

Scriptures. With fuller knowledge would come a recognition of the futility of the task.

But there is yet another test to which we can subject the results of the 'critical' school. There are cases in which recent archaeological discovery has enabled us to put them to the proof. The most striking of these is the account of the Deluge contained in the Book of Genesis. Here, if anywhere, we should seem to be justified in inferring the existence of a composite narrative, in which at least two stories of the Flood have been mixed or combined together. But it so happens that a Babylonian story of the Flood, which goes back in its present form to the age of Abraham, has been preserved in the Chaldean epic of Gilgames. When we compare this story with the account in Genesis, we find that it agrees not only with the so-called Elohist version, but with the so-called Yahvistic version as well.

It thus presupposes an account of the Deluge in which the 'Elohist' and 'Yahvistic' elements were already combined together. And since it was written some centuries before the birth of Moses, there are only two ways of accounting for the fact, if the narrative in