

January 6, 1949

Old Testament History 109

It really is, I think, worth more than Barton's book. It doesn't have as much material in it, but in some fields it has more material than Barton's has. It is much more conservative than Barton's book is but it is more up to date than any particular edition of Barton; that is the later editions, of Barton's, are naturally more up to date than this, but the 1924 edition of Price seems to be right up to that time. He has the discoveries made almost a month before it went to press. I marvel how he was able to have it so up to date and so well handled on most subjects. There are a few places where I do not like his treatment but there are very few. It has good pictures in it and a very good presentation of the field in general. So twenty years ago these were the two books which I would recommend. Now, unfortunately, today 1924 is very far back and so you can't really recommend Price's book any more, but for the general matter we are talking of now the only history of the decipherment of Babylonian and Assyrian and the early discoveries, Price is excellent up to 1924, and there is a tremendous amount of material that was available before that time of real importance in all fields of archeology. Now in more recent years I don't know of any book quite like Price, that handles it quite the same way that Price does, but there is a book which was published about four years ago by Finegan. LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT PAST is the name of Finegan's book. It is published by the Princeton University Press. It is a large book, much larger than Barton, and it is much more up to date because it is within these last three or four years. Finegan, of course, is not a scholar in the class with Barton but he is a man who has done good work and a lot of study. His field is New Testament rather than Old Testament. Barton was more familiar with the Old Testament field than Finegan is but Finegan read a great deal on it. He was well trained in the New Testament field in Berlin and he is, he has given a very good summary of the field, and, of course being a larger book than Barton the quotations from the original sources are more extensive than they are in Barton's. I think perhaps there is a bit