

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

**PayPal**

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jtvi-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

JOURNAL OF  
THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute

OR

Philosophical Society of Great Britain

---

VOL. LXXI

1939



LONDON:

---

PUBLISHED BY

THE INSTITUTE, 1, CENTRAL BUILDINGS, WESTMINSTER, W.C.1

---

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

831ST ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING,  
HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, MAY 8TH,  
AT 4.30 P.M.

BRIG.-GEN. H. BIDDULPH, C.B., C.M.G., D.S.O., IN  
THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous meeting were read, confirmed and signed and the Hon. Secretary announced the following elections :—As Members : S. J. Frame, Esq., and E. G. Lee, Esq.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Sir Charles Marston, J.P., F.S.A., to read his paper entitled “How the Old Testament Stands To-Day: The Lachish Discoveries.”

The meeting was then thrown open to discussion in which Mr. W. C. Edwards, Dr. Hart-Davies and Dr. Barcroft Anderson took part.

---

*HOW THE OLD TESTAMENT STANDS TO-DAY.  
THE LACHISH DISCOVERIES.*

By SIR CHARLES MARSTON, J.P., F.S.A.

ONE of the most prominent of our clergy recently summarised the change in the attitude of the so-called critical circles towards the Bible by saying—“They all now treat the Old Testament with respect.” In other words, criticism has definitely passed from the offensive to the defensive. It is busy jettisoning the Wellhausen theory and previous assured results. It can scarcely do otherwise, in view of the unveiling of the remote past which the Science of Archæology has brought about in Bible lands. There is considerable temptation to quote some of the past conclusions of criticism in the light of present archæological discoveries, but we are all prone to be misled, even though we are not critics. It is more satisfactory to find that conclusions advanced in my books are reinforced by further discoveries.

Five years ago I drew the attention of this Institute to the evidence bearing upon the Old Testament which had been found by the Science of Archæology in Bible lands during the previous eight years. The conclusions then reached were—

1. That Monotheism was the original religion.

2. That the Exodus of the Israelites from Egypt occurred in 1440 B.C.
3. That Abraham was born in 2160 B.C.
4. That the Hyksos were Hebrews.
5. That the Canaanites and Amorites were fellahin races; and that their idolatrous civilisation was sub-ordinate to the Hebrew civilisation in the day of the Patriarchs.
6. That Moses died in 1400 B.C.
7. That the Mosaic code marked the revival of Monotheism.

These are all fundamental discoveries of the first importance, which affect the whole outlook on the Old Testament. The progress of excavations seems to be driving many, more or less, to adopt them. But to pass on to the recent discoveries.

Five years ago the excavations at Tel Duweir, or Lachish, had only progressed as far as the discovery of the Temple, outside the walls of the city. We then possessed no hint of the sensational finds awaiting us. These began with the fragments of a water ewer in the refuse heap of the temple. Round the neck of this ewer were some letters of the alphabetical script discovered thirty years earlier by Sir Flinders Petrie in the Peninsula of Sinai, where Moses led the Israelites after the Exodus. Members are probably aware that this, the earliest known alphabetical script, had been used by Midianite miners who worked the turquoise mines of Sinai at the time of Moses, or perhaps even earlier, certainly not later. Besides the letter on this Lachish water ewer, specimens of this Sinai Hebrew script were next found in the rock tombs round the foot of the Tel on which the city stood. The pottery associated with the finds all gave a date of about 1300 B.C. The script itself is now generally recognised to be the remote ancestor of our own alphabet, through the Phœnician and the Greek. It seems probable that the Israelites brought it with them, when they conquered Canaan under Joshua, and that the Phœnicians afterwards learned it from them. The most important specimen of this script is painted in white letters on a red bowl. Dr. Langdon deciphered it to read "His righteousness is my hand (or support)." And linked it up with the passage in Isaiah—"Be thou their arm every morning." If Dr. Langdon's decipherment is correct, we have here a sentence which might for all the world have come from the book of Deuteronomy.

It must be borne in mind that these invaluable discoveries were made outside the city. The excavations inside on the summit of the mound of Tel Duweir have only progressed as far as the city destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, for there a later Persian occupation had first to be cleared away. We may expect to find other examples of this Sinai Hebrew script when we get down to the layer of ruins which represents the first Israelite occupation. But that leads to the sad reflection—if we ever do get down to it in our time.

It would almost seem as though the very powers of Evil were endeavouring to thwart the further discovery of outside evidence concerning Holy Scripture. The leader of the Lachish Expedition—James Leslie Starkey—although in entire sympathy with the Arab cause in Palestine, was murdered on January 10th, 1938. The Expedition's Camp at Lachish has since been raided three times, and it is to be feared has been destroyed. Again, Sir Henry Wellcome, whose munificent support alone originally made this expedition possible, died several years ago. His executors, with my collaboration, have since most generously carried on the work. The whole of the discoveries made are now being collated by Mr. Gerald Harding, Mr. Charles Inge, who succeeded Mr. Starkey, and by other members of the expedition, at the expense of the Wellcome Trustees. These will be published in due course.

And lastly, Biblical archæology has also to mourn the loss of Professor Langdon, whose premature death has been another severe blow to Old Testament work.

Mr. Starkey has been described as the greatest archæologist that Palestine has ever known. His untimely death at the age of 43 is an irreparable loss. But before he died, beside the Sinai Hebrew, he discovered another alphabetical script, and this time inside the ruins of the Lachish destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. It is known as the Phœnician Hebrew, and it has become evident that it was in general use by both Israel and Judah before the Babylonian captivity. This script is of a much more flexible character than the Sinai Hebrew, and seems to have been designed for ink writing on papyrus leaves, or skins. We are ignorant as to when it first came into use. The earliest known example was on the celebrated Moabite stone which dates back to about 850 B.C. But the leading authority upon it, Professor Torczyner, thinks that it may even have been used in the time

of Moses. And there are passages in the Pentateuch which suggest such writing (see, for example, Numbers v, 23).

This Phœnician Hebrew script was first found at Lachish in the remains of a room in the gate tower of the city destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar. When the ruins were cleared away, a cobbled floor was brought to light with a layer of four inches of black mud and ash on its surface. Debris to the height of two feet lay strewn upon this ; debris of burnt limestone, or brickwork, and blackened fragments of pottery. When they were washed from their coating of soot, eighteen of these pieces of pottery showed lines of ink writing upon them. Altogether the group contained ninety lines of readable matter ; and although found only just over four years ago, they have already become world famous as the Lachish Letters. For their decipherment has proved them to be nothing more nor less than a series of personal letters actually written in the days of Jeremiah the prophet. The writer was an outpost officer named Hoshaiah ; the letters were addressed to Jaush, the military governor of Lachish. These are the first personal documents that have been found of the time of the Jewish monarchy. Some say they constitute the most valuable discovery that has ever been made, in connection with the archæology of the Old Testament. All previous outside evidence concerning Israel, or Judah, has come through their enemies, such as Sennacherib's account of his treatment of Hezekiah, or from men who were only partly of Jewish birth, as in the case of the Elephantine papyri. But the Lachish Letters are contemporary correspondence between orthodox Jews written in the last years of the kingdom of Judah.

Before describing the contents of these letters, let us pause and consider what relationship they bear to the oldest existing Hebrew manuscript of the Old Testament. This is believed to be the one in the Synagogue at Cairo, and it dates back to about A.D. 895. It is written in the Assyrian Hebrew script, which was adopted by the Jews after the Captivity. But these Lachish Letters in their Phœnician Hebrew script were written not less than fifteen hundred years earlier than this, the oldest copy of the Hebrew Bible. No wonder the scripts are different. Nevertheless, the phraseology, and spelling, the style, and composition, are the same as those of the book of Jeremiah, or of 2 Kings. Is there any reasonable doubt that the whole of the Old Testament was once written in this Phœnician Hebrew script ?

According to Josephus (*Antiq.* xii, 2-11), the Hebrew version of the Old Testament which was used in the composition of the Greek Septuagint some three centuries before Christ, was written on membranes. And as the writing would be in these Phœnician Hebrew characters that might account for some of the variations between the Septuagint and the present Hebrew Bible. It is interesting to inquire whether in the minute dissections of the text of the Old Testament made by scholars, account has been taken of the fact that the Assyrian Hebrew script would not be the one in which the Scriptures were originally written. Until the discovery of these Lachish Letters, so little seems to have been known of this Phœnician Hebrew that even some of its characters were unfamiliar. Beside the writing on the Moabite Stone, the script was used for the Siloam inscription. It also resembles the writing used for the Samaritan Pentateuch, which suggests that version of the Old Testament to be of far greater antiquity than scholars assigned to it, with what has now proved to be the inadequate knowledge at their disposal.

The process of literary digestion of the Lachish Letters has only begun, but the results must all be favourable to the substantial authenticity of the Old Testament. As one studies the Letters it is interesting to notice that the names of most of the men mentioned in them are familiar to Old Testament readers. Beside the name Jeremiah, there is Mattaniah, Gemeriah, Jaazaniah, Neriah, Hagab, and others. There are frequent appeals to the Deity; in all cases the name used is Jahveh. There is no sign of idolatry, and it would seem as though the religious reforms of King Josiah had been effective, at least as far as the garrison of Lachish was concerned.

That the contents of these letters are of peculiar interest, will be judged from the following further reference to them. Professor Torczyner, who deciphered them with Mr. Harding, carried through a Herculean task with great ability, for the characters are illegible in places. He has been already criticised with considerable assurance by those who of necessity have not had his facilities for studying the originals. I can only write as an outsider in the sense of being unable to read this very ancient script. But there is a saying that outsiders see most of the game; and from that standpoint it would seem as though Professor Torczyner's interpretation of the Lachish Letters is fairly correct. It has been already stated that this correspondence was written

by an officer named Hoshaiiah to a high official named Jaush, who must almost certainly have been the military governor of Lachish. The letters, with perhaps one exception, are all from Hoshaiiah, who seems to have been in charge of some outpost on the route between Lachish and Jerusalem. The theme that runs through most of the letters is Hoshaiiah's endeavour to repudiate and exonerate himself from charges that have been made against him. We have to infer what those charges were, and what makes the inference more difficult is the fact that Hoshaiiah had to employ scribes to write the letters for him. He could only indirectly reply to the accusation lest the scribes should learn too much.

We gather, however, that Hoshaiiah was accused of revealing confidential information that came to his knowledge, or that passed through his hands on its way to or from Jerusalem. The nature of that knowledge concerned the affairs of a prophet. The critics postulate the prophet to have probably been Jeremiah. But the letters contain sufficient evidence to justify Professor Torczyner in identifying the prophet with Uriah, the son of Shemaiah, referred to in Jeremiah in the following terms—

“And there was also a man that prophesied in the name of Jehovah, Uriah, the son of Shemaiah of Kirjath-jearim ; and he prophesied against this city and against this land according to all the words of Jeremiah : and when Jehoiakim the king, with all his mighty men and all the princes, heard his words, the king sought to put him to death ; but when Uriah heard it, he was afraid, and fled, and went into Egypt : and Jehoiakim the king sent men into Egypt, namely, Elnathan the son of Achbor, and certain men with him, into Egypt ; and they fetched forth Uriah out of Egypt, and brought him unto Jehoiakim the king ; who slew him with the sword, and cast his dead body into the graves of the common people.” (Jer. xxvi, 20-23.)

The following extract from Letter III certainly seems to associate itself with the passage I have just read :—

7. “Thy slave's heart is sick, since thou hast sent to thy slave.
8. “And that he says ; my lord I do not know
9. “to read a letter. Jahveh lives (to punish me) if anybody has tried



10. "ever to read me a letter. And also
11. "whatever letter came to me I
12. "have not read it and even have not seen of it
13. "anything. And to thy slave it has been told
14. "saying. Down went the commander of the army
15. "Yikhbariah the son of Elnatan to come
16. "to Egypt. And
17. } "he ordered to bring Hodavieh and his men from
18. } here," etc.

The words "The commander of the army—Yikhbariah the son of Elnatan to come to Egypt" associate themselves with the words "The king sent men into Egypt, namely Elnathan the son of Achbor." This Elnathan was a brother-in-law of the king, and might well have been, therefore, the commander of his army. It is true that the scribe who wrote this Lachish Letter reversed the name, and wrote Achbor the son of Elnatan; but such clerical mistakes even occur in the Old Testament, and are of little consequence in what was probably a letter whispered hurriedly to a scribe, and hurriedly written. Then notice the words in Jeremiah—"Elnatan the son of Achbor and *certain men* with him," in association with the statement of the letter—"he (*i.e.*, Elnatan) ordered to bring Hodaviah and his men from here." It seems obvious that "the certain men" were "Hodaviah and his men."

But where was "here"? From what place were these Lachish Letters written? Professor Torczyner thinks the place was near Kirjath-jearim, the home of Uriah, the son of Shemaiah. And that Hodaviah and his men were taken to Egypt with Elnatan in order to identify Uriah. Now there is other evidence in these letters which links them with Uriah and with Kirjath Jearim. It is contained in Letter IV. As this is one of the most important letters in the group I propose to quote it. It reads as follows:—

1. "May Jahweh let hear my lord even now
2. "tidings of good. According to whatever my lord has sent (written)
3. thus hath thy slave done. I have written on the page according to what-
4. "ever my lord has sent me. And when my lord has sent

5. "about the sleeping house, there is nobo-
6. -dy. And Semachiah him has taken Shemaiah and
7. "Brought him up to the city, and thy slave, my lord,
8. "shall write thither (asking) where he is ;
9. "because if in his turning he has inspected
10. "he would know, that for the signal stations of Lachish  
we
11. "are watching, according to all the signs which my
12. "lord gives, because we do not see (the signals of) Aze-
13. "kah."

Here occur two personal names—Shemaiah and Semachiah, the first the actual name of Uriah's father. Semachiah's name occurs again in Letters XI and XIII. And it is associated in the Old Testament both with Shemaiah, and with Kirjath Jearim.

The names of Shemaiah and his son Semachiah occur in the lineage of Obed-Edom, the Gittite, who had charge of the Ark before David brought it to Jerusalem from Kirjath Jearim (2 Sam. vi, 10, 12). The lineage is set forth in 1 Chron. xxvi, 4 and 7. The incident which led to the Ark being taken to the house of Obed-Edom, occurred at a steep ascent—the threshing floor of Nacon or Chidon (2 Sam. vi, 6 and 1 Chron. xiii, 9) near Kirjath Jearim. And it would seem from the context that the house of Obed-Edom and his descendants was situated in the vicinity.

The Lachish Letter that has just been quoted refers to the fact that Hoshaiiah and his men were watching the signal stations at Lachish and Azekah. They must have done so from some commanding height such as this threshing floor near Kirjath Jearim. So these two names, Shemaiah and Semachiah, strengthen the identification of the prophet with Uriah, and the identity of the place from which they were written as a height near Kirjath Jearim. The concluding lines of the Letter just quoted establishes the identity of Tel Duweir as Lachish.

It is interesting to speculate whether the original leakage of news of which Jaush complained had to do with the king's threat to kill Uriah and his flight to Egypt. The whole correspondence suggests that Hoshaiiah sympathised with Uriah, and that even the governor of Lachish endeavoured to save the prophet, so far as his official position allowed him to do so. Many interesting points arise in connection with these letters, but considerations of space only allow reference to one other. The letters were found between the layers of two

burnings of the city, about ten years apart. So it has become evident that Lachish was twice destroyed by Nebuchadnezzar, once in the reign of Jehoiakim, and once in the reign of Zedekiah. The natural assumption would be that the letters were written in that interval, and that has been adopted by those who identify the prophet with Jeremiah. Now the letters may cover a considerable period of time, but it seems impossible to assign the incident of Uriah the prophet to any other king than Jehoiakim. How, then, did these letters come to be in a room of the gate tower of Zedekiah's reign? In Old Testament days the gate of the city was the place of judgment, and it would seem as though this dossier of Hoshaiiah was brought there for his trial in the reign of Zedekiah. There is now less reason to suppose it had always been kept there.

After Mr. Starkey's murder the Lachish Expedition most courageously continued their excavations until the end of the season. Their pluck was rewarded by the discovery of several more specimens of the Phœnician Hebrew script inside the city. One fragment linked up with the Lachish Letters. Another, broken from a jar, which actually stood alongside it, began with the words "in the ninth year." It was in the ninth year of Zedekiah's reign that Jerusalem was destroyed. And lastly on the steps of the palace of Lachish some schoolboy had scribbled the first five letters of the Phœnician Hebrew alphabet. It is becoming evident that the dossier of Hoshaiiah is not the only writing to be found in Lachish, and that the practice of writing in ink on pieces of pottery was not confined to his messages. It is therefore reasonable to assume that the correspondence from Hoshaiiah may either be dated after the first siege before the death of Jehoiakim, or it may have been in the city's archives during the first siege, and brought to the gate tower, when charges were levied against that officer before the second destruction.

To sum up—the two alphabetical scripts found at Lachish, the Sinai Hebrew and the Phœnician Hebrew, make it manifest that the Israelites, after they left Egypt, always possessed facilities for literary expression superior to those of the other civilised races of antiquity. It has therefore become ridiculous for critics any longer to affirm that the contents of the earlier books of the Old Testament were handed down for many centuries by oral tradition; and only committed to writing immediately before, or during, the Babylonian captivity.

The indications point to the fact that before the great age of Greek literature, there was a great age of Hebrew literary activity. Again the Ras Shamra tablets; the Semitic legislation of Hammurabi; the Egyptian moral code before the days of Moses; the traces of Midianite worship found at Serabit in Sinai; and the recent discoveries at Nuzi in North Mesopotamia, together demonstrate that the background of Mosaic legislation fully fits the time of Moses. So it has also become absurd to date Mosaic legislation to any other period in history than to the period in which the Bible represents it to have been instituted.

A recent review of *The Bible Comes Alive* by a prominent religious journal, represented me as claiming to "Overwhelm the principles of historical criticism." I have made no such claim. The principles may even be sound; those who used them broke down in the application of them. The critics of sixty years ago assumed that Man had attained a plane of knowledge where he could apply such principles of criticism to the Bible with assured results. In common with the leading scientists of their generation, the critics entirely overestimated their knowledge. They thought they knew about all there was to be known!! The dazzling discoveries made in all branches of Science in our time now demonstrate the utter absurdity of that idea. No wonder the archæological evidence that has recently come to light is having such a devastating effect upon assured critical conclusions emanating from those who took small account of ancient civilisations, and knew nothing of the alphabetical scripts used by the Hebrews from the days of Moses, now brought to light in the ruins of Lachish.

#### DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN (General H. BIDDULPH) said: I am sure that I am expressing the feelings of all present, when I say how indebted we are to Sir C. Marston for a lecture which is not only most interesting but most valuable; and in view of his share of collaboration in recent excavation in Palestine, we are indebted to him in a two-fold measure. The old proverb says that a pound of practice is worth a ton of theory, and in the same way a pound of archæological results is worth a ton of speculative criticism. In recent years archæology has been yielding the most important results, not only in places like Jericho, Samaria, etc., in Palestine, but in Egypt and at Ras Shamra, on the mainland opposite Cyprus. Only within

the last few weeks has the tomb of Shishak been discovered, the Pharaoh who plundered Jerusalem and the Temple in the reign of Rehoboam, and you can now look at the gold mask of his mummy case. The discoveries at Lachish are of great importance, and we shall await with interest future developments and evidence furnished by further excavations. Archæological discoveries, while they support the Bible, sometimes compel us to revise our mental atmosphere of the periods in question. We are apt to surround those ancient periods with the mental atmosphere of the age in which we ourselves live, and not with that which prevailed at the time.

Two points only in this lecture will I refer to briefly. (1) The script in which Moses compiled the Pentateuch—was it Sinai-Hebrew script or cuneiform? It is a most interesting subject. Some experts like the late Professor Naville think that it was cuneiform, and would refer to the Tel Amarna tablets; that eminent Assyriologist, the late Colonel Conder, thought the same, basing his argument on variants in proper names in the Pentateuch, due, in his opinion, to alternative transcription from cuneiform, a very strong argument; it is to be found in his book *The First Bible*, published by Blackwood in 1902.\* (2) The second point is the connection of the Lachish correspondence with the incident concerning the prophet Uriah, related in the book of Jeremiah. The date, the place, and above all the names, afford strong presumptive evidence to this effect, and I repeat that we shall await with interest any further discoveries. It only remains for me to propose a very hearty vote of thanks to Sir C. Marston and to throw open the meeting to discussion.

Mr. WILLIAM C. EDWARDS said :—Having twice had the privilege of visiting the Holy Land, and seeing with mine own eyes some of the extensive and expensive excavations which have been made possible through the generosity of Sir Charles Marston, I am glad to have this opportunity of publicly thanking him in the name of many fellow believers for the great services which he has rendered to the cause of truth and for the support of those of us who have

---

\* Isaiah viii, 1, shows us that two scripts were in use, which one may term demotic and hieratic respectively.

long been opposing the enemy who, under the guise of "modern thought" has been attacking the Holy Scripture.

Sir Charles Marston said to the sceptics : "I believe the Bible, you do not ; let the spade decide." With God's blessing it has been done and we thank God and you, his servant, Sir Charles, for your generous gifts which have made it possible to win this victory. Years ago hyper-critics decided "as an assured result" that Homer's Troy and all he wrote were mythologies, but the spade of Dr. Schliemann exhumed the buried city of Troy and buried for a time the critics in the excavations. But the critical mania is a brain and heart disease, and seems, humanly speaking incurable.

In the inspiring paper to which we have just listened you have quoted from the 12th Chapter Josephus' Antiquities. May I beg all to re-read that delightful chapter ?

The King Ptolemy Philadelphus, of Egypt, had the ambition to form a great library which should contain all the books to be found in the habitable world. One day he asked his librarian, Demetrius : "How many ten thousands of books have you ?" The librarian replied : "Twenty times ten thousand and soon it will be fifty times ten thousand." And he added : "I am informed that there are many books of law amongst the Jews worthy of the king's library—they are written in a character and dialect of their own and characters which seem to be like the Syrian and that its sound is like them also." The king was greatly interested and this conversation led to the freeing of thousands of Jews then in slavery and his sending an embassy to Jerusalem with gifts, such as a table, a cistern and thirty vials, all of gold, for the express purpose of obtaining the best copies of God's law and all the inspired writings. The high priest chose from each tribe six men of learning who came with the sacred writings to Egypt. Now, I remember, when in Nablus, being shown the ancient Samaritan copy of the Pentateuch ; I saw the wrapping [folding case] opened, exhibiting the ancient rolls just as described by Josephus. Here are his own words : "When they had taken off the covers wherein they were wrapt they showed him the membranes—so the king stood admiring the thinness of those membranes and the exactness of the junctures—exactly my own experience in the Samaritan Synagogue. They had a dinner and Josephus gives us the words of the Grace, the priest

praying that all prosperity might attend the king and those that were his subjects." I suppose most of us have seen the Lachish letters. It has always been a subject of enquiry as to *why* any messages were written upon shards of pottery. Here is a theory of my own: You remember the white stone to the church of Pergamos (Rev. ii, 17). Some think that it referred to the *tessera hospitalis* and that this was divided, and the two parts had to fit like the indentures of the deeds of ancient times or the Charte Partie. The Hebrew idiom for making a covenant seemed to have been "to cut a covenant." Well, if some vessels were broken by a person and parts were given to his friend upon which to write, then, *when* a message came if the part sent fitted a part kept, then it was almost certain that the message was genuine—and not a ruse, deception or forgery. We may recall the forgeries to which the Apostle Paul seems to refer (2 Thess. ii, 2); such forgeries were not uncommon in ancient times.

Dr. HART-DAVIES said: We are all agreed that a great debt of gratitude is due to Sir Charles Marston for the pains he has taken, and the very considerable amount of money he has expended, in his archæological researches, which have so marvellously confirmed the historic integrity of the Old Testament Scriptures. This latest discovery at Tel Duweir, revealing as it does the advanced literary ability of the Hebrews not long after the date of the Exodus, is only one of an immense number that could be cited to demonstrate how precarious was the Higher Criticism of the nineteenth century. Sir Charles has referred to the admission that "the critics now all treat the Old Testament with respect." I myself can vouch for a tremendous change of attitude, evidenced by what I experienced in a Bible lecturing tour in Australia in 1935, and a more recent tour in Australia and New Zealand in 1938. But it must not be forgotten that the majority of the clergy and the laity in the various denominations of the Christian Church are still profoundly ignorant of the vast implication of recent archæological discovery. It is patent that the critical edifice associated with the name of Wellhausen has crumbled to the dust. As Professor Sayce once said, "subjective fantasies must give way to the facts of science."

In the closing paragraph of Sir Charles's paper he refers to the

charge made against him that he is claiming "to overwhelm the principles of historical criticism." But can anyone truly say that the theories and suppositions and speculations which constitute most of the make-up of the Higher Criticism associated with the names of Wellhausen and Cheyne and Robertson Smith, can be accurately described as sound principles? Archæology has dug up the facts of history; and in the clear light of those facts it is now seen that these so-called proofs have been as precarious in their nature as they have proved to be pernicious in their results—in a decreasing respect for the Holy Bible as a divine revelation, and a consequent weakening of the moral and spiritual fibre of the nation. For "where there is no vision the people perish."