

is not the attitude of scholarship today. The attitude of scholarship today is "Here is a document which clearly comes from ancient times. This document is to be considered true unless there is evidence to the contrary." That is the attitude which is taken by scholarship toward all ancient document with a possible exception ~~if~~ ^{provided} provided today. We discover a tablet over in Mesopotamia and on this tablet we find the statment "I am the king so and so and I did such and such a thing." We don't right away say Well what a fraud, what a ~~monoc~~. There never was such a king as that. We never heard of him anywhere else. It doesn't exist." We don't say that "This probably means there was a king who did what is described here. It is possible that it is incorrect." But the burden of truth is on those who say it is incorrect to prove that it is. A very interesting instance of this was found in a case of a list of Babylonia kings which names four very early Babylonia kings. That is kings in Mesopotamia ~~and~~ in the course of a long series of names telling how long they reigned and the first of them is mentioned as having reigned 80 years and then the second reigned about 35 years and the third about 32 and etc. Well there was discovered then a single object in Mesopotamia on which it said it named a king whose name was utterly unknown and it gave his father as the first of these rulers. The first of this list ~~of~~ before. He, this man, the king's son and so son of the king who was the first of this list before and the list and no such name. So naturally people said Here is a fact. Here is the ancient implement of war which has been found with his name on it of a king and we have no such a king existing. But they said, He is given as the son of the king who we know existed. This is a fact, How do you explain it? And somebody advanced the hypothesis that actually he was the second king and the material about him had been lost and when the annals were compiled the two ^{reigned as one} ~~raised once~~ together and the ~~two~~ first ^{king thus} given an eighty year reign. And that is accepted now by all scholars. It is accepted that this evidence here is true and it fits into the other and explains the statement of the other. We do not have to just sign ancient