

different attitude in his inscriptions. There used to be a question raised about Daniel. If Daniel was so great a man at the court of Nebuchadnezzar why don't we have inscriptions that tell about him? Well, we have a few inscriptions now that give the names of a few officials in Nebuchadnezzar's court but very scanty is the information that throws any light on his court. The Assyrians left us abundant information about the leaders in their court. The Assyrians would name each year after a particular individual, and thus each individual's name was preserved in that way to some extent of the leaders in the Assyrian court, and then the Assyrian kings would tell of the great events during the part of their reign when they had something to boast about. Toward the ends of their lives they didn't bother with describing things as a rule, but the Assyrians left all these written inscriptions. Now Nebuchadnezzar up until the discovery recently . Up until that time we have not even the name of any of the leaders in Nebuchadnezzar's court. They are all just a blank. These inscriptions--he did everything. He says, "I crossed great mountains, I met mighty armies, I conquered great cities, I devastated tremendous areas;" he's just describing all that he had done and he'd run it all together. He didn't name the countries or the cities, or anything. The Assyrian king would say, "In my first year I marked out, I attacked this city and then I attacked this city, then I went to that, I met these people, I met this group, and so on, but Nebuchadnezzar doesn't do anything. Then he tells you, after he has given you about a paragraph of telling you of the way in which he--just running together all these tremendous conquests which he did, then he says, "I was anxious to establish the glory of the great go in Babylon, and therefore I took his temple which had fallen into decay

- - - - -