

sea, your power is going to absolutely disappear. Do you think he would have made him 3rd ruler in the kgdm? and put a gold chain about their necks? Well, Belshazzar seems to have been a man of higher quality than most modern dictators, a man who was true to his promise even though he was not liking what Daniel said. Because we read he actually had Daniel put a chain of gold around his neck and a proclamation concerning him that he'd be 3rd ruler in the kgdm. Then it goes on: And that night was Belshazzar king of the Chaldeans slain. And Darius the Mede took the kingdom.

This is an interesting story. It was told in SS. and used all through history. But within the last century Babylon was excavated and the excavators found the records about its history and its rulers, and in these records they did not find the word Belshazzar, and this starts "Belshazzar the king made a great feast . . ." They did not find the name Belshazzar among the kingd of Babylon. But they did find some account of the destructōn of Babylon which said that Nabonidus the name of the last king of Babylon, and this says in that night was Belshazzar king of the Chaldeans slain. They found that when the Persians took over Babylon, he did not slay Nabonidus but they gave him a pension and he spent the rest of his life studying archaeology. That hardly fits with what you read here. The name of the king is different. He was not killed that night like this seems to say. Well, the scholars said, That's exactly what we would expect. You read any liberal book and they will say, The Book of Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees. There's a very fine book on archaeology, fine of the whole written some years ago by Ira M. Price in which right through he shows evidences about the Bible being accurate and in relation to Daniel he shows a good many such evidences but then he says, However after careful study of all the problems of the Book of Daniel, we feel it is most reasonable to think Daniel was written in the time of the Maccabees -- that would be 400 yrs. after Nebuchadnezzar. There is no reason for such a book to be written at the time of Nebuchadnezzar; but at the time of the Maccabees when the Jews were almost whipped out by Assyrian attackers, then it would be natural for someone to write this book ~~and~~ to encourage them to fight valiantly." And that's what all liberal scholars teach, that it was written in the time of the Maccabees 400 yrs. later. Well, it fits with it doesn't it? How would anyone 400 yrs. later in the midst of the fighting of the Maccabees to deliver Israel from Assyrian attack, how would anybody know ~~that~~ 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? Or maybe there was some myth, some legend that has the name Belshazzar. It was natural to think that when the Babylonians conquered they would have killed the king. It just fits with the idea of a story made up later on to encourage the Jews rather than something that ~~and~~ actually ~~the~~ 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 that. There was one named Prof. Pinchees, in the British Museum who said, When you find difficulties in the Bible let's look for more facts. I think that's a good rule. When you find something in the Bible you don't understand, then let's see exactly what it says and 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 on it.