of Nabonitus and Belshazar - and you never had oaths taken in ancient times except in the name of a god or of a reigning king. And that suggested that Belshazar was co-king with Nabonitus, and that they both reigned together in the latter years of the reign.