JOURNAL OF

THE TRANSACTIONS

OF

The Victoria Institute

OR

Philosophical Society of Great Britain

VOL. LXXVII

1945

LONDON:

PUBLISHED BY
THE INSTITUTE, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, WESTMINSTER, S.W.

860TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD AT THE NATIONAL CLUB, 12, QUEEN ANNE'S GATE, LONDON, S.W.1., AT 6 P.M. ON MAY 14TH, 1945.

SIR FREDERIC KENYON, G.B.E., K.C.B., D.LITT., LL.D., IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the previous Meeting were read, confirmed and signed.

The CHAIRMAN then called upon Air Commodore P. J. Wiseman, C.B.E., R.A.F., to read his paper entitled "Archæology and Literary Criticism of the Bible."

The Meeting was later thrown open to discussion in which the Rev. A. W. Payne, Dr. Hart-Davies, M.A., D.D., and Mr. Tresise took part.

ARCHÆOLOGICAL AND LITERARY CRITICISM OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

By AIR COMMODORE P. J. WISEMAN, C.B.E., R.A.F.

THE importance of literary and archæological criticism of the Bible is mainly derived from the importance of the Bible itself. The estimate men have of the Bible must ultimately depend upon their opinion as to its trustworthiness. It cannot, therefore, be reasonably asserted that no matter what may be the accepted verdict regarding its integrity, its value to men can remain unaffected. It is generally conceded that, in the moral and spiritual sphere, the Bible has been—and in some quarters still is—the greatest formative influence we possess. Substantially it is also agreed that the primary reason why the Scriptures have had this supremacy is because they have been regarded as being, in some way or other, an authoritative revelation from God to man.

During the last century the trustworthiness of this "revelation" and "authority" has been the subject of considerable detailed investigation, and this should be welcomed, provided it is carried out in a truly scientific spirit by those having the spiritual and mental qualifications for the task.

There can be no question that the conclusions arrived at by criticism are largely dependent upon the proper scientific use of the instrument. Literary criticism can scarcely be called an exact science; its pre-suppositions are not necessarily self-evident truths, as for instance those that form the basis of

mathematics. Pre-suppositions are inevitable in all sciences, but in the case of Literary or Higher criticism there is probably a greater danger of these pre-suppositions being moulded by personal assumptions and tendencies of thought than in almost any other branch of science. But prejudiced criticism cannot be met by the rejection of all investigation; it can only be countered by better and more just criticism.

The terms Literary, Higher, and Archæological, criticism, including even the word criticism, have been frequently used in an ambiguous and confusing manner. By criticism we mean judging and defining the qualities of a writing. By *Higher* criticism, the examination of writings as a whole, the enquiry into the origin, character, authenticity, and authorship of documents; the endeavour to answer such legitimate questions as: When was the record written? By whom? To and for whom? Where written? In what manner? For what purpose? By *Lower* Criticism we mean the investigation into the integrity of parts or passages; that is, the determination of the correct text. *Literary* Criticism broadly includes both Higher and Lower Criticism. Higher Criticism is generally confined to an examination of the *internal* evidences, including the historical notes available in the Old Testament, while to archæological criticism is assigned the investigation of the *external* evidences. It is, however, more than questionable whether the results often produced by an examination of the internal, to the exclusion of external or archæological evidences, can possibly be sound. The reason why in the case of the earlier books of the Old Testament, Higher Criticism was confined to internal evidences will be readily understood when it is remembered that external or archæological evidences scarcely existed one hundred years ago.

Thousands of books have been written about the results produced by Higher Criticism, and in many of these an attempt is made to assess the revised value which may be placed upon the Bible, consequent on this criticism. But only a few of these writers have been able to introduce new questions of principle; most have contented themselves merely with the process of repeating the hypotheses produced a century ago by such leaders as Hupfeld, Kuenen, Graf, and later Wellhausen. Unfortunately, agnostic elements dominated the mental attitude of these leaders, and an etiological outlook seems to have controlled their view of the Scriptures. It is therefore not at all surprising that in some quarters there was a tendency to confuse the *instrument*

with the *results* which were produced by its use, and to protest not only against the conjectural results which seemed so disastrous, but also against the name and legitimate use of this form of critical inquiry.

Th value of Higher Criticism must be very limited, unless the critic has an adequate knowledge of the literary methods and activities of the age in which he is dealing. This means that he should be competent, not only in literary, but in archæological criticism. It is, however, indisputable that archæological or external criticism was not possible when the main conclusions of the sceptical theories were originated, because the material for it simply did not exist. The essential qualification for competent criticism being inexistent, judgment had to depend upon internal evidences only. It should be borne in mind that the main contentions of the agnostic section of the Higher Critical school (which drastically re-distributed the dates and order of the Old Testament writings) were announced while these critics were in almost complete ignorance of any contemporaneous literature ; in early days some were even sceptical that any could have existed. Archæological research has since provided us with a considerable literature reaching back to Patriarchal times.

For this reason, I submit that without a knowledge of the background provided by archæology, the Higher Critical conclusions of a century ago may be far from scientific or accurate. Were these theories premature ? Can they still be maintained ? In order to avoid generalities, I wish to illustrate the effect of the use of the twin methods of literary and archæological criticism from the life of one who was an expert in both, and who wielded a great influence, Dr. Sayce, late Professor of Assyriology at Oxford, the centenary of whose birth takes place this year. I propose to do this not from private conversations, but from his own written statements, especially in view of a recently published allegation that, in a private conversation, he made statements which involved the abandonment of the position he had maintained with growing strength up to the latest of his many published books. I was in Iraq when he visited it just before he died, and can say that there is no warrant whatever for an alleged change of view on the questions at issue, and this defence is due to a great reputation.

To his generation Sayce was a perplexing problem, and even now the main trend of his work is not as clearly understood as it

should be. Few would challenge his competence, even his supremacy, in his own field of criticism. He was one of the ablest Hebrew scholars of his time : at the age of 29 he was a member of the Old Testament Revision Company, and at 31, Deputy Professor of Comparative Philology at Oxford. His life covered the growth and propagation of the Continental critical theories.

Excavation in Mesopotamia began two years before he was born. Botta had then unearthed an Assyrian palace ; the year of Sayce's birth, Layard commenced his excavations at Nineveh. But at this time excavators were scarcely concerned with the discovery of *written* documents ; they were engaged in a search for the huge, human-headed bulls with wings, and other great monuments. The main reason for the apathy in regard to written records was the inability of scholars at this time to decipher with certainty the curious wedge-shaped inscriptions found on tablets and monuments.

The bent of Sayce's mind was revealed quite early in his life ; the Assyrian discoveries, which had just then commenced, captured his imagination. During his school-days he acquired a knowledge of the cuneiform script. His remarkable memory enabled him to retain the complexities of the syllabary. I have a letter written by him later in his life referring to the difficulties usually experienced by most men in memorising the Sumerian, Babylonian and Assyrian forms of the cuneiform syllabary, in which he says : " What I remember is the mental photograph of a printed page which consists of cuneiform characters, with their phonetic and ideograph equivalents." This ability served him well in all his reading. When he was 27 he published his *Comparative Grammar of the Assyrian Language* ; moreover, he wrote the first grammatical sketch of the Sumerian language ever attempted, based on a seal inscription from Ur of the Chaldees.

During this same period, Higher Criticism also cast its spell on him Before he entered Queen's College, Oxford, in 1865, the " German theories," as he called them, had become widely known. From the beginning he regarded himself, and later came to be regarded, as a champion of these views as to the method by which the Old Testament was compiled. Hupfeld had published his dissection of Genesis into fragments,* and Sayce was attracted by it. Colenso had issued his first volume in criticism

* *Die Quellen der Genesis.*

of the Pentateuch,* and it created a considerable and angry controversy. In Sayce's case it fell on fertile soil, and he writes: "I began to look forward to the day when I could champion his cause."† This he did a few years later, when "he saw his sixth and last volume through the press."‡

The Professorship of Hebrew at Oxford had been held by the celebrated Dr. Pusey for 54 years. Sayce was now in middle life, aged 37, and he wrote "For some years past he (Pusey) had assumed that I should be his successor, and had more than once told me so."§ Moreover, many influential people sought to secure the appointment for him, among them Liddon, who showed him the letter from Gladstone, the Prime Minister, in reply, which read: "I have a great respect for Mr. Sayce's talents and learning, but under no circumstances could I give him an ecclesiastical appointment."‖ Sayce explains the reason for the Prime Minister's antipathy: "I was now regarded as one of the leaders of the 'German' critical theology at Oxford, and knew that he (Gladstone) considered me to be 'unsafe.'" ¶

The man who was considered unsuitable because he was a leader of the Continental school of critical theology, gradually found that his archæological researches made him more and more orthodox, until he became known as an outstanding champion of the conservative school, and an aggressive critic of the prevailing destructive critical attitude towards the Old Testament. Writing of this episode,** he says: "Little did either Gladstone or myself then foresee that the time would come when Driver (who was given the appointment) would be the protagonist of 'German' higher criticism, and I should be regarded as the champion of orthodoxy."

Probably the greatest single event which altered his attitude to the Old Testament was the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets. The significance of this find was revealed by him in a paper read before the Victoria Institute in 1889, though it is not generally realised how great was his part in it. An old peasant foraging among the refuse heaps at Tel el-Amarna, on

* The Pentateuch and Book of Joshua critically examined.
† *Reminiscences*, Sayce, p. 22 (cited by kind permission of Messrs. Macmillan).
‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 32.
§ *Op. cit.*, p. 213.
‖ *Op. cit.*, p. 34.
¶ *Op. cit.*, p. 213.
** *Op. cit.*, p. 214.

the Nile, came across some tablets; but even the dealers in Egyptian antiquities were unaware that they had any value, because they were offered so cheaply. My own experience is that when a peasant is prepared to sell cheaply, they are probably genuine; when the price was high they generally proved to be forgeries. Let Sayce tell his own story: "The only winter which I did not spend on the Nile was the one when the famous cuneiform tablets were found by the fellahin at Tel el-Amarna. . . . the whole collection would have passed into my possession intact; as it was, there was no one in Egypt who was acquainted with cuneiform, and the antika dealers regarded the tablets as so many worthless bricks. Most of them were thrown into sacks and carried on donkey-back to Ekhmin. There M. Frenay, who acted as an agent of the Louvre, bought a few, thinking, as he told me, that they might turn out to be of interest, and one of these was sent to the Louvre and shown to Oppert, the Professor of Assyriology. Oppert was old and blind, and pronounced it to be a forgery. The result was that no more were purchased by Frenay; the tablets were again carried on donkey-back along the banks of the Nile to Luxor. By that time more than a third of them had been destroyed or mutilated, to the incalculable loss of science and history. Next to the historical books of the Old Testament, the Tel el-Amarna tablets have proved to be the most valuable record which the ancient civilised world of the East has bequeathed to us. What we now have is an index of what we should have possessed had the collection been preserved uninjured and intact."*

When he reached Egypt in the following year he was told about these tablets. A few had been offered to the Cairo Museum, and Grebaut, the Director of Antiquities, asked Sayce's opinion about them. Those in the possession of the French School of Archæology were brought to him, and he says: "These I copied, and wrote at once to Grebaut, telling him that there could be no question about their genuineness, and that he should, if possible, secure every one that had been discovered. I was unable to assign a date to the tablets, as those I had copied contained no indication of their age, and the form of the script was new, and so could not be compared with anything previously known; in a letter to the *Academy*, however, I ventured to suggest the age of Nebuchadrezzar, which soon turned out to be

* *Op. cit.*, p. 251.

some eight hundred years too late. But at that time we were under the spell of the "Higher Critics," who were confident that there could have been no Semitic literature before the epoch of King David."*

The event proved to be the turning-point in Sayce's life. He wrote: "The discovery of the Tel el-Amarna correspondence suddenly threw a new light on the whole subject and revolutionised my view of it. It was henceforth plain that the assumption of the late date of the literary use of writing was false and that already in the Mosaic age education was widespread and literary works were being produced and an active epistolary correspondence carried on to an even greater extent than in the Middle Ages. The excavations of Schliemann and his followers had shown us that Homeric tradition was founded upon historical fact; the sceptical criticism which had divided the Homeric poems among a variety of unknown authors was already discredited; it was now the turn of the East. After 1888 it was no longer possible, except for the ignorant, to maintain that literary works such as we find in the Old Testament could not have existed in the Mosaic era. The main support of the so-called literary analysis and criticism had disappeared. Henceforward the character and credibility of a Hebrew document must be settled, not by the assumptions and subjective fantasies or ignorance of the critic, but by archæological research."† We should notice that these statements were made not in the clash of a contemporaneous discussion, but were written down in the cold light of later years when reviewing his life's work.

It will now be seen how far he had moved from the position he had taken up in his earlier years. His explanation is‡: "I myself had now come to be regarded as a representative of the so-called 'Orthodox' party and a defender of Holy Writ. It was in vain that I protested against being classed as a theologian, and explained that I dealt with the Old Testament simply as an archæologist. Just as the archæological discoveries in the Mediterranean had given a death-blow to the 'critical' theories about Homer and the early traditions of Greece, so similar discoveries were now giving the same death-blow to the theories about the Old Testament and its contents which had been imported from Germany. Subjective fancies must make way

* *Op. cit.*, p. 258.
† *Op. cit.*, p. 272.
‡ *Op. cit.*, p. 303.

for the solid facts of science which were at last being recovered. One after another the foundations upon which such theories had been built had been shown to be baseless; first came the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets and its revelation of the use of writing in the pre-Mosaic age; then that of the legal code of Khammurabi, the contemporary of Abraham; and finally that of the Aramaic papyri of Elephantinê. With hardly an exception, the archæological discoveries of the last thirty-five years in the Nearer East have been dead against the conclusions of the self-appointed critic, and on the side of the ancient tradition."

In 1880 some boys who were playing in a tunnel adjacent to the Pool of Siloam, near Jerusalem, accidentally discovered some writing on the roof. Its existence became known to Dr. Schick in Jerusalem, but he was not a Semitic scholar, and consequently was not aware of its precise value. Sayce happened to be in Jerusalem in 1881 and, on being told of it, immediately made his way to the Pool, and by the light of a candle, while he was sitting in mud and water, made a copy which, on being translated by him, was found to be the oldest example of Hebrew writing discovered; so this famous inscription became known to the world through him. It records how the rock beneath Zion was tunnelled simultaneously from the two ends in order to bring the waters from the spring outside the city within the walls; that the workmen from opposite ends met "pick to pick." This is the work referred to in 2 Chron. xxxii, 30, carried out in the reign of Hezekiah.

When in 1891 a Chair of Assyriology was created at Oxford, he accepted it, and for the 33 years he occupied it he was known as an unrelenting opponent of the Higher Critical conjectures.

There is much in the Old Testament about the Hittites; but, until excavations commenced, nothing was known about them other than that stated in the Bible. Dictionaries had not a single historical extra-Biblical reference. Yet in the account of the Syrian invasion of Israel in 2 Kings vii, 6, we read of the Syrians saying: "Lo the King of Israel hath hired against us the Kings of the Hittites and the Kings of the Egyptians have come upon us." One distinguished scholar had written: "its unhistorical tone is too manifest to allow of our easy belief in it." "No Hittite King can have compared in power with the King of Judah, the real and near ally who is not named at all . . . nor is

there a single mark of acquaintance with the contemporaneous history."

It was Professor Sayce who was the first to reveal their historical character, and to show how great a power they were. In the reign of Rameses I they had struggled with the Egyptians, then the supreme power in Western Asia, and, at the time referred to, were a power somewhat similar to the divided kingdom of Egypt, and a greater military power than Judah.

In his *Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments*, he took a middle position. It commences with the statement: "I am well aware that the pages which follow will satisfy neither 'Higher Critics' nor their extreme opponents, and that every effort will be made to dispute or minimise the archæological evidence which they contain." In his next publication, issued in 1894, we find him as the first contributor in a series of essays called *Lex Mosaica*. Without exception, all the other essays were written by leading scholars who were unquestionably opposed to the prevailing higher critical attitude. He begins his contribution, entitled *The Archæological Witness to the Literary Activity of the Mosaic Age*,* with: "The end of the nineteenth century is witnessing the ebb of a wave of historical scepticism which began more than a century ago. It has spared nothing, sacred or otherwise, and in its progress has transformed the history of the past into a nebulous mist. But the ebb had already set in before its tendencies and results had made themselves felt beyond a limited circle of scholars, and before its spirit and principles had influenced popular thought. Hence it is that we can speak of its ebb at the very time when the negations of the so-called 'higher criticism' are the most widespread and influential, and the assertions of its adherents are the most positive and arrogant."

In 1904 he published his *Monumental Facts and Higher Critical Fancies*. Its very title shows how far he had travelled away from his old attitude of "champion of German critical theology."

I have already referred to the pre-suppositions which often prejudice a just investigation of the Bible. We have seen how Sayce gradually turned away from the sceptical approach; but it is very necessary to emphasise that while in his case there is abundant evidence of an early prejudice in favour of the sceptical type of criticism, there appears never to have been any mere prejudice

* *Lex Mosaica*, p. 3.

which determined his attack on the Higher Criticism, for he remained what is known as a "Broad Churchman" to the end of his day. This is important, because it is often asserted that only those who take a Fundamentalist point of view oppose the critical theories. In his case the reasons for his opposition to the Higher Criticism were based not on any pre-conceived acceptance of the Bible, but on the impossibility of reconciling the Higher Critical conjectures with the facts as revealed by archæological research.

Not long before he died he published his *Reminiscences*. In the closing pages reviewing his life's work he says: "My acceptance of the results of Schliemann's discoveries and my attitude towards the so-called Higher Criticism of the Old Testament after the discovery of the Tel el-Amarna tablets brought upon me showers of controversy and abuse. The excavation of Troy and Mykenae and the discovery of the tablets were sufficient proof to me that merely subjective criticism of ancient literary documents was a worthless pastime. But it has taken a quarter of a century to convince the literary world in general of the truth of this."*

Has the literary world in general yet been convinced? There can be little doubt that when Sayce wrote in 1923, scholars had at least felt the insecurity of the old critical arguments; the basis of the sceptical criticism of the Old Testament had been undermined to such an extent by archæology that the rationalising conjectures could no longer be offered with conviction as reasonable and up-to-date criticism.

Unfortunately, it so happened that just when scholars felt most doubtful about the old critical conjectures, the general public began to believe the theories and to regard the Bible as largely unhistorical.

The position to-day is therefore very unsatisfactory, and a state of stagnation appears to have set in, for though the old sceptical ideas can no longer be maintained, there seems to be little or no attempt made to disavow or renounce them, and so clear the ground for better and less fettered criticism. The view which appears to prevail in some quarters is that the only feasible course to be taken in the dilemma is a middle one, involving a partial acceptance of the sceptical theories and a partial belief in the records as a revelation from God. However,

* *Reminiscences*, p. 474.

people are confused and perplexed when asked to believe that God revealed Himself in a corrupt way or by means of myth and legend.

It took fifty years for the destructive theories to permeate to the minds of the people of this country; how long will the reconstruction take? A widespread belief in the untrustworthiness of the Bible has been sown, and though in respect of scholarship the sceptical theories are all but dead, the results in the minds of the people are living and active. The harvest is being reaped for the seed of distrust sown. Is it not time that the public should be informed that the so-called results are neither assured nor modern, but doubtful, often disproved and largely obsolete?

In this connection under the new Education Act the Bible is to be taught in schools. Will teachers, using the now out-of-date text-books, tell children that some person or persons unknown copied parts of the Babylonian laws of Hammurabi and by a process of editing compiled the ten commandments? Will the teacher further say that the unknown person or persons falsely used the name of Moses and the background of God's revelation to him on Mount Sinai in order to secure the acceptance of the decalogue as authoritative?

The value of the Bible in the estimate of the present generation will depend upon how it is taught to regard it. Much remains to be done in clearing the ground of the debris of the century-old, obsolete and destructive criticism, and of ensuring a more discerning, scientific and constructive investigation.

Discussion.

Dr. Hart Davies warmly thanked Air Commodore Wiseman for his valuable paper and expressed the wish that it could be published and widely circulated in pamphlet form, because of the appalling ignorance both among the clergy and the laity of the remarkable results of recent archæological discovery and the undermining effect which they are bound to have upon what used to be called "the assured results of the Higher Criticism."

In reference to the precarious nature of a Criticism which is mainly based upon investigation of the content of literary documents to discover the source of authorship, he told the following illuminating story. When in 1935 the Victoria Institute awarded

him the Gunning Prize for the essay entitled " Biblical History in the Light of Archæological Discovery since A.D. 1900," the late Dr. Thirtle, a former editor of " The Christian," a sound Hebrew scholar, with a rich editorial experience, came to congratulate him upon his success. During the conversation which ensued, Dr. Thirtle, who had been one of the three judges appointed by the Institute to adjudicate, told him that after he had read his essay, he was convinced that he had recognised the author in the person of the late Dr. McIntyre, the then Principal of the Glasgow Bible Training Institute, whom he had known for many years and with whose style of composition he was familiar ! A glaring example of the pitfall which awaits the critic who depends upon internal evidence and ignores the precise historical data such as archæological discovery has so richly supplied concerning so many records in the early books of the Bible.

The CHAIRMAN said : On behalf of the Institute I should like to thank Air Commodore Wiseman for his paper, which fully recognises the principle that scientific criticism must not be rejected in the study of the Bible. I should endorse most fully his observation that " prejudiced " (I should say rather " hostile ") " criticism cannot be met by the rejection of all investigation ; it can only be countered by better and more just criticism." I welcome also his vindication of a scholar who, though capable of inaccuracies and rash assumptions, nevertheless was nearly, and even forward, to accept the results of archæological discovery, even when they ran counter to his own previous beliefs. Hostile criticism in the 19th century did much to shake men's belief in the Bible, by showing that statements in it were irreconcileable with the evidence of national science, and in some cases with modern standards of morality. What it really shook was the conception of the Bible, prevalent since the Reformation, which regarded the Bible as a revelation given once for all, and equally valid in all its parts and to all ages. Modern criticism has substituted for this the conception of a progressive revelation, and of a record of God's method of leading His chosen people from the beliefs and practices of a primitive tribe and nation, up through the higher teaching of the Prophets and culminating in the revelation of the New Testament. In the establishment of

this conception archæology has done great service. It has proved the antiquity of writing, thus making it clear that from at least the time of Moses the historical records of the Hebrews can rest on contemporary written documents. It has proved that codes of laws fully as elaborate as the legislation embodied in the Pentateuch were current among the surrounding peoples in and before the age of Moses. It has (in the documents discovered at Ras Shamra) given us a knowledge of the Canaanite religion, and notably of the worship of Baal, which sets the history of the Israelite kingdoms in a clearer perspective. And all through, from the time of the patriarchs, it shows the Hebrews, while sharing the primitive legends and practices of their neighbours, yet being all the time led along a higher level, its best elements holding fast to the monotheistic creed of their father Abraham, and growing from the worship of their tribal Deity, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, to the conception, proclaimed by the Prophets, of the Almighty God of all the world.

But I do not want to go over again the ground so ably covered by Air Commodore Wiseman. I only wish to thank him for the instruction he has given us.

Mr. CHARLES TRESISE said: Mr. Chairman, I shall be brief, as desired. I rise merely to second most heartily the vote of thanks to Air Commodore Wiseman, and to follow up a remark made by the mover by asking if it is not possible for this Institute or some other body to make, in some way, more widely known to the general public such archæological discoveries as we have been hearing of this evening and other confirmations of the reliability of Holy Scripture records. Apparently it takes about 50 years for such knowledge to convince the teaching profession and percolate through the Board of Education; consequently our children are now being taught in our schools and from many of our pulpits the late Victorian speculations which are still humorously known as "modernism.' Something ought surely to be done to counteract this.

I was amused this evening to hear our old friend "the assured results of modern criticism" crop up once and again. Some years ago this chestnut appeared, not for the first time by many, on the front page article of one of our religious newspapers. One of my friends, who is something of a Hebrew and Greek scholar, wrote

asking if he might have a short list of these "assured results." The editor, who is a canny Scot, was not falling into that trap, however, and refused point-blank. "Sir," he wrote, "I conceive your question to be asked not with the idea of eliciting information, but of creating controversy." Now this was, of course, perfectly true, but one would have thought that if the results so often spoken of were so very assured the editor might have been glad of a little controversy on the matter to convince an enquirer.

Mr. Chairman, I have much pleasure in seconding the vote.

Rev. A. W. PAYNE, expressed his sincere thanks to the writer of the paper and heartily agreed that detailed investigation of the Bible should be carried out by those who have "the spiritual and mental qualifications for the task."

COMMUNICATION.

Sir CHARLES MARSTON wrote: I had the pleasure of knowing Professor Sayce well during the last few years of his life. So far from changing his mind about the inadequacy of the Higher Criticism, he became more emphatic against it.

It will be remembered that the only Book where he thought the Higher Criticism was valid was in the late dating of the Book of Daniel. I remember drawing his attention to the Elephantine Papyrus and its bearing upon this Criticism, and he replied—"If I had to write about the Book of Daniel again, I should put it far earlier." So even with Daniel, the Professor's view on the inadequacy of the Higher Criticism became more emphatic.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

I wish to thank Sir Frederic Kenyon and all who have commented. There appears to be little criticism and much agreement. On the main theme of the paper—the conversion of Professor Sayce from a sceptical criticism of the Bible to a scholarly criticism of the critics of the Bible—there seems to be no valid doubt. I agree with the remarks regarding the "appalling ignorance" of the results of archæological discovery, and also with those regarding the un-

intelligent repetition of that overworked phrase " the assured results of modern criticism." Not very long ago after a lecture on archæology, a Professor of Biblical Exegesis (who was then teaching these so-called " assured results ") remarked to me that he " was unaware that there was so much to be said on the other side of the subject." I could but suggest that it was the duty of one in his position to be acquainted with the archæological evidence.

There is, I think, a clearer understanding today of the increasing fulness of the revelation of God in the Bible, but at the same time not a little misunderstanding regarding it. I suggest that the growth of Biblical revelation may be likened to the growth of a baby into manhood. Although in its earlier stages a baby is deficient of many of the qualities which are ultimately necessary, and in this sense is immature and incomplete, the baby is not necessarily faulty, though it is very limited. Few can have regarded the revelation to the patriarchs as in itself complete or final. It is admittedly preparatory and needed much to supplement it, and this amplification took place in the times of the prophets, and completely and finally through the coming into the world of our Lord and Saviour. Likewise, although God's revelation of Himself in earlier times was necessarily incomplete, it was not in consequence faulty or inaccurate.

As may be seen from the admittedly ancient narrative Genesis xiv, the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob was not merely a tribal God ; in verse 22 we read that Abraham says " I have lift up my hand to *the Lord, the most high God the possessor* of heaven and earth." And it is of interest to note that the men of Sodom were wicked and sinners against *Jehovah*." When we find advanced truth such as this in the early patriarchal narratives we cannot justify a transfer of these passages to a later period in history merely in order to make them fit into a preconceived inflexible theory of development. I agree that it is not any early section of revelation that is given " once for all " but the completed revelation.