

## RESPONSE ARTICLES

### EDITOR'S NOTE

*AUSS* occasionally prints differing viewpoints on a topic. When a subsequent article takes the form of rebuttal of a presentation published earlier in *AUSS*, the author of the original article is given an opportunity to respond. The general rule is that such dialogue is subject to the usual criteria governing *AUSS* articles, including the stipulation that the discussion should enhance knowledge in the field by presenting new information and/or fresh insights on old materials.

In the following dialogue, Lester L. Grabbe critiques a presentation made in 1983 by William H. Shea concerning the Belshazzar of Dan 5, and Shea in turn responds. Although Grabbe's article does not add materially to what scholars critical of the Daniel account have already iterated, but rather simply refocuses their arguments for a specific purpose, we have felt that it is legitimate to include it as part of a dialogue that may have some informational value for our readers. Shea too, in the first sections of his article, refocuses information that is rather well-known. However, in the latter part of his article he presents a fascinating new interpretation of certain data in two ancient Babylonian documents from the immediate post-Nebuchadnezzar era (and hence the title "Bel(te)shazzar Meets Belshazzar").

—K.A.S.