

You find it correct, of course in Josephus, but Josephus at c. 100 A.D. based it on the book of Daniel, what he had. So Dougherty said the book of Daniel is superior to all ancient writings that were preserved and passed on in remembering the name of Belshazzar, the fact he was actually king, and the fact that there was a dual rulership in the kingdom.

How many people, do you think, in the last 2000 yrs. who read this story realized there was a dual rulership in the kingdom? Yet three times this a.m. I read to you verses in which it says, You will be made third ruler in the kingdom. What did that mean, the third ruler? It doesn't explain the historical situation, but when you know the situation you see how exactly it fits with it. Nabonidus is first ruler, Belshazzar is the second; he would make Daniel the third, and three times this reference is made here, and I suppose in the past 2000 years hardly anybody noticed that little phrase and wondered just what did it mean. But it preserved the memory of this historical fact correctly through all these years that's only been rediscovered just now.

I find it hard to resist carrying this illustration a little further, and I don't with an ordinary crowd because they don't quite catch it, but with a crowd largely ministers I think I will. The critics view is this: in the days of the Maccabees, 400 yrs. after Nebuchadnezzar, a man made up these stories in order to encourage the Jews to fight valiantly, against the Assyrian oppressors. The argument is that it was actually written in the time of Daniel. If the liberal view is right what actually happened? Well, we'd have to say it's this: At that time 400 yrs. afterwards the name Belshazzar was completely forgotten; the facts about the dual rulership were completely forgotten, but there was a man there among the Jews fighting for their lives who said, I want to write a book to encourage the people but I want to get my facts straight so, he said, I want to know about the actual events of the destruction of Babylon 400 yrs. ago, so he left the army where every man's arm was needed, smuggled his way through the Assyrian lines, made his way across the desert to Mesopotamia, got to one of the temples there and persuaded one of the priests to teach him an almost forgotten cuneiform writing which scholars have learned today == over 300 common signs and a few other hundred uncommon ones == went through hundreds of clay tablets like Prof. Pinchess did in the British museum, learned the true facts about Belshazzar and the dual rulership, and having gotten these facts he wrote his book, made his way clear back across the desert, smuggled his way through the Syrian lines, got to the Israelite lines fighting for their lives and gave them his book to encourage them! It's certainly much simpler to believe the facts as they were written down at the time and preserved correctly even though otherwise they were completely forgotten all through these centuries.

Now the other illustration I'd like to give you is from an entirely different field. It's not one I've come across in any books, but I happened upon it a few years ago, and I was just thrilled when I found it. I must give a little background first. The name of Sigmund Freud is not very popular among Christians and deservedly so because he had some very bad theories that have done great harm.