

writings so that one can see what is dependable and what is solid, and where the points are at which human speculation simply enters in. The same thing of course applies to historical statements in the Bible. We have Belshazzar in the Bible who was not mentioned in the cuneiform writings as far as known 50 yrs. ago. They say Belshazzar is just a myth. Then they found in real texts, contracts in Babylon mentions of Belshazzar, the king's son. Eventually they found that a correction interpretation of a particular inscription about the fall of Babylon referred to the king's son being killed. And the Bible says, In that night Belshazzar was slain. It just fits. And the evidence is now conclusive and complete that Belshazzar was ruling along with his father Nabonidus. But the historical books up to Josephus and the Bible did not even mention him. So there were those 50 yrs. ago who said Belshazzar simply did not exist.

Now there are problems that are not yet settled. There was a discovery made within the last 10 or 15 yrs. of a tablet which tells about Nabonidus having a period of insanity. It has such a great similarity to the account of Nebuchadnezzar in the Book of Daniel that the modernists today say that the story of Nebuchadnezzar's insanity in the book of Daniel is based on really the story of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon. Of course they will use that to (try) to show an error in the Scriptures. Actually the error can easily be the other way of course. The fact is that some king at that time ~~was~~ went through an experience similar to what is described in Daniel. That is clearly the evidence now. As to whether it got incorrectly tied up to Nabonidus instead of to Belshazzar, (?) the tendency of the unbeliever is naturally to say that the Bible must be wrong. But it is just as reasonable to think it could be the other way. One of these days a proof may come along to prove that it is. For the present we have an evidence of such an experience