

occurring as the book of Daniel says. The modernists say the book of Daniel was written 400 yrs. after the time of Nebuchadnezzar. Why should anybody 400 yrs. later make up a story like that and connect it up with the great king Nebuchadnezzar? What would be the thing that would lead him to do it? The fact that we find an evidence from that very time of such a thing having happened to a great king in Babylon is a big step toward corroboration of the Biblical. Now there is the argument they make from it, it was not Nebuchadnezzar at all; it was Nabonidus -- somebody can have made a mistake or somebody can have not dared to mention it in connection with the great king, and tied it up with a lesser king. We just don't know the facts about it.

The modernists' books will take from each of the stories of the two brothers, and they will tell you the ~~myths~~ ~~myths~~ found in an Egyptian record ~~about the~~ ~~two brothers~~ and it's amazing the similarities to the story of Joseph. You have these two brothers, and one of them is very strong -- the younger brother and he works for the other, and the older brother makes him work for him constantly and all this. And the older brother's wife tries to seduce the younger brother, and he tells her how he could not. His brother has been so good to him it would be wrong for him to do such a thing and so on. And she grabs his garment and she tells the older brother that the younger brother tried to seduce her, and she has grabbed this. And the older brother gets very angry and he chases the younger brother, and the modernistic account usually stops just at that point. And they say Look at the similarity to the story of Joseph. It could not be accidental. Well I don't think it could be accidental. But they just stop right there. They don't go on and give you the rest of the Egyptian story usually. The rest of the story tells how the older brother chases the younger brother and the younger brother runs and it looks as though