

archaeological evidence showing the accuracy of statement after statement in these books. But Garstang says in the beginning of his book that the books of Joshua and Judges, he says, in them I have dealt only with the older material--with the material from J, from the J and E document.

He says I omitted from my book all consideration of P material. It is simply the J and E material from Joshua and Judges that he gives, and he gives instance after instance of the archaeological verification of the accuracy of the statements or showing how that Palestine as he has studied it in the different places there, fit right into the background of the accuracy of the stories.

Now, he says, I have not paid any attention to the P document because it is so late that naturally no historical validity is to be ascribed to it, and yet he says, I must mention a most remarkable thing that I have also observed there is archaeological evidence showing the accuracy of statements which are contained in the P document. But he does not bother to give them in his book because the P document is so late that it's pure accident you would think! that there is archaeological evidence for its validity. As a matter of fact your archaeological evidence pays no attention to whether it is P J or E.

Where we find something from archaeology that throws clear light upon a statement of the OT, the statement and the archaeological evidence fit together.

Someone said a few ~~years~~ ago there are two types of archaeologists: those to whom if you asked the question, Has something been found which contradicts the Bible and shows it to be wrong, they would answer No. And the others who would answer, Not yet! But it is a result of the higher criticism that there is this attitude of skepticism. The higher criticism of 60 yrs. ago took possession of our great universities and of our theological seminaries and the result is that the men working in archaeology the bulk of them go to it believing the Bible is a bunch of myths and legends and then when they find evidence that shows it is accurate at one point or another, they are surprised.

But that is the expectation, that it is not true, that it is a book formed by this process of bringing together these different documents expressing these ideas of people many centuries after the time of the events which are alleged to have occurred. They were taught that in the universities and they accepted it as something that is true and that scholars have proved, and consequently they go not expecting to find evidence and very often it just does not fit with their general philosophy and where something agrees with the Bible they put it in a footnote or refer to it incidentally in their talk.

Often where there is something they don't quite see how it fits together with the Biblical statements, it will be stressed as an evidence of inaccuracy. Though in most such cases a little bit of examination shows that there is no real contradiction