

sun on their right, and a part of the time on their left. But that is just the statement that modern science regards as proof of the truthfulness of the story. The adherents of the Higher Criticism claim the monopoly of criticism, and will not allow any methods but theirs. But the criticism they mean is speculative and visionary, and is based on fancies and presuppositions and not on facts. The discovery of the famous Tel-el-Amarna tablets was greeted at first by literary criticism with its customary scepticism. They were called forgeries, but that position is no longer tenable. Take, as an example, the discoveries of Mr. Pinches in a cuneiform text of the names of Chedorlaomer and his allies, which are recorded in Gen. 15. "Kudur-Laghamar" is called King of Elam, and we are told that he oppressed Babylonia and even attempted to destroy the temple of Bel in Babylon, and all through the text the names and the political situation are the same as in the Genesis narrative. Literary criticism had decided that the account in Genesis was mythical and unhistorical, that the names were etymological fictions, and that the idea of a Babylonian expedition to Palestine in the age of Abram was suggested by the campaigns of the later Assyrian monarchs. Consequently it was necessary to deny the archæological facts. Mr. Pinches and his brother Assyriologists were told by the literary critics, who could not decipher a single cuneiform character themselves, that their readings were mistaken, and that Kudur-Laghamar, Tidal, Amraphel and