

Another interesting instance of special corroboration concerns the cities mentioned in the book of Genesis. In all but one case the cities have been examined archaeologically and evidence has been found that a city was actually at that place as early as the Patriarchal days. <sup>(16)</sup> On the other hand, a ~~xxx xxx xxxxxxx~~ number of cities mentioned in later books but not mentioned in Genesis have been found to have no~~x~~ remains reaching back to as early a date. <sup>(16)</sup>

A most striking instance of special corroboration is the case of the fifth chapter of the book of Daniel. When materials first 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 instead of killing him they 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 statement 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 this son was co-king with his father during the latter 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 Daugherty of Yale University wrote a volume in the series of Yale Oriental Researches entitled, "Nabonidus and Belshazzar." <sup>(17)</sup> 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 as sole king. During subsequent centuries references to the destruction of Babylon make no mention of Belshazzar. It would seem that he was possibly 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 ~~ix~~ any rate, until the time of Josephus, we have no other Neo-Babylonian record which preserves the name of Belshazzar or the fact of his power in the kingdom. Daugherty points out that the book of Daniel has the name accurately preserved and the fact of his power and of his death at the time of the conquest. In addition to this he mentions that it preserves for us the record of a dual