
The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

WILLIAM J. JONES, *Editor*

VOLUME VI.

Wheaton, Illinois, April, 1932.

NUMBER 3.

Editorial

IN a sketch of Samuel Rutherford, Andrew A. Bonar writes something which bears heavily upon virile Christianity among students, as well as among lay believers. He says: "It might be instructive to enquire why it is that wherever godliness is healthy and progressive, we almost invariably find learning in the Church of Christ attendant on it; while on the other hand neglect of study is attended sooner or later by decay of vital godliness."

The averting of genuine study of the Word of God is a danger into which modern college and theological seminary students too easily fall. But a similar danger, and one just as perilous is the error of thinking that true learning and true piety are incompatible. How facile it is to divorce the knowledge of the universe—natural revelation from the knowledge of the Word—divine revelation, and assume that they are two different kinds of knowledge! The student, whether evangelical or not, finds it a sore temptation to forget truths of apparently remote subjects when he focuses his attention on what he regards as religious truth. In succumbing to this snare he errs greatly; he fails to consider that every truth has its ultimate significance only in its proper relation to God.

Arduous study of the world, or of God, or of man must ever be for the Christian student a reverent and a devotional study. But it should be *study*, the bending of the whole mind and soul on the object. And every devotional act of the Christian student, whether alone or with other Christians should be intelligent. Too often piety is severed from learning; too often students are inclined to pray or sing without the understanding!

If we as evangelical students are to make any deep and lasting impress upon the Church in our generation, we must not take our studies lightly nor our devotionals carelessly. Both have a place and both must be cultivated. It is not enough that we have fervor; there must be fuel of truth for the fervor to consume! God as a god of truth must ever be worshipped in spirit and in truth. And there is no more exacting and demanding task than that enjoined upon all believers by the Apostle, "bringing every thought into captivity to the obedience of Christ". It is not knowledge which is to be cast down, but that—whether it be called knowledge or imagining—which exalts itself against the "knowledge of God". Religious mystics abound in student circles. They would have one believe that the more the intellect is submerged, the more godly one is likely to be. That is not the Apostle Paul's view, nor is it the view of saintly souls of the Church in all ages, whose hymns of praise, for instance, are redolent with devotional charm. They are rich in worship because they are rooted in the knowledge of God and not in man and his ephemeral emotional states.

"If the Foundations Be Destroyed, What Can the Righteous Do?"*

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

WHY the archæologist? *Cui bono?* of what use is he anyway? And especially, What can he contribute of helpfulness in a series of brochures for the building up of the religious life of the devout people, young and old, who can be induced, in these frivolous times, to read religious books? For is there not a very widespread notion that at least the oncoming generation, just now thundering at the door, home from college with "yells bursting in air", is exceedingly skeptical? That is iterated and reiterated until, according to the dictum of *Alice in Wonderland*, "what I tell you three times is true," we are rather obliged to believe it. In fact it is believed by very many. I recently read a book written up from one of these surveys, questionnaires, which nearly drive educators frantic, intended for the very purpose of proving that college students of today are alarmingly skeptical. This particular questionnaire was conducted at Cornell University and, from the rather prevalent opinion of that institution, I thought that, if the author could not prove it there, he could not prove it anywhere. So I read the book with increasing interest—ever increasing interest, and at last growing amusement. The author told what the students were reading, what questions they discussed, what arguments they put forward, what appalling doubts were bandied about, until all the years since my college days seemed obliterated. That skeptical stuff had such a reminiscent sound. When I was a student—some years since—at dear old Muskingum, one of the most conservative institutions in the land then and still, we discussed all those questions, put up all those skeptical bluffs, until we must have seemed to our betters an unbelieving lot. There was not a thing in all that this author put forward to prove the wicked thinking of present-day students that was not familiar, except the college slang. They had learned a new lot which I did not understand.

Yet there is a real difference between the students of my college days and those of today. When we returned occasionally to our homes, we began to air some of our sophomoric wisdom and our fathers peered over their glasses at us and said, "Tut, tut". And we "tutted"! Then perhaps we spoke to our old pastor about our intellectual qualms and he said sympathetically, remembering his own student days, "Oh well, after a while, these ideas will not trouble you so much". He knew they were only growing pains. So we subsided; *today the young folks will not subside*. They insist upon those questions being answered.

Now why the archæologist? to answer those questions. If it seem a very large claim to make for the archæologist that, of all teachers today,

*Because of pressure of material in this issue, we are forced to omit the whole address of Dr. Kyle, and publish this instalment. The October number of the EVANGELICAL STUDENT will conclude this article. We are sure that our readers will want to receive the succeeding portion of this address.

he is best qualified to meet the skeptical tendencies of the young generation turned loose in a great new world of facts which they have not yet for themselves organized, let us consider carefully the following:

I

Our religion is an historical religion. Most religions are religions of a person. Such is Mormonism; it is the religion of Joseph Smith. There is a little biography attached to him, but no history lies back of the book. All the Mexican history, such as it is, which Mormons claim for their book, was written into it by the Reverend Mr. Spaulding who wrote it as a romance to while away the ennui of invalid days. Joe Smith took that romance, wrote into it some quotations from the Bible, adjusted it to his purpose, and presto, the Book of Mormon. That religion is the religion of a person.

Mohammedanism is also a religion of a person, the religion of Mohammed. While quite a little of the Bible is incorporated into it, it is not vitally related to it in any historical sense. The religion of the Koran is the religion of a person.

So also Buddhism is the religion of Buddha and Confucianism is the religion—or rather morals—of Confucius. Little or no history is behind these. They have not historical, but personal roots, so each is a religion of a person.

Christianity is also a religion of a person, most intimately so, but, in addition, it is an historical religion. I was once lecturing in Athens, Georgia, the University town of the state. One who was interested in the conference at which I was lecturing said to me, "There is a Jewish clothing dealer here in town I wish you to meet." Now I had met some Jewish clothing dealers in a business way, and the remembrance was not particularly alluring, but I courteously suppressed those memories and said, "Certainly, I will be glad to meet your friend." We found a typical Jewish clothing dealer, and talked a minute or two about those little nothings which strangers utter when they meet and feel a little uncertain, and then he turned sharply to me and said: "Now this is my idea: Christianity has its roots in Judaism, and Judaism has its fruits in Christianity; and when we all get to see these things we will not be very far apart." "Well", I thought, "you are not very far from the kingdom." Was there ever a more succinct statement of the relation between Christianity and Judaism?

Yes, Christianity, in addition to being a religion of a person, *is also an historical religion.* Our Lord said explicitly that He "came to fulfill" the law. He fulfilled its moral demands upon us in His atoning work and in His life of perfect obedience, and He fulfilled all the adumbrations in the ceremonial requirements and so ended the sacrifices "once for all". Such was His constant representation during His life and in His teachings and such also is the burden of the Epistles which followed; especially the Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians argue respectively the assuredness of the satisfaction and its completeness. Then in the Epistle to the Hebrews the whole argument is reviewed historically to show espe-

cially to the Jewish world *that all was fulfilled*. The Christ came not to *add* to the revelation of redemption, but to *personify* it. In the patriarchal period, from creation to the descent into Egypt, there was revelation in promise, from the Protevangelium concerning the seed of the woman, to the covenant made with Abraham and confirmed to the patriarchs. In the tribal period, from the descent into Egypt to the entrance into the Promised Land, we have revelation through Providence, God's moving pictures, the proof of His being and His supremacy in the wonders in Egypt, the giving of the Law from Sinai and the instituting of the whole ceremonial system of types and shadows at the Tabernacle, the divine leadership in life throughout the wilderness journey and the substitution of Joshua, Jesus, for Moses the Lawgiver at last actually to lead into the Promised Land. In this period the whole of the revelation of redemption was unfolded. In the national period there was revelation through prophecy unfolding and applying, but adding nothing to the revelation. In the redemptive period came revelation in Person, the same revelation fulfilled in the Person of the Son of God, neither taking from it nor adding to it, but only fulfilling it. Then in the evangelistic period, in the Epistles the personification of the revelation was unfolded, as had been its foreshadowing at Sinai and in the prophecies. This evangelistic period is continuing in the heralding of that revelation by preachers to the bounds of the nations and to the end of time; still the messengers of that one revelation.

Yes, our religion is an historical religion; the Jew of Athens was right; how marvelously true it is that Christianity has its roots in Judaism and Judaism has its fruits in Christianity. Christ and His message can no more be separated from their historical roots in the Old Testament than can the ripened summer fruits be separated from the roots that sent up their sap in the springtime of the year. *Cut away the roots and the fruits soon drop.*

II

History is inseparably bound up to a narrative of events. Folklore and legends and myths do not make history; they may, and oftentimes do, depict manners and customs, but the *events* of folklore and legends and myths being, in part, usually in whole, imaginary cannot be accepted as history. It is oftentimes asserted in answer to this that a work of fiction may convey much valuable truth. So it may; but when? Only when, and in so far as, it is a true representation of real life. Why is Conrad so much admired by literati though the sensationalists who feed on falsehoods find him dull? It is because he, more than any other recent novelist, depicts such things as really happen, so that when one reads a work of Conrad he says at the end, "Just so; only the names are imaginary." Then somebody is sure to mention *Pilgrim's Progress*; somebody always does mention *Pilgrim's Progress* in this connection. But *Pilgrim's Progress* is not a work of fiction; it is a narrative of real events, the events of every pilgrim on the way to the Celestial City. Even the names exactly *describe* each of us at the various passages of the pilgrim's way.

(To be concluded in an early issue)

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT

The Magazine of THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS

WILLIAM J. JONES, *Editor*

VOLUME VII *Wheaton, Illinois, January, 1933.* NUMBERS 1 AND 2

Editorial

SOME time ago we prepared an embryonic editorial on the subject of Christian Missions in which we indicated that the Great Commission has never been withdrawn, and that the very thought of such a question (or any of its equivalents) as "Shall We Abandon Missions?" is in the very nature of the case absurd, and an affront to the One whose authority is woven into the very fibre of the irrevocable mandate to preach the gospel to every creature. It is for us as students to enquire whether the Lord has abandoned us, in our shabby fulfilment of the divine command! So we must perforce drag our unwilling observations to light, now that a young missionary writing for the most part to young people who might be missionaries, writes in one of our current periodicals under the caption, "Is There a Case for Foreign Missions?"¹

Enough has been written both of the Laymen's Foreign Mission Inquiry and of Pearl S. Buck's general attitude toward Missions to obviate any extended remarks on these particular opinions. But the specific approach of the article mentioned merits some strictures. With respect to the Inquiry which is really an Inquisition, we venture the judgment, incidentally, that if the denominational leaders who are stridently denouncing the report and are shouting "Fire!" had not sometimes fanned the flame which figuratively speaking set fire to the structure of modern Missions, their strong crying might have more significance than it does have, now that the siege is laid. If there had been no "inclusive policy" in mission boards during the past there would not have been any missionaries of the inclusive type for such a commission to observe.

Mrs. Buck writes a sort of missionary Æneid, the record of a search for some satisfying basis for her life-work as a missionary. As such it has a vital bearing on what attitudes toward Christianity students now contemplating missionary endeavor will hold. The author finds justification for her occupation in the fact that despite the poor quality of missionaries in service (who are no poorer than those sending them) she finds noble missionaries, truly great souls who have considered the Christian cause of missions sufficient to really challenge their lives; that there is an unmistakable imprint of Christ's influence in other lands and cultures; and therefore she is unwilling "to have the figure of Christ, however veiled, pass from the earth."

Were this the only trend of her argument, there might be little cause for complaint, but when one notes the vitriolic, acerb antipathy for ortho-

¹Pearl S. Buck in *Harper's* for January, 1933.

"If the Foundations Be Destroyed, What Can the Righteous Do?"*

MELVIN GROVE KYLE

HISTORY is made up of real events. This is not only essentially a necessity in order to be history, but in this case it is doubly so because of the outcome of that history in the Person and the events and the message in which the history culminates and is fulfilled. Important as this will at once appear, it is not infrequently overlooked. A very dear friend of mine, a devout man and a firm believer in the Word as an objective revelation, yet in conversation remarked incidentally that he did not think it mattered much whether the records in the Old Testament were a narrative of actual events or not. I allowed the remark to pass in the casual way it was made for the moment. A little later in the conversation, he spoke of our Lord's quotations from the narratives of the historical books. I asked, "Do you think He believed those stories?" He replied, "Certainly He did." Then I asked, "If the stories were not narratives of actual events, what becomes of our Lord's deity?" "Ah" said he, "I see." So it comes about that many devout believers in the reliability of revelation, are yet deceived by the smooth and confident and reiterated assertion that "It does not matter much, whether the narratives are history or merely folklore." Certainly Christ did not *fulfill* that which had no original *actuality*. We might as well venture to speak of some latter day Indian Chief *fulfilling* the legend of Hiawatha, or to reconstruct, as some have actually tried to do, the physical geography of the ancient world upon the legend of Atlantis. It will not do; real history out of which great facts come and great truths emerge to be "*fulfilled*" in any life, *must consist of a narrative of actual events.*

III

The attack upon our religion is an historical attack. Very many elements of the attack are directly against the historicity of the narratives, both of the Old Testament and the New. And all the more subtle are the attacks of criticism, that are not immediately and directly against the historicity of the narratives, yet go back to this as the hinterland of the whole controversy. When this is established all the critical opinions founded upon the untrustworthiness of the narrative find themselves suspended between heaven and earth; it is impossible to rise and fatal to fall. What, for example, becomes of the whole critical theory of the late authorship of the ceremonial system at the close of the Exile, if the narrative of the Tabernacle in the wilderness be a narrative of facts?

The philosophical attack of a century ago is a spent force and its few advocates of today do no more than parade the tawdry arguments of the olden time without even a change of clothes! As Joseph Cook character-

*The concluding portion of the address delivered at the Seventh Annual Convention of the League, the first part of which appeared in the April, 1932, issue of the STUDENT.

ized the efforts of one who attempted the threadbare arguments: "He put his hand in the abandoned nest of infidelity and took out a handful of empty eggshells, filled them with blasphemy and hurled them at his audience." I heard Mr. Stead, Editor of the *British Review of Reviews*, do exactly that in the Christian pulpit of the City Temple in London in 1928. His great audience looked down their noses in silence. How he ever got into a Christian pulpit with his stale message, I do not know. That old philosophical attack has gone by to the limbo of infidel utterances; no philosopher worthy of the name today holds its argument to be valid.

There is another attack upon our religion which is looming on the horizon of popular thinking and has already reached the zenith of the learned world. It is the psychological attack, behaviorism, the notion that there is nothing of our experience, but our behavior; there is no soul; nothing behaves, it just behaves itself. It has a self-starter. Of course, then, when the behavior stops, there will be nothing to call to account, so there can be no such thing as responsibility for human conduct. This is being widely taught in our high schools and the colleges of the land. It accounts in large measure, not for any intellectual skepticism, but for the rising tide of immorality. Police chiefs relate occurrences too horrible to narrate here which are directly traceable to collegiate instruction that young men and women are not responsible for what they do! This is the dragon next to be slain.

But just now the great attacking force, deeply entrenched behind a half century of the most intense critical scholarship the world has ever known, is assailing the credibility of the Biblical narratives and asserting that, since the Bible was not written expressly as a scientific book, it does not need to be a truthful book, but only, that out of a fog of myth and legend, there may be sifted some precious grains of truth to adorn the heavenly way.

IV

The only way to meet successfully an attack upon historicity is to get the facts in the field. Facts are final; if they substantiate the narrative, it is a narrative of actual events. And does any one now ask, Why the archaeologist? It is he who gets the facts in the field. The great and ever increasing volume of research work in Bible lands is all directed to this end, and it is this witness of the field work in Bible lands which is now to be recounted.

V

Some Recent Facts brought out by the Archaeologist. It is important to note that history is always recounted looking down stream, from the earliest times to the present. But archaeological history is always viewed looking up stream; the latest history is on the surface and as we go down in the debris, we go back in the history. Some of the recent witness of the field work in Bible lands will be now narrated beginning near the surface of Israelite history and going back step by step through Israelitish, and Patriarchal and Canaanite history to Babylonia and the primeval story of the home-town of Abram.

(1) It is noted (II Chronicles 1:16) that Solomon "had horses brought out of Egypt" for his chariot corps, the "heavy artillery" of that day, or the equivalent of the tanks suddenly thrust into the Great European war. The University of Chicago in its excavations at Megiddo has found the stables of Solomon, not, of course, those arches under the temple area at Jerusalem so ostentatiously shown to tourists by Jerusalem guides as Solomon's stables, but real stables at the great fortress which guarded the most important pass in the land, that leading from the Plain of Sharon to the Plain of Esdraelon. Through this pass went all the invading armies of Egypt or Assyria or Persia and through this silently swept the cavalry of Allenby in that night raid that overwhelmed the Turkish and German army. These stables really were discovered many years ago by Shoemaker in his work at Mutesselim (Megiddo), but he was not able to determine what the ruins might have been. Now, when the excavations are systematically carried on, stripping layer after layer from the area of the mound, the relation of things to each other appears and Solomon's stables are clearly shown and the pottery evidence certifies the time. Here are long rows of stalls carefully paved and properly drained. In fact, the horses seem to have been as carefully cared for as are the petted darlings of the race-course today. It is a bright light upon the power and lavish expenditure of Solomon's reign; this chariot corps, the strongest arm of the military power, had wealth lavished upon it as upon the great battle fleets of modern navies; no expense spared to make it most effective. The great king was perfecting the machinery of defense to hold his own and to extend his domain to the limits of the promise. Soon this work was to be completed and the last grip of the dead hand of Egypt upon Palestine to be loosened, when, by a diplomatic marriage, Solomon got Gezer as a dower with his Egyptian wife. True she was a hostage from her father and a spy upon her husband to preserve the peace, and she introduced Egyptian idolatry into Jerusalem along with all the other varieties practised by Solomon's wives; but at last Solomon was in complete control in the land—*at how great a price!*

(2) The Egyptian influence, of which Solomon was trying to rid himself in the land by letting it into his own household! had been an inheritance from his father David. A curious and unexpected discovery was recently made near Amman, the capital of Trans-jordania and the ancient capital of Ammon. Some workmen were digging a ditch for a work of civil engineering, drainage or irrigation, and came unexpectedly upon a tomb. It was plainly ancient and was dated by Dr. Albright, for ten years Director of the American School of Oriental Research, now at the head of the Semitic Department of Johns Hopkins University, my colleague also in the excavations at Kirjath-sepher, one of the foremost experts in the pottery evidence of Palestine. He placed its time in the reign of David. When we note that it contained an anthropoid shaped (human shaped) sarcophagus distinctly Egyptian, it is seen at once that in the days of David the land was not yet free from Egyptian tendencies. In fact, as we shall presently see, the ugly ogre of Egyptian military power was still

a threatening menace on the southwest. Thus more than three centuries after the Exodus Israel was not yet entirely escaped from the stranglehold which Egypt had in the slavery days.

(3) The extent to which this Egyptian menace affected, and was well adapted to affect, the national life of Israel to so late a period is next illustrated, as we look upward along the stream of history—illustrated in a triumphal entry graced by Saul and Jonathan. Shakespeare speaks of dinner “not where one eats, but where one is eaten”; so there are triumphal processions not where one triumphs, but where one is triumphed over. So it was in the triumphal entry graced by Saul and Jonathan. They had perished at the battle of Gilboa (I Samuel 31). The Philistines found their dead bodies, cut off Saul’s head to carry to Beth-shean in triumph and placed their trophies in the temple of Ashtaroth in that Philistine city. In fact the Philistines held this great fortress till, in the reign of David, he wrested its control from them and that finally. Within the last years the excavations by the University of Pennsylvania at Beth-shean have not only confirmed the narrative of the Bible, but have set a background as startling as helpful to the story of Israel of that age. The excavators going down in their work from the Roman, Greek, Christian, and Israelite remains in the ruins at this place, came at last to the level of the days of Saul as shown unmistakably by the pottery, the determining criterion in every such case now. At that level they found the temple of Ashtaroth; not an insignificant shrine, but a great temple, sixty feet wide and ninety feet long. Cult objects identified it unmistakably. The trophies of Saul and Jonathan were not found—not yet—who knows what may yet turn up, though probably they were carried away long ago.

In addition to the identification of the temple of Ashtaroth, and of far greater significance, was the discovery that the Philistines, who had so often troubled the Israelites and still were able to hold the great fortress at the junction of Esdraelon and the Jordan, were but the cat’s paw for the Egyptian monkey. Behind the troublesome Philistines,—always had been behind them in the troubled centuries since the Exodus,—was the mighty power of Egypt. At Beth-shean, not only abundant Egyptian relics attested the presence of Egyptians, but great inscribed tablets announced the presence and the power of the suzerain nation in the persons of Seti and his son Rameses the Great. When David finally drove out the Philistines from Beth-shean, he pushed back the Egyptian frontier in Palestine to the lower part of the Plain of Sharon and, at last, by diplomacy and a domestic tragedy, Solomon finally persuaded the Hawk of Egypt to return to the palm-groves of the Nile.

(4) Jabin, king of Hazor (the great fortress of the north “on its mound”), was the greatest of all the leaders of Canaan arrayed against Joshua (Joshua 11). He gathered a great host to meet the invading army of Joshua and awaited them at the waters of Merom. There Jabin was utterly routed; his mighty chariot corps was made helpless by houghing the horses, more effective than spiking a cannon. Then Joshua burned that city and utterly destroyed it, the only place so utterly destroyed in his

great northern campaign of the Conquest. Until very recently the site of Hazor was unknown, until in 1928 Dr. Garstang identified it a little west of the waters of Merom in the highlands of Naphtali. The pottery showed the early history of the place down to the Late Bronze Age and the beginning of the Early Iron Age. There the pottery absolutely ceased. From that time on it was not occupied at all. This date, the beginning of the Early Iron Age, is *exactly the time of the Conquest*. (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1926; October, 1928.)

(5) Looking a little farther up the stream of history to the beginning of the Conquest we see a great host encamped on the east side of the Jordan in the Plains of Moab. Their sprawling black tents are scattered far and wide over many little valleys which make up the Plains here. In the Book of Numbers (22-24) we have the historical record of this host, the great company of desert wanderers under Moses, and at last under Joshua, and now about to attempt the conquest of the Promised Land. The account is somewhat circumstantial, indeed more circumstantial than appears in the narrative itself. Only the cities of the region are named and the points of vantage from which Balak would have had Balaam curse Israel, but from which, according to circumstances in each case, he blessed Israel instead. It is only when the topography of the region is studied that the circumstantiality of the account appears. It is certainly that of an eye-witness, and as graphic as a military description of a battle field.

In 1929, Péré Mallon of the Pontifical Biblical Institute of Jerusalem, who was also a member of the Staff of the Xenia Seminary Expedition to the Cities of the Plain in 1924 (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, July, 1924), went over east of the Jordan to see what could be learned concerning the geography and topography of that region. It is only within recent years that the science of pottery has been worked out for Palestine. The first principles were laid down by Sir Flinders Petrie about twenty-five years ago, but only within ten years have they been thoroughly worked out, tested, and turned into a real and trustworthy science in the service of history. Péré Mallon is one of the experts in pottery chronology, and so was a member of our staff at the Cities of the Plain, and so, also, now went to examine the Plains of Moab. Bit by bit the whole Old Testament narrative is being thus proved up.

Beginning with the names of the cities mentioned in Numbers, he was immediately able to identify each one of them among the names of towns on the sites known by modern Arabic names. Being accomplished in the colloquial, he found it easy to recognize the Hebrew names in these modern appellations. Besides, the locations themselves were exactly in order topographically as viewed by an observer on the ground. One thing, however, was at first puzzling; in addition to the towns mentioned in the Biblical narrative, some other sites were noted, not now occupied as towns, but evidently of importance in olden times. Why then were not these places mentioned in the account? An examination of the pottery at these places at once told the whole story and added another touch to the graphic accuracy of the narrative in Numbers. There was only the rough heavy

pottery of the Early Bronze Age with the ledge handles and the lug handles so characteristic of that Age. There was *nothing of any later Age in the culture of the land*. The places had not been occupied after the close of that Age 500 to 600 years before the Israelites camped here. Of course, these places were not mentioned in the account, since they were then uninhabited. Interest in the matter deepens, when it is noted that it was just about the end of the Early Bronze Age that the Cities of the Plain, Sodom and her allies, were destroyed. These cities of the Plains of Moab may have been enveloped in the same deluge of fire and sulphur and salt; a wind might easily carry the ashes so far. I have been in Naples in a mild eruption of Vesuvius, when the city was sifted, as with a light snow, with the ashes from the volcano fifteen miles away. Or it is more likely that, not in the destruction of Sodom were these places involved, but in the greater besom of destruction in the form of some conquering host that swept the whole of Palestine very soon afterwards and completely changed the civilization, brought in, in fact, a light and beautiful pottery almost as attractive as China ware. At any rate, these cities had ceased to exist half a millennium before the account in Numbers and so, naturally enough, were not mentioned.

It was, however, when P ere Mallon turned to the story of Balaam's prophecy that the complete attestation of the narrative came. He found that the account, in its order and in what is seen from each point of vantage to which Balak took the prophet to view the menacing host, it is that the wonderful accuracy of the writer appears. From the first place of the prophet's view, only a small part of the camp of Israel could be seen. Perhaps Balak was rather afraid for Balaam from afar to see how great was the menace of the invading host. But instead of cursing the invaders, the Prophet blessed them. Then Balak took him to another place from which a much wider view of the camp of Israel was had, yet still instead of cursing was blessing. Then from the heights of Baal Peor also, completely identified, not only by the topography and the pottery, but by the evidence of the High Place, the whole vast assemblage of Bedouin tents of the desert was spread out to view, and the greatness, the terror of this invading menace was visible in all its horror. Yet still the prophet blessed, and, in blessing, gave one of the most glowing of the Messianic visions of that early stage of the Messianic hope. Altogether we have here one of the greatest triumphs of the science of pottery culture in Bible lands.

(6) Only a little while before the camping on the Plains of Moab for rest before attempting conquest of the Promised Land, the host under the leadership of Moses had passed by Kir of Moab, now Kerak. It is rather curious, that some critics have set up the idea that Moab did not exist as a nation until the time of David. When the Pentateuch is shoved away forward to Exile times, then, in consistency, it becomes necessary to pull after it a great many events; the existence of Moab is one of them. But Moab in the time of Moses, the traditional Moses, not the Moses of the critics, is well attested. In 1908, I was at work at Luxor in Upper Egypt.

I got permission from M. LeGrand of the Department of Antiquities, hired some diggers, and borrowed a ladder and set to work around some statues of Rameses the Great in front of the temple of Luxor. About the base of the statues were inscriptions, rows of cartouches containing names of peoples and places which Rameses claimed to have conquered. It had been suspected that Moab was in one of these lists. I cleared one list after another until I came to the last, and to the last name in this last list. When I scraped the mud from the inscription, there stood out the name Moab spelled out in phonetic characters of the hieroglyphs, as clearly spelled indeed as if in Roman letters (*Recueil de Travaux*, XXX). Here was Rameses a little before the Exodus, boasting of having conquered Moab, evidently a place of sufficient importance, though far away across on the east of Jordan, to be the subject of a royal boast. This certifies the existence of Moab as a nation in the time of Moses.

But what of Kir of Moab? Was it in existence, when Moses passed this way? In 1924 we searched for some days for the evidence of that early city amidst the many ruins of Kerak but did not find it. One day our geologist, Professor Day of Beyroot, came in and announced that he had found the pottery of that old city on the precipice east of town. We jeered at him, "that no one ever built a city on a precipice." But Dr. Albright said, "I will tell you what it means:—the castle just above that spot is Crusader work. The Crusaders were Europeans who cleared the ground before they built. They threw the rubbish down over the precipice." There we found a great layer of it. The pottery was not that of the time of Abraham and Lot. Certainly not, for Lot was himself the progenitor of Moabite civilization. Here was the pottery of the time of Moses; the strange shapes of the end of the Late Bronze Age and the Early Iron Age. Kir of Moab was certainly on the ground, when Moses came this way.¹

(7) For a glimpse into the life of the Israelites in the wilderness, we must look in upon them in Egypt and then see what they were like after the wilderness life and they were settled in the land. The difference noted will tell us what they lost in the desert. Menepthah, the Pharaoh of the Exodus, tells us that he used the Asiatic slaves in the army, in industrial pursuits, and on public works.² The Bible mentions only the employment of the Israelites on public works, because it was there the insurrection took place and that only had immediately to do with the Biblical story. The Bible never tells us anything merely to gratify curiosity, as do most historical books. That the Israelites were used in industrial pursuits is evident from the skill of Bezaleel and his fellow craftsmen and artists who made the Tabernacle. God endowed them especially for their work but he chose them first for their fitness. It is equally certain that the men of Israel had been used in the army from the celerity and the success of the preparation of an army to combat the Amalekites, the most fearful cavalry in that world of Bedouin horsemen. This army drill they kept up, for

¹*Explorations at Sodom*, p. 136.

²*Moses and the Monuments*, p. 16.

they had need for it in the desert life, and when they came to Canaan. But what became of their arts and crafts? After the Tabernacle, *they built no houses*. The old Egyptian-trained workmen all died off and the boys had no opportunity to learn. In two generations they would certainly lose their arts and crafts, except the simplest ceramic art needed to make bowls and flagons for use in the wilderness.

At Kirjath-sepher, when in 1928 we had cleared away the houses of the late city of the kings of Judah after Solomon and came to the city below, which had been built by the Israelites when they came into the land, we had a surprise, a surprise, indeed, that exactly fitted the Bible history. That first city built by Israel on this site was a mere squatter settlement. It had no plan, displayed no skill, was, in fact, the crude efforts of a people without the arts and crafts. Compared with the Canaanite city that they destroyed or the city of the kings of Judah that later followed, it was a huddle of shanties. In the wilderness, God taught the Israelites religion and trained them in citizenship, but they lost their arts and crafts. Did God leave them helpless? Not so. He provided them teachers. The Philistines were skilled and the Israelites learned from them. From this time on the debt of Israel to the Philistine potters is soon manifest and for a long period. Thus the history of those days seems to unroll before our eyes like a scroll.

(8) Now at last we have been able to read the date on that scroll of history. It is not a certain year B. C., for they never dated things that way in those days, but it is a very definite and reliable date nevertheless. The date was first read distinctly in our excavations at Kirjath-sepher (*Bibliotheca Sacra*, 1926, 1928; *Sunday School Times*, same years). When we opened the great chariot gate of the city on the east side, we found within at a certain level in the debris a great layer of ashes and charcoal, indubitable evidence of a great burning; the city had been destroyed. Who destroyed it? An examination of the pottery was most illuminating and conclusive. *Below* that level, before that time, there were the strange shapes and unusual decorations of the imported Cypro-phoenician wine pitchers and similar juglets for perfumes, and Mycenaean stirrup vases, unmistakable evidence of the Late Bronze Age, and all below that nothing *but Bronze Age pottery*, from Canaanite times. Undoubtedly up to the time of that great fire, the Canaanite held the city. Immediately *above* that layer of ashes, without any neutral layer of dust to denote a time when the city was unoccupied, but *at once*, there was the utterly different and simpler pottery of the Early Iron Age, garishly decorated in imitation of Philistine pottery. It was, at that time and ever afterward to the top of the mound, Israelite pottery. Evidently after that burning, the Israelites held the city down to the end of Israelite national history. And have we not already learned that the Israelites lost their arts and crafts in the wilderness and learned from the Philistines? What a tell-tale layer of ashes! The complete change in civilization shows that there was a conquest, a foreign conquest. The Israelite character of the pottery ever afterwards shows that it was an Israelite conquest, and the continued hold-

ing of the city to the end of their history shows that this was *The Conquest* and not any later one. Then it is to be noted that all below that layer of ashes was of the Bronze Age, and all above that layer was of the Iron Age. Undoubtedly then the Conquest was just at the beginning of the Iron Age. Why so sudden? How possible so immediate a change? Well, how long did it take America to make the change from the Horse Age to the Automobile Age? not twenty-five years. When the auto became cheap and abundant it drove the horse out. So when iron became abundant and was cheaper, it very quickly drove out the expensive bronze.

(9) But why the change just at this juncture in Israelite and Canaanite history? Only about twenty-five miles southwest of where we were at work discovering the incoming of Israel at Kirjath-sepher, Sir Flinders Petrie at the same time was uncovering the Philistine remains at Gerar. The most amazing find was the iron smelting furnaces which the Philistines at that time introduced into Gerar. Where they learned the secret, and still more where they got the ore, is still a mystery, but the smelting furnaces explain the sudden change from bronze to iron. It was just at that time that Israel came in for the Conquest. Now when was that? I have said that no dates "B. C." are ever found in that age, *before the birth of Christ*. But the date can be made out from the pottery in comparison with Egyptian and Greek remains found in the layers of debris. The date can be determined to within about fifty years, a possible error of twenty-five years on either side of a point. The best estimate for the date is about 1275 before the birth of our Lord.

Here is a cultural date for the Conquest and so for the exodus about fifty years earlier (Kirjath-sepher was taken probably about ten years (?) after Jericho). There has long been a dispute about the place in Egyptian history at which the Exodus took place. Most Egyptologists believe it took place under Meneptah the successor of Rameses the Great, who was the builder of Pithom and Raamses. Some, especially certain critics, insist most vociferously upon an earlier date in the reign of Amenhotep IV, and that Thothmes the Great was the Pharaoh of the oppression. There are difficulties, no matter which horn of the dilemma is taken, but this cultural date of the Conquest found at Kirjath-sepher is decisive, and the chronologers will have to adjust themselves to the facts. By no possibility can the beginning of the Iron Age in Palestine be thrust back to the middle of the fifteenth century B. C. That difference of opinion of three hundred years for the date of the Exodus has been the great disturbing element in all calculations of Old Testament chronology. If it be said that pottery chronology is not exact, with a possible error of fifty years, it certainly is a great improvement over an error of *three hundred years*. In any case it must be remembered that these errors are not errors in the Bible, but errors in the *calculation of dates which are not given in the Bible*. Again the pottery is the touchstone which tests and determines the time of Biblical events.

(10) Moving backward along the course of history, the next great landmark for the archæologist is the Great Break, the something that

happened in the Jordan Valley which put an end to all civilization in the lower part of the Valley around the Cities of the Plain for twenty-five hundred years. The civilization of the Jordan Valley has been worked out by careful study of the pottery from the base of great Hermon away down to the Plain where stood Sodom and her allies. Everywhere appear the great ledge handles and the lug handles and the net decoration of the Early Bronze Age followed by the beautiful shapes and delicate pottery—I had almost said Chinaware—and the imitation alabaster, of the Middle Bronze Age, the mid-patriarchal times, and the importations and imitations of the Late Bronze Age at the end of which came Joshua and his host, all found regularly, except in one place. In the region of the Plain down below Jericho something happened. At the end of the Early Bronze Age, the time of Abraham and Lot, there is a great break. In 1924 the Xenia Seminary expedition to the Plain rode day after day for two weeks, around the Plain, up into the mountains, down the water-courses to the Sea, away to the lower end of the Plain; then dug down in the debris of later constructions to virgin soil seeking that Early Bronze pottery to certify that the civilization of the days of Abraham and Lot was actually on the Plain. In all that search we found not only not a scrap of that civilization, but not a scrap of any kind of civilization earlier than Arabian, Crusader and a little Byzantine; nothing within twenty-five hundred years of the time of Abraham and Lot.

Then, at last, away up on the mountain-side we found the High Place, the Great High Place of the Plain—manifestly of the first importance from the elaborate defenses provided—and beside it graves, and from the graves the great pottery of the Early Bronze Age, assuring that the civilization, the ancient civilization of the Cities of the Plain which long have hidden their shame beneath the overflow of the Sea, was of the time to which it is ascribed by the account in Genesis. Then their dawned upon us the significance of the two weeks' fruitless search over the Plain; that region has no history from the destruction of the Cities to the end of Bible history; it was so utterly destroyed that for two millenniums and a half the place was uninhabitable. As there was no civilization, of course, we found no trace of any! Here was the Great Break, as plainly written in the pottery as in the leaves of Holy Writ. The pottery of *Bab ed-Draa* (the Great High Place) is all older than the eighteenth century B. C., at the latest, since none of the characteristic Middle Bronze or Hyksos types appear, and everything is "first Semitic". The date we have fixed for the catastrophe of Sodom and Gomorrah, about the early part of the eighteenth century B. C., seems to be exceedingly probable. In any case, there was a great convulsion of nature which destroyed the towns of the Southern Ghor, and made an ineffaceable impression upon the survivors!¹

(11) And now that Abraham has come upon the scene, we must seek that home town of Ur, the domicile of the Abram who at direction of God

¹Albright, *The Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research*, Vol. VI, p. 66.

went out "not knowing whither he went" and set agoing all that wonderful train of providential events which we have been tracing. But who can tell that story? It has become so wonderful that the men of sober science doing the work have almost lost their heads in their efforts to give adequate account of the wonders they have found. Though some have questioned the exact identification of Ur, and it may be that it is not positive, yet that question scarcely affects the significance of the remarkable things found. If they be not from Ur, they are from the same region, represent the same civilization, and go back equally far beyond the time of Abram and reveal to us that ancient world for as long *before* Abram as Abram was before our Lord or we are since His time. So insistent has been the assertion that the earliest times must represent a very crude state of culture, that we must all confess to some feeling of disappointed expectation to say the least, when the civilization of Abram's day turns out to be quite comparable to the marvels supplied from the sands of Egypt, and we stand aghast when it appears that 2000 years before Abram's day there was a culture which, at its best loses nothing in comparison with the finest works of art of the Egyptian and the Greek world. The farther back toward the flood the excavations penetrate, the more remarkable is the evidence of culture. The jewelry, the decorations, the implements and weapons in pure gold, even razors of gold hardened to a cutting edge! They not only possessed a skill unsurpassed, but discoveries in metallurgy of which we are totally ignorant. We begin to get a hint of the marvels of antediluvian civilization. For is not this as it ought to be? The post-diluvians did not begin at the beginning; they were not primitive men, they inherited the civilization of the early world which the flood swept away. In the wonders of Ur, in the stupendous architecture of some of the south sea islands, perhaps even in the marvels of the Mayas and the Incas, and the cave temple of the Island of Sicily, we got hints of the great world which the flood of Noah destroyed. Some day we will learn more, and more definitely about it.

VI

Such is the witness which the field work in Bible lands is giving to the historicity, the entire trustworthiness, of the Biblical narratives; such the answer the archæologist is able to give to the fundamental question of the whole Biblical controversy. Is the Biblical story true? or does our faith rest only on the shifting sands of legend and folklore? Such also is the scientific character of the answer the archæologist is able to give. "A lot of imagination about it." Yes, but it is scientific imagination; the historical imagination which sees things as they were, not that sees things that never were; the mathematical imagination of the surveyor with his compass and his level, and of the pottery expert whose science is today as accurate as any other historical science. Wherever the pottery test can be applied to the narratives of the Bible they are found

to be correct. Such is the value of the evidence that is moving one theological seminary after another to the work of Biblical archæology and the training of specialists who shall study and read the message of the potsherds, and to collect great museums of Bible lands' antiquities that every man sent out to preach the Bible message will have an ineffaceable impression of the trustworthiness of the Book.

One little fact may overturn the most splendid and alarming theory. It is but a short time since the wonderful discoveries of skeletons deep under geological strata in France, were seized upon by the anthropologists to demonstrate to us the fabulous age of man upon earth, going away back into geological time! It did look terrifying. Is it any wonder high school young folks become a bit skeptical when confronted with such things? But nothing more is being said of those skeletons. Why? The eager anthropologists are not shouting the explanation, but here it is. Some more skeletons were found in the same strata; one of them that of a young girl, and on her wrist a *Roman bracelet!* Of like character and to like end are the artifacts from Bible lands. Now will anyone ask, "Why the archæologist"?

IF YOU ONLY KNEW

That the League makes no organized appeals or "drives" for funds but simply informs friends of its needs—

That frequently the first contributions of each month come from students who have had to—literally had to "pinch" in order that the League work, which is their work in a very strict sense, might continue—

That this past summer a young lady missionary on furlough decided to help meet emergency needs in the League by applying the proceeds from the sale of bonds left to her, rather than "reinvesting it in the world," as she said—

WOULD YOU NOT HELP?

The EVANGELICAL STUDENT needs more subscribers, and the League which it so faithfully represents merits your continued support. The magazine is not self-supporting. Help make it so!

In this issue you will find inserted a subscription blank, with spaces for listing the names of friends whom you think would be interested in our work and who would like literature.

Use the blank for your own subscription or that of a friend.

THE LEAGUE OF EVANGELICAL STUDENTS