

feeble viceroy; he was entrusted with 'the kingship.'"

In addition to his cuneiform researches, Professor Dougherty investigated all subsequent ancient writings which tell about the end of the Babylonian Kingdom. He found that none of these writings preserved the name of Belshazzar or any of the facts about him. The name does not occur nor is there any recognition of the part he played until we come to the time of Josephus, toward the end of the First Century A.D., and Josephus admittedly used Daniel as his source of information

On page 200 Professor Dougherty concludes: "The foregoing summary of information concerning Belshazzar, when judged in the light of data obtained from the texts discussed in this monograph, indicates that of all non-Babylonian records dealing with the situation at the close of the Neo-Babylonian empire the fifth chapter of Daniel ranks next to cuneiform literature in accuracy so far as outstanding events are concerned. The Scriptural account may be interpreted as excelling because it employs the name Belshazzar, because it attributes royal power to Belshazzar, and because it recognizes that a dual rulership existed in the kingdom. Babylonian cuneiform documents of the sixth century B.C. furnish clearcut evidence of the correctness of these three basic historical nuclei contained in the Biblical narrative dealing with the fall of Babylon. . . . The total information found in all available chronologically-fixed documents later than the cuneiform texts of the sixth century B.C. and prior to the writings of Josephus of the first century A.D. could not have provided the necessary material for the historical framework of the fifth chapter of Daniel." In a footnote he adds: "The view that the fifth chapter of Daniel originated in the Maccabean age is discredited."

Thus the very memory of Belshazzar's name and power disappeared except for these references in this one chapter in the Book of Daniel. The information has come to light and has shown the accuracy of the Biblical statements. Again we have a striking fulfillment of I Peter 1:24-25.

It is interesting to go through the Bible noting instances of individuals, cities and nations whose existence is evidenced through archeological discoveries. To my mind, it is even more striking to find instances in which the background of a Biblical story is illustrated by some archeological discovery in such a way as to demonstrate that the Biblical story shows a knowledge which would hardly be available to one who wrote long afterwards. Such instances indicate that the Bible was written at the time it claims to be and not many centuries later, as the Higher Critics maintain.

There is an interesting instance of this type in connection with the thirteenth chapter of the book of Genesis. This chapter relates an incident which is well known to all who have ever attended an American Sunday School. After amassing a great deal of property in Egypt, Abram and Lot came up into Palestine and encamped between Bethel and Ai. Soon it developed that their flocks and herds were so large that there was great danger of strife between them.

It is easy to imagine what must have occurred next. Probably Abram's men came out at 5:30 one morning, as was their custom, and started to lead their flocks and herds to pasture. To their dismay they soon discovered that Lot's men had gone out half an hour earlier, and had already taken all the good pasture land within easy reach. It was necessary, therefore, to lead Abram's flocks and herds a long distance in order to find good pasture. This was very unpleasant. Probably Abram's men came out at 4:30 the next day, and when Lot's men came out at 5:00 they, in their turn, found that the good pasture was already taken and that it was necessary for them to go a very long distance away from the camping place. The next day they probably went out at 4:00. Such a process could not continue very long before it would reach the point of real trouble. Strife began between the herdmen of Lot and the herdmen of Abram.

In this situation Abram went to Lot's tent and suggested that they seek an amicable way out of the difficulty. Let us picture them as they walked along on the hill country between Bethel and Ai. Abram said, "Let there be no strife, I pray thee, between me and thee, and between my herdmen and thy herdmen; for we be brethren. Is not the whole land before thee? Separate thyself, I pray thee, from me; if thou wilt take the left hand, then I will go to the right; or if thou depart to the right hand, then I will go to the left." Verse 10 continues: "And Lot lifted up his eyes, and beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah, even as the garden of the Lord, like the land of Egypt, as thou comest unto Zoar." The next verse states that "Lot chose all the plain of Jordan, and Lot journeyed east; and they separated themselves the one from the other."