

But 'the argument from silence' is essentially unscientific. To make our own ignorance the measure of historical credibility is to adopt the subjective method in an extreme form. If there is one fact which above all others physical science is constantly impressing upon us, it is how little we know of the material universe wherein we live; and the same lesson is taught by archaeology in regard to the history of the past. Time after time the most positive assertions of a sceptical criticism have been disproved by archaeological discovery, events and personages that were confidently pronounced to be mythical have been shown to be historical, and the older writers have turned out to have been better acquainted with what they were describing than the modern critic who has flouted them.

As we shall see, the campaign of Chedor-laomer and his allies has proved to be no myth or fiction, but sober fact; the very names of the kings who took part in it have been recovered, and we now know that the political situation presupposed by the narrative corresponds exactly with the actual requirements of history. It was the critic who was mistaken, and not the writer in Genesis.