

The Bible Champion

Volume XVI.

SEPTEMBER, 1913.

Number 2.

THE ARENA.

Story of Jonah in the Light of the Highest Criticism.

PROF. LUTHER T. TOWNSEND, LL.D.

The thought of the present time is somewhat skeptical, also somewhat superficial. Except in case of extreme radicals, the modern skeptic does not scoff at the Christian religion as a system. He speaks approvingly of its humane efforts to benefit the race, and may even enter its communion, still he does not hesitate to express with great freedom his doubt as to its supernatural claims. All miracles are therefore discredited.

The story of Jonah is not only discredited, but is regarded by some critics as quite suitable for the amusement of children, and is labeled "The Pickwick" and "The Bigelow Papers of the Bible." And one may well think from the frequency and violence of the attacks upon the historical integrity of this story and from the sport made of it that it is the most vulnerable narrative in the Bible.

Ever since the dawn of the Christian era the Jonah story has received at the hands of unbelievers a large deal of attention. It provoked the mockery of Celsus in the second century, of Zosimus in the fifth, of Thomas Paine in the eighteenth, while in the last and present centuries and in our own country, among both clergymen and laymen, the story is pretty generally regarded as unhistorical.

It is said to be "an allegory," "a legend," "a satirical poem," "a parable in ethics," or

"a fiction in prophetic dress," anything in fact except veritable history. Not a few entertain the opinion that it is altogether too late to discuss any of these miraculous stories of the Bible. It is insisted upon that they shall be dismissed from our thoughts and from our talk, since they can no longer be believed by intelligent and educated people. We would better spend our time, it is said, in discussing the practical phases of the gospel, the social and economic questions of the day. Let the dead past bury its dead out of our sight and hearing while we pass on into "the brightness and serenity of the approaching centuries."

Not so very long since the story of Jonah was handled in such a way by an eminent clergyman, who is also a literary critic, the Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbott, as to excite "great merriment and outbursts of laughter" in the congregation, though such results, the doctor afterward said, were not intended. But if the story, as he assured his hearers, "is wholly fiction," why should not just such facetious and laughful results have been intended? Imposture ruthlessly should be exposed, and shafts of ridicule are among the best agencies in exposing it. If the story of Jonah is not true, if it is "wholly fiction," if the amusement that arises from "the simple statement of the story shows," as the critic said, "the incon-

Archaeology, The Science of Antiquities.*

MELVIN GROVE KYLE, D.D., LL.D.

Round about is the great green circle of the Pocono Mountains of the Blue Ridge range in northwestern Pennsylvania. It is an enclosed basin. From the lookout on Buck Hill, nearly every square mile can be seen, *but nothing beyond*. It may be assumed that the great world without corresponds, in a general way, to this little world within, but one might circle around endlessly within these mountain walls without ever knowing with certainty that it is so; without, indeed, having any means of putting that assumption to the test. *But a way out has been made*. Here the melting ice of some long past glacial period swirled round and round in hopeless effort to escape from this environing mountain ridge. But yonder below, twenty-five miles away, at that strange notch in the horizon, at last some Titanic force of geologic time cleft the rim of this basin with the Delaware Water Gap. Through it an outlet was found to the world beyond. Through it we may pass out from this inclosed basin, and from our never-satisfied curiosity concerning the corresponding world without, to put our theories of that world to the test of observation.

Biblical criticism of the past half-century has been moving in just such an inclosed basin. Eichhorn, the founder of the Higher Criticism, defined it as "the discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form, and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characters." This definition is still adequate for the essential features of the method, though in its use it is often combined with the broader historical method that draws much help from external evidence also. The Higher Criticism, then professedly deals only with internal evidence. But what is internal is inclosed. Thus the Higher Criticism in its essential character is a circumscribed inquiry, and has an incomplete, because inclosed, existence unable to trace its own correspondences. It runs an

enviroined course within an impassable horizon; *i. e., impassable to it*. The first object of its inquiry is the origin of a literature. But the origin of a literature, its author, and the times from which it comes, and all the infinitely varied influences which the times bring to bear upon it, however much they be *reflected* within that literature, *lie* wholly without it. They make the historical setting, illustrate the imagery, and supply the facts needed to complete the picture. It may be assumed quite properly that what is without does truly correspond to that which is reflected within and may be known correctly by it, if only the correspondences between them be read aright. To read them aright by circling round and round in its inclosed basin is the task the Higher Criticism has set itself. There is no end to this circular path, no way inherent in the method by what it may test decisively its theories formed within the circle of Biblical Literature concerning the facts which lie without. *But a way out has been found*, a water gap here also. As geology provided for an outlet from this Pocono basin to the environing world beyond, so archaeology, the geology of human history, has by its researches found an outlet from this inclosed basin of the internal evidences of Biblical Literature, a way out for the examination of the environing circle of times and circumstances. It has thus furnished a convenient and effective way of putting to the final test of actual observation the theories formed within this circle of internal evidence concerning the facts that lie without.

Archaeology is the science of antiquities. One might almost describe it in a popular way as the science of old dead things; dead men of olden times and their dead customs, dead laws, dead institutions, dead empires, dead languages, dead literatures, and dead religions, and in some respects, dead art and dead architecture. One thing makes such a description inadequate, this, namely, that *all antiquities are not dead*. Some old things are still alive, have been vital ele-

* Opening chapter of "The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism."

in life, literature, and morals to this day. We write with letters; we set our clock faces staring at the world with their twelve-fold marks of division; we try to teach modern life and even modern politics the Ten Commandments. But these things are all antiquities. We must not deny the ancient world its meed of honor, nor refuse the origin of letters to the Phoenicians or to the people from whom they received them, nor our duodecimal computation of time to the Babylonians, nor the Ten Commandments to Moses. So the popular conception of antiquities as old dead things has its limitations. Archaeology, the science of antiquities, has to do with some things still very much alive.

But the science that compasses all that is dead and much that still lives, extends beyond the compass of a man. Professor Petrie, in his recent *Methods and Aims of Archaeology*, has called this science, "The knowledge of how man has acquired his present position and powers," and adds: "The mass of new material which has been collected, especially in the last fifty years, cannot be mastered by one man, if he is to find time for original work." Thus archaeology by its growth has come to be not one science, a specialty, but a whole system of special sciences each with its own territory and a more or less definite horizon, and any discussion of the subject, to be perfectly intelligible, must exactly define its scope.

Archaeology, as the science of antiquities, is here to be confined within the Biblical field, a field which has been variously delimited.

DeWette held that "The content of Hebrew archaeology extends to that which belongs to the whole state of the Hebrew nation in its historical manifestation." In his classification, he has the following: "Sources, Monuments, Literary sources, Class I. The Old Testament. The first and most important source is the Old Testament, which has the advantage of a very careful estimate of the separate writings of the ancients and a stronger appreciation of their historical character." Others have regarded this field as much narrower. The scope of Biblical archaeology most generally recognized in later times is embraced in the threefold division: I. Domestic An-

tiquities; II. Civil Antiquities; III. Sacred Antiquities. Professor I. M. Price says: "There is still another section to add on the land of Palestine itself."

But since antiquities are not necessarily dead, and since the Bible itself is one of the still living antiquities, Biblical archaeology properly includes not only all facts bearing upon the Bible which had been lost and have been found, and all literary remains of antiquity which have brought down to this day information which throws light on Biblical questions, and "another section . . . on the land of Palestine itself."

But also, as of the first importance, this greatest of all antiquities in the world, the Bible itself. There is a widespread tendency in some quarters to leave the Bible out of the list of witnesses, on the ground that it is on trial. However plausible this may seem, it is illogical. We might as well rule out the most important part of the earth as a witness in geology or an old man from telling his own life story, as rule out the Bible from any discussion of Biblical archaeology. It has the most to tell and there is no more reliable witness. Indeed as "the proper study of mankind is man," and of the geologist, the earth, so the most important study of the Biblical archaeologist is the Bible.

Criticism is the art of scrutiny. This definition would the more completely comprehend all that passes under the name of criticism, were it said that criticism is the art of scrutiny when it does not descend into unsympathetic inquisitiveness or, worse, into mere faultfinding. When it does so demean itself, it has no boundaries, no horizon. Much of the speculative criticism of the times soars aloft like a balloon, with equal uncertainty of flight, and nobody knows where it will come down, or if ever. If the field of archaeological facts is beyond the compass of a man and a lifetime, what shall we say of the boundless flight of speculative criticisms?

So criticism is here to be limited in its scope, and mainly, though not exclusively, to the literary criticism of the Bible, now, following, Eichhorn, commonly called "the higher criticism." But we cannot even yet move on in safety without stopping long enough to state exactly what is to be understood by the Higher Criticism, for the

phrase "higher criticism" is as variously used, and its use, without proper definition, as liable to be misunderstood, as the word "evolution." In this discussion we will neither take the toplofty way of those who assume the Higher Criticism to be the sum of all wisdom, nor the imprecatory way of those who proclaim it a "doctrine of devils," but keep to the middle of the plain

road marked out by Eichhorn's definition, "the discovery and verification of the facts regarding the origin, form, and value of literary productions upon the basis of their internal characters." This is true Higher Criticism. In this its original and proper signification it is accepted by all critics as a legitimate and helpful method.

Oriental Archaeology.*

PROFESSOR JAMES ORR, D.D.

Oriental Archaeology is a subject which has come with such vast strides to the front, has been fraught with such surprises, and now covers so immense a territory, that any book which furnishes an intelligent interpretation of its results is sure of a hearty welcome. Much more is this the case when what is proposed is to illustrate how the new light streaming in from past millenniums in the East affects our estimate of God's Holy Word, and our judgment on the keen and relentless, often almost reckless, criticism which has in late years been applied to that Word.

There is need, no doubt, in the case of both assailants and defenders of the Bible, of great care and caution in the application of the data supplied by Archaeology. Exploration has been amazingly rich in results, but the temptation is great at every step to go beyond the limits of what is actually proved, and to mix up theory and conjecture, and make large and premature deductions from scanty and often ill-understood material. Archaeology is not yet an exact science, and while there is happily a large and ever-growing area of undoubtedly established facts, there is also a not inconsiderable margin in regard to which too positive assertion is still hazardous. Every one who has tried to follow the course of discovery is painfully aware how much modification of earlier conclusions is found to be necessary with the inevitable increase of knowledge. Add to this the circumstance that even where the facts are not disputed, there is always the possibility of

interpreting the same facts differently. As Epictetus said, everything can be laid hold of by two handles, and according to the presuppositions with which the subject is approached, the most opposite conclusions may be drawn from the same apparent premises.

It is a merit of Dr. Kyle's book, "The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism," that the author has his eyes wide open to these possibilities of error, and seeks diligently to keep them in view in his own treatment. Just because of the clash of opinions on many points, it becomes the more interesting to try to discover how the advance of knowledge on the whole is affecting the attitude one is justified in taking up to the Bible. In the judgment of many—the present writer included—there can be little doubt as to the **general** answer. The progress of knowledge has not overthrown, but has in innumerable and surprising ways, helped to confirm the view one derives from the Bible itself as to the beginnings of human history, the character of ancient civilizations and the place of the Hebrews in the midst of these, the old family relationships and distributions or mankind, the veri-similitude of the picture of patriarchal conditions, of life in Egypt, in the desert, and in Canaan, of the later history of the kingdoms, and altogether of the course of events as depicted in Holy Scripture, in contrast with the violent and hypothetical constructions, based largely on an *a priori* theory of development, of the modern critical schools. This also is the thesis which Dr. Kyle sets himself against with such clearness and success in his book to establish. In this task

* From the Introduction to Dr. Kyle's "The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism."