much like Colossians, though differing in certain minor points. To the evangelical the fact that the book explicitly says that it was written by Paul should settle this matter. After all, it is quite natural that Paul, writing at about the same time to two churches that had similar problems, would express many of the same thoughts, while emphasizing those features that were of particular importance to each.

If any Bible book were proved to be a fraud by such clear proofs as were found regarding the <u>Donation of Constantine</u> and the <u>Travels of Sir John Mandeville</u>, it would deserve to be as completely forgotten as Sir John himself. However, the situation is far different. About two centuries ago there was a period of great scepticism regarding all ancient documents and some scholars held that any ancient document must be assumed to be a fraud unless proved true. Today the situation is quite the reverse, largely as a result of the rise of archaeology.

The Bible contains the names of many kings who ruled in lands other than Israel. Many of these were rulers of Egypt. Some were rulers of Assyria. Some ruled in Babylon or in Damascus. Most of the these names were otherwise completely unknown 200 years ago. Since that time thousands of records have been excavated in these various lands and from them it is possible to reconstruct a large portion of their history. When the names in the Bible are compared with the names found in these records a remarkable correspondence is discovered. Although most of those kingdoms used entirely different systems of writing, these names are spelled in just the way one would expect a Hebrew to spell them and are arranged chronologically in just the