

When you come to see exactly what this means, one problem was in v.11 it says, "Neb. thy father the king." If Neb. was the father of Bel., this man Nabonidus whom we have much historical evidence on wouldn't fit into the account anywhere. But when you examine the use of the word father and son in the Bible, you find they are used differently than we do today. We use them so often we don't think of them. But you take the Gospels where it begins, "The story of Jesus Christ, the son of David, the son of Abraham." How could He be the son of David? David lived about 1000 B.C.! How could a man have a son who lived 1000 yrs. after he did? Impossible if the word son means what we mean by son today, but if you go through the Bible you find "son" means a descendant, not necessarily in the next generation. You find many cases where it is perfectly clear that that is true. Your immediate descendant or a later generation. Same is true of "father" -- either next generation or an earlier generation. That way they speak of David as Jesus' father. Father in sense of ancestor. So this does not say he came immediately after Nebuchadnezzar.

Pinchess ~~is~~ said, Let's get some more facts. So he went into the British museum where he was employed and found thousands of clay tablets that had been brought there from Babylon. These tablets they had picked out the tablets that had interesting stories on, that had literary records, that seemed to be history, but there were thousands of them that were simply legal contracts and lists of sheep one had, and number of areas of property, etc. No archaeologists who had time to read all these. They'd just glanced over them and picked the ones that looked most interesting. So Pinchess went to these and picked out every one he could find that came from the reign of Nabonidus. In those days they always date the thing by the reign of the king. He found quite a number from the reign of Nabonidus. He took these and began to read them carefully, and after a time he came to one that had the very name Belshazzar in it, so he found that in the reign of Nabonidus there was a man named Belshazzar. Then he came to a tablet that said a certain man rented a house for 3 yrs. ~~as~~ as agents for Belshazzar the king's son. So this showed that Belshazzar was in the royal family. Then he went on and began to find tablets in which the oath was taken in the name of Nabonidus and of Belshazzar, and oaths were never taken except in the name of a 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. Professor Dougherty of Yale University wrote a book in this series on Yale Oriental Researches called "Nabonidus and Belshazzar" in which he gathers together the evidence from this and shows that actually the facts are that Nabonidus was the last king, but that Nabonidus retired for a number of years to Temah, an oasis in the Arabian desert and left his son Belshazzar as co-king with him but actual ruler. So Nabonidus was the nominal ruler, but Belshazzar was the co-king and actual ruler during these last years. So your list of kings just lists Nabonidus but Belshazzar was just as much king as Nabonidus and the references to him as king are true. Then Prof. Dougherty went through all the ancient ~~and~~ accounts of Babylon he could find and he found that from the time of the fall of Babylon, right up to the time of Josephus, there is no account he could find which had the facts about Belshazzar in it. These facts were forgotten, but they were in the clay tablets that lay buried for all those centuries.