

When making room for the period of seven years in Nebuchadnezzar's life it would seem to have been better if the author could have stated whether or not Langdon assigns the tablets for the gaps mentioned on page 290 to any particular year, instead of raising the doubt as to whether he assigned them to dates which would make the seven year period less likely. Finally the supposition that a regency would be deemed preferable to an Evil-Merodach (295) seems to be directly contrary to the author's statements on a previous page (263) that weaklings soon ceased to reign in Babylonia, and that "some more aggressive, self-assertive, or intelligent brother or rival speedily made an end of them by assassination or rebellion."

The present writer does not know enough about the languages to discuss the argument about the Kasdim and the Galdus, but he wishes that late writers had been kept out of the discussion. Diodorus Siculus, "who lived in the time of Caesar and Augustus," Quintus Curtius "probably of the second century A. D.", Arrian "prefect of Cappadocia under Hadrian", and others who lived earlier but too late to be of any great value, are liberally used in the argument. William of Tyre and Ekkehard who were both in Palestine within a century of the First Crusade are considered practically worthless authorities for that expedition, while such men as John of Ypres writing in the West two centuries or more afterwards contribute absolutely nothing except as they quote earlier sources. Is not the very point of the Kasdim question that the usage is supposed to represent the custom of a later age? Why then use the writers of that age, who were admittedly surrounded by the customs of that later age, to testify concerning events in the earlier age.