

of the modern European scholar is necessarily a house of cards.

If we are to refuse credit to the narratives of the Old Testament, it must be for some other reason than a belief that we can analyze its documents into their component elements, can fix the age and object of each, and can be sure that ancient Oriental thought must have developed in one particular fashion and in no other. There is only one kind of evidence which can be admitted for or against the history that has been handed down to us, and that is the evidence of archaeological facts. If they support it, we can safely disregard the speculations of the 'higher critic'; if their testimony is adverse, we have something more substantial to go upon than 'literary tact' or a Massoretic counting of words.

In default of facts 'criticism' has been fond of appealing, in support of its negative conclusions, to the absence of documentary evidence. The story of the campaign of the King of Elam and his allies against the Canaanitish princes, we have been told, must be pure myth or fiction, since there was no record of Babylonian expeditions into Palestine in the patriarchal age.