

ments of a German professor can never have come to us from the ancient East.

In the eyes, therefore, of inductive science there is only one admissible test of the authenticity and trustworthiness of an ancient record, and that is an archaeological test. So far as the historical side of the question is concerned the philologist pure and simple is ruled out of court. It is the archaeological evidence of Egyptology or Assyriology, and not the philological evidence, which can alone be applied to the settlement of historical disputes.

This fact is often forgotten, and it is assumed that every Egyptologist or Assyriologist is equally a judge of historical questions. But there are students of Egyptian and Assyrian who have devoted themselves only to the philological side of their subject; and where archaeology is involved the opinion of such students is consequently just as valueless as that of any other philologist in other fields of research. Doubtless wherever literature or inscriptions are involved philology supplies part of the material of an archaeological fact; the question, for example, as to the existence of the name of a god Yahum or Yahweh in