

of half a dozen states at that time, without having access to modern reference books. It is doubtful if the average American could even be certain who were Presidents of the United States and of Mexico in 1838 without first using reference books of a type not available to the original writers of the Bible.

The similarity of the Biblical names to those used on the monuments, and the correctness of the order in which they occur, provide a striking corroboration of the general accuracy of the historical narrative. In addition, they give proof of the remarkable care that was taken by the Hebrews in copying and recopying the Old Testament. Careful examination of the many instances of this type, and comparison with the relatively poor preservation of names in many other ancient writings (as, for instance, the Greek translation of the Old Testament), provide a mass of material for study of the matter of special corroboration. While occasionally a problem in this field is as yet unsolved, the number of instances where the equivalence is certain is large enough to constitute a strong argument for the accuracy of the history involved.¹³

Another interesting instance of special corroboration concerns the cities mentioned in the book of Genesis. Many of these have been examined archaeologically and evidence has been found that a city was actually at that place as early as the Patriarchal days. On the other hand, there are cities mentioned in later books, but not mentioned in Genesis which have been found to have no remains reaching back to so early a date.¹⁴

A striking instance of special corroboration is the case of the fifth chapter of the book of Daniel. When material first

¹³Many books contain discussions of this material. For a recent brief account of outstanding instances, cf. J. Finegan, *Light from the Ancient Past*, (Princeton: 1946), pp. 170-190.

¹⁴W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, (New York: 1935), p. 133.

began to be discovered from the Neo-Babylonian Empire, it was found that the last king of Babylon before its conquest by the Persians was named Nabonidus, and that when the Persians conquered they did not kill him but allowed him to live out his life in retirement. Daniel 5 calls the last king of Babylon Belshazzar and says he was killed when the city was taken. This appeared to be a sharp contradiction between the Biblical statements and the archaeological material.

However, research in the British Museum among the hundreds of clay tablets from the reign of Nabonidus showed that he had a son named Belshazzar. Further investigation revealed that his son actually reigned as co-king along with his father during the latter part of his reign, while Nabonidus lived at a place remote from Babylon. There are many other instances in ancient times where a king associated a son with him in the kingship during part of his reign. Eventually a tablet was found which mentioned the death of the king's son at the conquest by the Persians.

Professor Dougherty of Yale University wrote a volume in the series of Yale Oriental Researches entitled, "Nabonidus and Belshazzar." In this book he examined all the cuneiform evidence and found that it proved that at this time Belshazzar was the actual ruler and commander of the army even though ranking as co-king along with his father rather than as sole king.

During subsequent centuries references to the destruction of Babylon make no mention of Belshazzar. Possibly he was the individual selected by the Persians as the target for their vilification, the one who was considered to be the incarnation of all the evils which they opposed, as is customarily done by nations at war, selecting some one of the opposite side to be the individual target for their hatred. At any rate, until the time of Josephus, who uses Daniel as his source, we have no other ancient record which preserves