

denied all kinds of theories about-- for instance there's --- Tel-el-hesse was considered by the original excavators, who hadn't excavated very far into it, as Lachish. Many a book had a picture of the Tel and said underneath it "Excavating Ancient Lachish." He soon became convinced it was not Lachish. Lachish was a much bigger hill a little distance away called Tel-e'd-d'wer. Eventually Tel-ed-d'wer was excavated and the Lachish letters were discovered there. The proof that it was Lachish.

He altered a great many theories people had had. He was a rare scholar in that when he would get a theory he would immediately publish it. Then other people could criticize it. If he found he was wrong he would immediately publish a retraction and say what he thought it was. So he said you can't take a quotation from Albright as a conclusion on anything unless you know when it came out. Some men will spend their whole life working on a thing and then they will publish their great, final, last word on it eventually and many of them don't live long enough to do that. But he gave me a big pile of his reprints once and he said, That's completely disproved now. This one, he said, I had some interesting ideas but on further consideration they are not right! So on. But in doing it there was an interchange of thought. He was a real thinker. My feeling is that we go to Palestinian archaeology, we go to Egyptian or Babylonian with the Biblical background in mind, and we're interested in seeing what fits with it. What doesn't fit we try to explain, or we put on the shelf as a problem for further explanation. I think he went with Paul Haupt's reconstruction in mind, and when he would find something that seemed to fit Paul Haupt's attitude, well that's what you'd expect. Nothing exciting, nothing to write a big article about. Just what you'd expect. But when he would find something that would contradict Haupt's attitude, I think, my feeling has always