fully what I have in mind. Now to go on, however, to the second aspect of corroboration. Special corroboration. I think it is very good to keep the two distinct in our minds. General corroboration we have noticed is the general background of the situation and that is an of tremendous importance. Special corroboration is eveidenced in some other source that a particular thing actually happened as described there., there axearthex a specific statement is a correct statement. You see this deals more far more with details than the other does, the matter of general corroboration. This deals more with individual precise statements. Under the general aspect of general corroboration we have the great general sweep of the relation of the Bible to the history of ancient times as gotten from archeology. We find that certain periods one nation dominant in the <sup>B</sup>ible and we find that at that time that nation was truly an important nation. At another time we will find a nation merely mentioned in the Bible or marsix mentioned as a comparatively unimportant nation and at that period we find that nation was not in a position of great importance. Such efidence as this is general corroboration.

Now for special corroboration. I just want to give you an interesting instance of it now which is found in the book of Isaihh. This instance I have given so many times that I have not bothered to put down the exact reference and it slips my mind for the moment. It is **there** the reference to Sargon in Isahah. Chapter 20. Thank you. In Isaiah 20, the first verse, "In the year that Tartan came unto **i**shdod when Sargon king of Assyria sent him and fought against Ashdod and took it." Now in this statement in the <sup>B</sup>ible we have a reference to a king of Assyria named Sargon. Then general importance of a king at that time would be general corroboration. But now a special question would be, what about this name mentioned here, Sargon? Was there a king of Assyria of **gf** that particular name at this time, the time of Isaiah? In the **e**dition of the Encyclopedia Britannica published a little over one hundred years ago the statement was made that no such king as Sargon had reigned in Assyria. There

-22-