

word OT is definitely in it. He has a great many texts that have nothing to do with the OT, but a great many that do. The whole thing gives a very fine selection of material of ancient Egypt and Babylonia. I was working on Daniel just recently and I looked up in the index for Belshazzar and he has just one or two texts among a number that are known - references to him, and no recognition whatever of the fact that Belshazzar has been proven to be a real king as talk in the Bible. He completely side-steps that.

I saw an article in the newspaper some time ago about Dr. Breasted who was then head of the Oriental Institute in the Chicago and the heading was Theories of Fundamentalism Disproved. Underneath it said Bible Shown Not to be Free From Error! Then it said, The Bible is not free from error and never can be proved to be free from error; this statement was made by Prof. Breasted in connected with his giving to the press of the discovery by one of his expeditions -- I believe it was of Bethshean in Palestine -- of an inscription showing that Shishak had captured Jerusalem as described in the book of Kings. So he had found an evidence exactly fitting with the Bible and he was afraid people would draw the natural conclusion the Bible was true so he made a statement exactly <sup>opposite of</sup> /of that which he found, and that's what got into the headlines. That's the situation we face in the scholarly world today. But in a way, as far as objective defense of the Scripture it is better than the opposite situation in a way. We had c. 100 yrs. ago that anything in a Babylonian tablet that sounded a little bit like something in the Bible, and they would say, O that proves the Bible is true, and some of the most absurd arguments were given. Now some of the scholars go back to those statements and quote them to show what silly people fundamentalists are. We need to be careful, cautious and objective in what we deal with, but the prejudice