

it occurred at that time. Archeology fits with the Bible as it stands, and it doesn't fit with the Bible as reconstructed by the critics.

I think at the risk of tiring you I will take the time for one more instance. One more very interesting instance it is to me, from the book of Daniel. The book of Daniel is one of the most doubted books in the Old Testament. It tells of mighty things which happened, marvelous interpositions of God,- not off in an obscure corner of the world somewhere, but right at the capitol, at the palace, of the greatest ruler of the day, and so naturally if you don't believe in the supernatural you can't believe in that. And so all critics are agreed that the book of Daniel was not written by Daniel,- it was written in the time of the Maccabees, 400 years later. It was even such a fine book as the book of _____ Bright, a book written in 1924 but right up-to-date at that time, very excellent book on the monuments of the Old Testament, and very good on the whole. Even that book says, "There is no historical situation in the time of Nechadnezzar to account for the writing of this book. It must have been written in the time of the Maccabees, when it was needed to encourage and to inspire the people". And of course most of us who hold this view are not conservative to anywhere near the extent that Bright is, and he holds that the book of Daniel is full of discordant errors and legends. N

Now I would just like to mention one interesting chapter in this book, the 5th chapter. Everybody who has ever gone to Sunday School knows the 5th chapter of the book of Daniel. Belshazar the king made a great feast, and at the feast a hand came out and wrote something on the wall. Belshazar was tremendously interested, he wondered what it was, and he was frightened, and he wanted to know the explanation. And he said, "Whosoever shall read this writing and show me the interpretation thereof, shall be clothed with scarlet and have a chain of gold about his neck, and shall be the third ruler