

OK rulership, in that three times in this chapter (Dan. 5: 7, 16, 29) reference is made to the honor of becoming "the third ruler in the kingdom." In the opinion of Professor Daugherty such an accurate representation of the actual situation in this point which seems to have been forgotten otherwise weighs strongly against the wide-spread theory that the book of Daniel represents the ideas of the Maccabean period four hundred years after the reign of Nebuchadnezzar and suggests instead a much earlier date for the book.

A most interesting instance of special corroboration is concerned with the references in Ezra 2:68⁽¹⁸⁾ and in Nehemiah 7:70-72, to a coin which was used by the returned exiles in Judah during the Persian Empire. In the Authorized Version this coin is referred to as a dram, while the Revised Version uses the word ^{DARIC (19)} ~~daric~~. Actually the Hebrew word has four consonants DRKM. This would correspond exactly to the name of a common Greek coin, the drachma. In fact, an Aramaic inscription found at the port of Athens has used the word in exactly the form which is found in the Bible, to represent the Attic drachma. However, it would seem strange indeed, that the Attic drachma should be used in Palestine as early as the time of the Persian period. It would be expected rather that some sort of Persian coin would be used. Perhaps this is the reason why the translators of the Authorized Version ignored the "K" in the Hebrew word and used an English word dram, a word which does not correspond to any known ancient coin. The translators of the Revised Version put back the "K" but ignored the "M" and used the word ⁽²⁰⁾ ~~daric~~, corresponding to an ancient coin possibly derived from the name of the Persian ruler, Darius. ⁽¹⁷⁾ The presence of the four consonants in the word in the Bible could not be a copyist's error since it occurs four times. Despite the unwillingness of the scholars responsible for the Authorized and Revised Versions, to consider that the statement of the original Hebrew text might be correct after all, in spite of its apparent historical improbability, a recent archaeological discovery suggests that they would have have given us a better translation if they had simply reproduced the Hebrew word instead of trying to use one word that would avoid its natural implication. In 1931 Professor O. R. Sellers of McCormick Theological Seminary and Professor W.F. Albright of Johns Hopkins University excavated Beth-zur in southern Palestine. Here they found remains from the Persian period. Dr. Albright reports: "Six coins of the