

"The secretary of Belshezzar, son of the king, leased a house for three years" on certain conditions. A third tablet tells of the payment of a certain amount of silver to the steward of Belshezzar, son of the king. These give evidence that Belshezzar actually existed and was the king's son.

The next step was the discovery of the tablet giving contract by the oath of Nabonidus, king of Babylon and of Belshezzar, the king's son. It was not customary to swear oaths by anyone save the reigning king. Inscriptions have been found telling for each of the last years before the downfall, just what the king's son did and what Cyrus did. Nabonidus seems to have lived in retirement during the latter years. Belshezzar would seem to have actually been in charge of the government in Babylon and in control of the army. It would seem thoroughly justifiable to speak of him as the king and he would seem to have been the real director of affairs. The king's son was slain, but Nabonidus was allowed to live in retirement after Babylon had been taken. The biblical account seems to recognize the condition of the Government in its mention that Daniel was to be made third ruler of the kingdom. This would recognize the position of Nabonidus as first ruler, while Belshezzar was second ruler.

Professor Daugherty of Yale has recently published a book on Nabonidus and Belshezzar. He considers the cuneiform evidence with great care and then examines the various writings dealing with the period that had been preserved to us from a period subsequent to the fall of Babylon. He comes to the conclusion that there would seem to have been a deliberate attempt to misrepresent the position of Belshezzar or to destroy his memory. The literature after the contemporary cuneiform material, up to the time of Josephus, except for the Book of Daniel, would not suffice to give an accurate idea of conditions as they actually were. The Book of Daniel is superior to all other known