

good many such evidences, but then he says, After careful study of all the problems of the book of Daniel, we feel ~~most people~~ it is most reasonable to believe that Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees, (that would be 400 years after Belshazzar) - in the time of the Maccabees. There's no reason for such a book to have been written in the time of Nebuchadnezzar. But at the time of the Maccabees when the Jews were almost wiped out by the Assyrian attack it would be very natural for somebody to write this book to encourage them to fight valiantly. That's what all the liberal scholars believe and teach that it was written in the time of the Maccabees 400 yrs. ~~xxx~~. later.

Well it fits with this doesn't it? How would anyone 400 yrs. later in the midst of the fighting with the Maccabees to deliver Israel from the Assyrian attack, how would anyone know the exact name of the last king of Babylon? Belshazzar sounds like a good Babylonian name. It would be a good guess wouldn't it? Maybe there was some myth that had the name Belshazzar, and it was natural that when the ~~king~~ conquered they would have killed the king. It just fits with the idea of a story made up later on in order to encourage the Jews rather than something that actually gives the facts of the time. So that seemed to fit with what the archaeologists were discovering.

But when this happened not every archaeologist was ready to accept it. There was one named Prof. Pinches in the British Museum who said, When you find difficulties in the Bible let's look ~~for~~ for more facts, and I think that's a good rule. Where there is something you don't understand in the Bible, let's see exactly what it says; let's know what those words mean as exactly as we can. But then if we don't know the answer let's look for more facts. And see whether they will throw further light.

One problem was in v. 11 it says, Nebuchadnezzar thy father the king. Well, if Nebuchadnezzar was the father of Belshazzar, this man Nabonidus whom we have much historical evidence of would not fit into the account anywhere. But when you examine the use of the word "father" and "son" in the Bible you find they are differently ~~xxx~~ than the way we use them today. We read them so often we don't think of it. But now you take the beginning of one of the Gospels where it says, The beginning of the gospel of the story of Jesus the son of David, the son of Abraham. You say How ~~xxx~~ could he be the Son of David. David lived about 1000 B.C. -- 1000 yrs. before. How could a man have a son who lived 1000 years after he did? It's impossible if the word son is what we mean by son today. But if you go through the Bible you find the word son means a descendant, not in the next generation necessarily and you find many many cases where it is perfectly clear that that is true. Your immediate descendants or a later generation. The same with father. Father is either the next generation or an earlier generation. That way they speak of David as Jesus' father. In the sense he was his male ancestor. So this does not say he immediately came after Nebuchadnezzar.

Pinches said, Let's get some more facts. So he went into the British Museum where he was employed and he found there thousands of clay tablets that had been brought there from Babylon.