

All Rights Reserved By HDM For This Digital Publication
Copyright 1993 -- 2005 Holiness Data Ministry

Duplication of this disc (CD or DVD) by any means is forbidden,
and copies of individual files must be made in accordance with
the restrictions stated in the B4UCopy.txt file on this disc.

VOICES FROM ROCKS AND DUST HEAPS OF BIBLE LANDS
By Jasper Abraham Huffman

"If these shall hold their peace, the stones will cry out" (Luke 19:40).

Revised and Enlarged
Illustrated

The Standard Press
Marion, Indiana

At This Edition Of The Book Was Published,
Jasper Abraham Huffman was:
Dean of Religion, Taylor University
And President, Winona Lake School
Of Theology (Summer Sessions)

Books By The Same Author:
Building The Home Christian
The Messianic Hope In Both Testaments
A Guide To The Study Of The Old And New Testaments
Redemption Completed
Upper Room Messages
Job, A World Example
Youth And The Christ Way
With Christ During Passion Week
The Holy Spirit

Copyright 1943
The Standard Press

First Edition, 1928
Revised Edition, 1943

Printed In The United States Of America
By The Light And Life Press
Winona Lake, Indiana

* * * * *

Digital Edition 10/24/05
By Holiness Data Ministry

* * * * *

DEDICATION

To all men and women, everywhere, who earnestly seek to come into possession of a more thorough knowledge of the Bible, this volume is hopefully dedicated.

* * * * *

GRAPHICS WITH THIS PUBLICATION (In The Graphics Folder)

hdm2488a.jpg = Book Cover -- Author Picture

hdm2488b.jpg = The Rosetta Stone

hdm2488c.jpg = The Behistun Inscription

hdm2488d.jpg = Clay Tablets

hdm2488e.jpg = The Moabite Stone

hdm2488f.jpg = Fragment Of The 6th Tablet Of The Babylonian Creation Series

hdm2488g.jpg = The So-Called Adam And Eve Seal

hdm2488h.jpg = The Deluge Tablet

hdm2488i.jpg = A Portion Of The Code Of Hammurabi

hdm2488j.jpg = King Hammurabi And The (So-Called) Sun-god

hdm2488k.jpg = Papyrus Page 1 -- III Century

* * * * *

CONTENTS

Introduction By M. G. Kyle
Foreword

01 --A Strange Key Which Unlocked An Ancient Civilization

- 02 -- One Of The World's Oldest Signboards
- 03 -- The Old Testament On Trial Before Odd-Appearing Witnesses
- 04 -- Babylonian Stories Of The Creation And The Fall
- 05 -- The Babylonian Flood Story
- 06 -- The World's Oldest Code Of Laws, The Code Of Hammurabi
- 07 -- Tutankhamen And The Exodus
- 08 -- Light On The Language Of The New Testament
- 09 -- The Place Of Pottery In The Science Of Archaeology

* * * * *

INTRODUCTION

Whoever presents the great facts of either science or religion in popular language renders a distinct service, and when one presents both science and religion at the same time he renders a double service. It is this latter which Dr. Huffman has done, and done well, in his brochure on Biblical Archaeology. The few great facts which he has chosen to present are so selected as both to whet curiosity and inspire confidence, and so prepare the way for the study of all that Archaeology brings to bear upon the Bible.

One does not need to agree with all that Dr. Huffman says to commend his book. Though his view of the time of the Exodus seems to me to have insuperable difficulties, there are difficulties at whatever point in Egyptian history that event be placed. Moreover, he makes out a stronger case than usual for the earlier date.

The brevity of the book is one of its greatest merits, for it is intended only as an appetizer. The reader who begins with this taste will surely go on to a full meal.

M. G. Kyle
Xenia Theological Seminary

* * * * *

FOREWORD

The time has come when not only the ministry, but the laity as well, must be informed upon the interesting subject of Archaeology. From the platform and by the press the facts of ancient things are being pressed upon the people. How shall these things be evaluated in their relation to the Bible and religion?

Few have the opportunity to consult the heavier works on the subject, and still fewer are privileged to make first-hand investigation; therefore the necessity of a volume of this nature.

This book is not intended as a critical treatment of the subject of Archaeology, but as a practical discussion for the common folk, to make clear what contribution the youthful science of Archaeology makes to our knowledge of the Bible. Few technical terms are employed, and the

aim has been to write so that the least informed may find pleasure and profit in reading. The confessed aim of the volume is to inspire increased faith in the Book of Books, whose historical statements Archaeology so abundantly corroborates.

Grateful acknowledgment is made for help derived from the following authors in their respective works: Dr. George A. Barton, in *Archaeology and the Bible*; Dr. Ira M. Price, in *The Monuments and the Old Testament*; and Camden S. Coburn, in *The New Archaeological Discoveries and their Bearing upon the New Testament*.

It is the hope of the author that this brief introduction to Biblical Archaeology will inspire some to pursue a more thorough study of the exceedingly interesting subject.

Very sincerely,
J. A. Huffman

* * * * *

FOREWORD TO SECOND EDITION

When the first edition of this volume was prepared, it was intended as a mere introduction to the subject of Biblical Archaeology, written with as few technical terms as possible, to accommodate those beginning their quests into this exceedingly interesting field. This purpose the volume has served well.

In the meantime the interest in Archaeology has continued to increase, until the claim is made for it, that waiving war periods, and second only to crime, it has come to take its place of interest on platform and in the press. Because of its contribution as a valuable science, institutions of learning have added the subject to their curricula in increasing numbers.

The scripture quotations used in this volume are taken from the American Standard Version.

This edition contains a large number of revisions throughout, and an entirely new chapter on "The Place of Pottery in the Science of Archaeology." It is hoped that this revised volume will serve an even better place in the study of Biblical Archaeology than did its predecessor.

J. A. Huffman
Taylor University
May 1, 1943

* * * * *

01 -- A STRANGE KEY WHICH UNLOCKED AN ANCIENT CIVILIZATION

Covered with the dust of centuries lay an ancient civilization. So completely had it disappeared that little was known concerning it except that it once existed. Had it not been for

one single book, the Bible, which contained references to this nation, men might have trodden its ruins under their feet with scarcely a suspicion of its one-time greatness. This civilization was Egypt, in the valley of the Nile.

It is with the unlocking of the door to this ancient civilization and the "key" with which it was accomplished, that this chapter is concerned. It is not for the sake of Egypt alone that such intense interest is taken in her, but for the sake of other nations whose histories are entwined with hers. Biblical references to Egypt are incidental and are due to the contact of the Hebrew nation with her.

Two factors combined to make the preservation of the antiquities of ancient Egypt almost perfect. First, the architecture was principally of stone, which would not decay; and, second, the absence of rainfall and frost made the preservation of perishable things possible.

It was not until about the seventeenth century that European travelers began to bring home with them Egyptian relics. Strange writing was seen on the walls of temple ruins, but no one could read it; therefore it aroused little interest. The past was "locked;" and there was no known key with which to unlock it.

* * *

Discovery Of The Rosetta Stone

[See hdm2488b.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

It was in 1798-09, when Napoleon, accompanied by a group of scholars and artists, visited Egypt, that the Rosetta Stone, which proved to be the "key" to the ancient Egyptian civilization, was found. While excavating at Rosetta, near the mouth of the Nile, one of Napoleon's party, a French engineer named Boussard, found a strange stone. That was in the year 1799. The stone was granite, black in color, described as 21 feet 9 inches in height, 2 feet 4 1/2 inches in width, and 11 inches thick. The upper portion and lower right corners were broken off.

On this stone were inscriptions in three languages, and in three registers, one above the other. The upper register had fourteen lines; the middle one thirty-two and the lower one twenty-eight. The language in the lower register was the Greek, which could be easily read, but the two other languages were not known to any living persons. The language in the upper register was just like that seen on temple ruins everywhere, but was meaningless, as none could read it.

For years various scholars attempted to decipher the two unknown languages, but without avail. What was written in the Greek could be read, but, as Dr. Price says, the lines in the upper registers remained a "riddle." The reading of the Greek register disclosed the fact that the stone was a monument set up by some priests about 195 B.C. in honor of Ptolemy V., their ruler, for having canceled certain priestly taxes and having restored the priests to their places in the temple. But the reading of the Greek lines was of little consequence and unlocked no door to the

secrets which lay beneath the ruins. It was the language in the upper register of the Rosetta Stone which had to be deciphered before that bolted door would be unlocked.

* * *

Decipherment Of The Rosetta Stone

In the year 1818, a Frenchman, Champollion, set himself to the task of decipherment. A happy thought occurred to him, Perhaps what was written in the lower register in Greek was written in the upper registers in the strange languages. Proceeding upon that assumption Champollion labored long and arduously to decipher the unknown languages. Using the known Greek as a basis; he deciphered the two other languages and within four years (1822) announced his discovery to the world.

The results of the decipherment of the Rosetta Stone were far reaching. It was found that the inscription in the upper register was the hieroglyphic Egyptian (ancient picture writing), and that the writing in the middle register was demotic Egyptian (a conventionalized picture language developed from the hieroglyphic). What was written upon the stone was of little consequence or interest; but the arrangement made possible the decipherment of the language of the ancient inscriptions, thus unlocking that old civilization to living men. Then the inscriptions on temple walls, in tombs, and everywhere in Egypt could be read. It only remained for man to excavate, explore, and translate.

Within a few decades Egypt was the scene of much activity. Explorers were at work digging out the ruins, and scholars were deciphering the inscriptions. The youthful science of Archaeology was at work extracting from those heaps of ruins testimonies concerning vanished centuries and bygone millenniums. Thus a history of Egypt has been constructed and a fair knowledge gained of times and peoples for centuries forgotten. Many of the statements of the Bible, the only book which reached back to that day, have been corroborated by these silent witnesses of the long ago.

The Rosetta Stone now rests in the British Museum, having been surrendered by the French to the British in the adjustment of their differences in 1802. The visitor, as he beholds this stone, carefully covered by a glass case, is looking upon a "key," strange to be sure, but, nevertheless, upon the "key" which unlocked the ancient civilization of the Nile Valley.

* * * * *

02 -- ONE OF THE WORLD'S OLDEST SIGN-BOARDS

[See hdm2488c.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

The sign-boards seen along the public highways and streets today bear no comparison, in antiquity or importance, to the one in which we are here interested.

* * *

The Behistun Inscription

This ancient sign-board, called the Behistun Inscription, is carved into the flattened and smoothed rock limestone surface of one of the Zagros Mountains, in Persia, a peak which rises about seventeen hundred feet above the level plain. This mountain is on the caravan route between Baghdad and Teheran. Below the inscription is a large spring, where it is said that every caravan and army which passed from Persia to Babylonia drank. Darius I, the king of Persia, whose achievements are there chronicled, was a shrewd advertiser.

The inscription dates back a little more than five hundred years before Christi making it about two thousand four hundred years old. It was discovered in 1835 by Henry C. Rawlinson, an English army officer on duty in Persia. Upon discovering it, Mr. Rawlinson began to sense the possible importance of the inscription. He determined to copy it, with a view to its translation.

The story of Mr. Rawlinson's work of copying the records is one of heroic endeavor and worthy achievement. The inscription is about five hundred feet from the base of the cliff, and a fearful chasm of approximately 350 feet yawns just beneath it. Immediately below the inscription there is a ledge of rock about fourteen inches wide; but parts of the edges of this ledge had crumbled away as a result of erosion, making its use extremely dangerous. But Mr. Rawlinson, assisted by natives, succeeded through a period of four years in copying the entire inscription. Sometimes he would stand upon the ledge; sometimes he would work upon a ladder, the base of which rested upon the ledge, and which was steadied by an attendant; at other times he was suspended in a swing before the columns of writing which he was copying.

In the picture the artist represents Mr. Rawlinson standing upon the top of the ladder, which is being held upon the ledge by someone. Various schemes were devised, and through courageous effort, painstaking labor, and hazards of such fearful character that few would have been willing to brave them, the task was finally completed.

The reading of the inscription, after it had been copied, proved to be a longer task and even more difficult than the copying. There were nine panels -- five in the Persian language, three which proved to be Median or Susian, while the other one of the nine was in the ancient Babylonian. At the upper right corner there is a panel containing a picture of Darius receiving homage from a group of military captives who have ropes about their necks. The writing was found to be of cuneiform, or wedge-shaped characters, making all the columns difficult to read. It was not until the year 1857, twenty-two years after its discovery, that Mr. Rawlinson completed the translation. He had spent much of his time during that long period working upon this translation.

* * *

Value Of The Behistun Inscription To Archaeology

The contents of the inscription were of comparatively little interest, being records of the military achievements of Darius I, king of Persia. Their interest and value consisted in the fact that the deciphering enabled scholars to read the other ancient records of the civilization of the Euphrates and Tigris Valleys. It was, indeed, the key which unlocked the history of the very ancient peoples, apart from which we would have no knowledge of them except through incidental references in the Old Testament.

Like the Rosetta Stone, which unlocked ancient Egypt, this inscription also contained three languages, one known to modern scholars, and two unknown. Again, as in the case of the Rosetta Stone, what was written in the one language was written in all three languages. As Champollion deciphered the Rosetta Stone by reading the Greek register, so Rawlinson deciphered the Behistun inscriptions by reading the Persian, figuring out the unknown languages on the basis of the known. Other scholars worked upon the translation of the inscriptions from time to time and verified the work of Rawlinson, but the honor of the translation belongs to one man, who also discovered it -- the Englishman, Rawlinson.

It is difficult for the average person to appreciate the value of the discovery and translation of the Behistun Inscription. Its paramount interest for the Christian student consists in the fact that it made possible the construction of an Assyrian and Babylonian history corroborating many references made to these people in the Old Testament. As there was no history, apart from the Bible, which dated back farther than four hundred years before Christ, critics took the liberty to question and even dispute the statement, made in the Bible concerning these nations. A history of these peoples has now been written from the inscriptions found on palace walls, monuments, and clay tablets, which first corroborates and then supplements the sacred record -- the Bible. This achievement was made possible by the deciphering of the Behistun Inscription.

Without this key the literature of Babylonia and Assyria, not the least among which was the great library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh with its thirty thousand "volumes" -- not volumes as we know them, but volumes of clay tablets, cones and cylinders, discovered by an Englishman, Hormuzd Rassam, in 1854. Much of the work of the deciphering of these Babylonian and Assyrian documents is accredited to George Smith, an officer of the British Museum. Smith began working about 1872 and continued through a number of years. From the library came the Babylonian Story of Creation, the Babylonian Flood Story, called the Gilgamesh Epic, and a great amount of other interesting and enlightening literature, all inscribed, of course, on clay tablets and cylinders in cuneiform characters. This is looked upon as one of the most important archaeological finds ever made, for into this library had been gathered copies of Babylonian and Assyrian literature reaching back to the earliest time in their history.

Ashurbanipal, King of Assyria, who reigned from 668-624 B. C., appears to have been obsessed with a desire to include in his great library all the literature of the past, and while in their written form these accounts may date back only to the seventh or eighth centuries before Christ, they were doubtless handed down from generation to generation, orally, from a much earlier time.

Were it not for the Behistun key, providentially discovered and painstakingly deciphered, this great library would mean no more than so many clay tablets, cones and cylinders curiously arranged. Were it not for the Behistun inscription such work as is now going on in ancient Babylonia and Assyria could not have been undertaken, for it would have been well-nigh meaningless. The inscriptions of Ur of the Chaldees, the original home of Abraham, which have been recently excavated by representatives of the British Museum would yield nothing of definite information had the language of the country never been unlocked. Without this key the voices which now speak out from the mounds and dust heaps of ancient Babylonia and Assyria would be as silent as they had been for more than two millenniums.

Dr. Price, in his book, *The Monuments and the Old Testament*, claims that the discovery and deciphering of the Behistun Inscription is the greatest achievement ever made in the field of language or archaeology; that it was as great a discovery in the field of history as the telegraph in the commercial world; and in this he is quite correct. Note the following interesting lines from Dr. Price: "There lay the supposed old civilizations of the Mesopotamian Valley buried out of the sight of man for thousands of years. Its former inhabitants were unknown. Its mighty empires were apparently blotted from the pages of history. Its relations with outside nations were known only through hints here and there. In fact, it was only a shadow, with the Old Testament alone to point to a possible greatness. But what now? This achievement in the translation of the cuneiform inscriptions gives us at one stroke a whole valley full of thrifty cities, well-organized governments, conquering armies, and world-wide rulers. They are all made to step out upon the stage and play their most important role in the drama of ancient nations."

This quotation beautifully summarizes the facts of the case and shows why the Behistun Inscription is not merely one of the world's oldest sign-boards, but, at the same time, one of the world's most important signboards, pointing the people of modern times back with certainty to the people and events where the curtain of beginning history lifts.

* * * * *

03 -- THE OLD TESTAMENT ON TRIAL BEFORE ODD-APPEARING WITNESSES

[See hdm2488d.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

To most people it seems strange that any portion of the Holy Bible should be placed on trial. But such is the case. The Old Testament especially is being submitted to a grueling test at the hands of the prosecutors, the critics. The question is: "What will be the outcome of the trial to which the Old Testament is being submitted?"

One of the chief witnesses for the defense is the youthful but interesting science of archaeology. It speaks a silent, but powerful word for or against the Book. Which will it be? In fact, its evidence must be translated from the inscriptions on walls of temples and tombs, from pillars erected millenniums ago, and even from clay tablets, queer-looking as those portrayed on page 31. From wherever these testimonies are gathered the characters used in the writing are much the same -- either the hieroglyphic, picture writing, or the cuneiform (the wedge-shaped

characters). Those shown in the illustration are the cuneiform. It is with these odd-appearing witnesses and what they say that we are interested.

The word "Archaeology" is compounded of two Greek words, *arxai* (arkae) and *logos* meaning words about the beginning. It is, then, the science of ancient things. The materials with which archaeology has to deal are architecture, monuments, inscriptions, art, implements, customs, pottery, and, in fact, everything which can be found in the ruins of ancient times. Pottery, itself, is discovered to be of such importance in relation to the subject that an entire chapter, the closing one of this volume, is devoted to it.

The tomb of Tutankhamen, discovered in Egypt by Lord Carnavon and Howard Carter, in the early twenties of this century, affords an illustration of the materials with which archaeology has to deal. It was an undisturbed tomb dating back to the fourteenth century before Christ, making its contents considerably more than three thousand years old. It was not likely that anything would be found in the tomb of Tutankhamen which would have any direct bearing upon the Bible, for he belonged to the latter part of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, a period after the Israelites had left Egypt; but his tomb, with its implements, furniture, jewels, art, vessels, food deposits, etc., is an illustration of the materials with which archaeology has to deal.

There is a close relation between archaeology and the Bible, for upon these two sources we are entirely dependent for our knowledge of the most ancient peoples and their history. Concerning this fact Professor Delitzsch in his volume *Babel and Bible* says: "The Old Testament formed a world by itself till far into the last century. It spoke of times whose latest limits the age of classical antiquity barely reached, and of nations that have met either with none or with only the most cursory allusion from the Greeks and Romans. The Bible was the whole source of our knowledge of the history of hither Asia prior to 550 B.C. But now the walls that formed the impenetrable background to the scenes of the Old Testament have suddenly fallen, and a keen, invigorating air and a flood of light from the Orient pervades and irradiates the hoary book, animating and illuminating it the more as Hebrew antiquity is linked together from beginning to end with Babylonia and Assyria."

* * *

Archaeology Corroborates The Bible

What, then, is the testimony of archaeology to the historical trustworthiness and accuracy of the Bible? This is the question which I propose to answer. If archaeology corroborates the statements of the Bible, by that silent but powerful testimony it witnesses to its trustworthiness. Believers do not need such evidence to prove their Bible true, but they welcome everything which corroborates its records. Such corroborations stimulate faith and convince the unbelieving.

* * *

Proves Writing An Ancient Art

First of all archaeology puts to rest forever the contention that Moses could not have written the Pentateuch because the art of writing was unknown in his day.

The fact is now settled beyond dispute that the art of writing was highly developed a thousand years before the days of Moses. The author has in his possession several clay tablets written in the Babylonian cuneiform, which date further back than 2000 B.C. The accompanying pictures are fair representations of the cuneiform clay tablets. They are illustrations of the highly developed condition of the art of writing long before the days of Moses. The code of Hammurabi, who has been identified with Amraphel of Genesis 14, is the oldest code of laws in existence. It dates to about 2100 B.C. This code of laws is a fine testimony to the practice of writing long before the time of Moses. No intelligent person will ever again argue against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch on the grounds formerly argued, that the art of writing was unknown in the day of Moses, except it be a case of ignorance or of genuine dishonesty.

* * *

Proves Existence Of Cities

Again, archaeology has proved the existence of certain cities which were mentioned in the Bible, but which critics argued never existed. Less than a century ago bold and daring men went so far as to say that no such cities as Nineveh, Babylon, Lachish, and so forth, had ever existed. But workmen have, with mattock and spade, and directed by the explorer, excavated these very cities; their identity has been established beyond a possible doubt, and their ruins stand as silent but powerful testimonies to the historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament records.

* * *

Proves Existence Of Hittites

Then, too, archaeology has borne witness to the existence of certain peoples mentioned in the Old Testament. A people called Hittites are mentioned in connection with the history of Palestine. It was from Ephron the Hittite that Abraham purchased the cave of Machpelah in which he buried Sarah; so the Bible tells us in Genesis 23:10, 16. Though the Hittites are mentioned more than two score times in the Old Testament, critics have argued that no such people ever existed, characterizing the mention of them by the Scriptures as "tales of Oriental fiction." Imagine the chagrin of those critics to find that archaeology discloses not only the existence of such a people, with a nation in Palestine, but that a great Hittite empire stretched all the way from upper Mesopotamia almost to the Aegean Sea!

The capital cities of the Hittites, Carchemish and Boghas Koi, have been excavated; their language deciphered; their code of laws read and compared with other ancient codes; and their civilization has become well known.

Although archaeological remains are not usually found above ground, the author of this book has seen many Hittite building remnants in present use in Syria. They were quarried out of

sites of ancient cities and casually employed without being recognized as Hittite remains. He photographed a stone which bore a Hittite inscription, builded into the foundation of a modern mosque in Aleppo, Syria. It was used not at all because it was recognized as a Hittite stone, but merely because it filled a needed place in the wall.

* * *

Corroborates The Account Of Brick-Making

Archaeology corroborates the experiences Of the Israelites in Egypt described in the fifth chapter of Exodus. Here we are told that the Israelites as slaves were compelled to make brick. At first the straw with which the clay was mixed to adhere until the bricks were baked in the sun was furnished them. Later they were compelled to go and gather stubble for this purpose, but still later they were compelled to make brick without any straw.

Naville, the explorer, tells us that when he excavated Pithom, one of the ancient treasure cities, he found brick in its walls made with the use of a liberal quantity of straw, some with less straw, and some without any straw.

In this discovery of Pithom lay a snare as well as a corroboration. The process of brick-making disclosed here did corroborate the art of brick-making mentioned in the Bible. But since the name of the Egyptian Pharaoh, Rameses II, was found on some of the bricks, Naville concluded that this treasure city, Pithom, had been built in the reign of Rameses II, and that he had been the Pharaoh of the Oppression, which would mean that the Exodus occurred during the thirteenth century.

By subsequent examination, however, it has been discovered that Rameses II had not built Pithom, but repaired it, and as an ardent plagiarist, had assumed the credit by inscribing his name upon the bricks used in the work of repair.

It is now believed that the cities later called Rameses and Pithom, were built by Ahmes I (Ahmose) of the 18th dynasty, who arose and overthrew the foreign dynasty of the Hyksos, erected these fortifications against the return of the Hyksos, and began the oppression of the Israelites, in the late 16th century. B.C.

* * *

Explains Israel's Varied Treatment

An explanation is afforded by archaeology concerning the varied kinds of treatment which the Hebrews received in Egypt. At first they were the favorites of the king and were granted the most fertile part of Egypt, the land of Goshen, in which to reside and to pasture their flocks and herds. Toward the close of their stay they were the oppressed slaves. Dr. Kyle refers to the radical turning of their fortunes as being "from court to corvee," meaning from the court party to lowest of slaves.

The Biblical explanation of this change is found in the statement, "A king arose who knew not Joseph" (Exod. 1:8), but it remains for archaeology to interpret this verse. A tribe of Asiatics called "Hyksos" had swooped down upon Egypt, taking advantage of a weak and unsettled political condition, and had seized the throne and placed one of their number upon it. This had happened several hundred years before the Hebrews went down into Egypt, probably about 2000 B.C., so that when the Hebrews came they found one of these Hyksos, or "shepherd kings," as they are called, ruling as the Pharaoh of Egypt. As Asiatics, and possibly Semites, having some things in common with the Hebrews, and not being native Egyptians, they accorded the foreigners a heartier welcome and were more willing to share Egypt's most fertile lands with them than the Egyptians would have done.

The new king who arose and who knew not Joseph was likely a native Egyptian of the early eighteenth dynasty, after the Hyksos kings had been driven out. Fearing lest these Hebrews might increase and become strong enough to seize the throne as the Hyksos had done, they were accorded oppressive treatment by the new Egyptian Pharaoh.

The king who arose, who "knew not Joseph" is now believed to have been Ahmes, referred to in a preceding paragraph.

This same fact affords an explanation for the puzzling admonition of Joseph to his brethren when preparing them for introduction to Pharaoh. He told them to say, "Thy servants are shepherds" and the comment immediately follows, "For every shepherd is an abomination to the Egyptians," Genesis 46:34. Why should Joseph instruct his brethren to introduce themselves to the Pharaoh as shepherds if every shepherd was an abomination to the Egyptians? Simply because the Pharaoh to whom they were about to be introduced was not an Egyptian at all, but a shepherd king.

* * *

The Moabite Stone Testifies

[See hdm2488e.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

Another testimony to the historical trustworthiness of the Bible is found in the Moabite Stone, which was discovered in 1868 at Dibon (now called Dhiban) on the north shore of the river Arnon, by Rev. F. A. Klein, a missionary. It was erected by Mesha, king of Moab, to the god Chemosh, about 850 B.C., and commemorates Moab's deliverance from Israel's domination.

The inscription is written in the Hebrew language, and is characterized by Dr. Geo. L. Robinson in his volume, *The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament*, as "the very first important Hebrew inscription ever found in Palestine; the longest and, in many respects, the most important of all."

Unfortunately the stone was broken into pieces by the superstitious natives when they discovered the anxiety of the Germans and French to come into possession of it; but all of the

pieces were finally secured by the expenditure of much time and money, and the Frenchman, Clermont-Ganneau, reset the fragments. The stone may be seen in the Louvre in Paris.

This stone is a veritable supplement to brief portions of the Books of the Kings (I Kings 16:23-28; II Kings 3:4, 5). While there are details in each account which are not given in the other, they supplement each other well. The Moabite Stone is characterized by Price as "the finest old inscription so akin to Hebrew yet found."

The following lines from the Moabite Stone are taken from Price's *The Monuments and the Old Testament*:

* * *

Moabite Stone Record

1 I (am) Meshah, son of Chemoshmelek, King of Moab, the Dibonite.

2 My father ruled over Moab thirty years, and I ruled after my father.

3 And I prepared this monument for Chemosh at Korkhah.

4 A monument (to celebrate) deliverance, because he saved me from all invaders, and because he let me see (my desire) upon all mine enemies.

5 Omri (was) king of Israel, and he oppressed Moab many days, for Chemosh was angry with his land.

6 His son succeeded him, and he also said, "I will oppress Moab."

7 In my days said he (thus): I will see my desire on him and his house, and Israel perished with everlasting loss.

8 And Omri took possession of the land of Mehedeba, and dwelt therein during his days, and half the days of his son, forty years.

9 But Chemosh restored it in my days. I built Baal-Meon, and constructed in it a pool (?),

10 And I built Kirjathan. The Gadites had dwelt in the land from ancient times, and the king of Israel had built for himself Ataroth;

11 But I warred against the city and took it.

12 And I slew all (the inhabitants of) the city, a spectacle for Chemosh and for Moab.

13 And I carried off thence the arel of Dodeh, and I dragged it before Chemosh in Keriioth.

14 And I caused to dwell therein the men of Sharon and the men of Meheroth.

15 And Chemosh said to me: Go take Nebo against Israel.

16 And I went by night and fought against it from early dawn until high noon.

17 And I took it and slew all of it, seven thousand men and women, and... female slaves; for to Ashtor-Chemosh I had devoted it.

18 And I took thence the arels (altars) of Jehovah, and dragged them before Chemosh.

Record From The Books Of The Kings

"In the thirty and first year of Asa king of Judah began Omri to reign over Israel, and reigned twelve years: six years reigned he in Tirzah. And he bought the hill Samaria of Shemer for two talents of silver, and built on the hill, and called the name of the city which he built, after the name of Shemer, owner of the hill, Samaria. And Omri did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah and dealt wickedly above all that were before him. For he walked in all the way of Jeroboam the son of Nebat, and in his sins wherewith he made Israel to sin to provoke Jehovah the God of Israel to anger with their vanities. Now the rest of the acts of Omri which he did, and his might that he showed, are they not written in the books of the chronicles of the kings of Israel? So Omri slept with his fathers, and was buried in Samaria: and Ahab his son reigned in his stead." -- I Kings 16:23-28.

"Now Mesha king of Moab was a sheepmaster, and rendered unto the king of Israel the wool of an hundred thousand lambs, and of a hundred rams. But it came to pass, when Ahab was dead, that the king of Moab rebelled against the king of Israel." -- II Kings 3:4, 5.

Several points in the Moabite record corroborate the Scripture records:

1. Omri, the sixth king of Israel, is mentioned by name,
2. Moab's vassalage to Israel is conceded in the Moabite record (Lines 5-8).
3. Israel is mentioned six times; four times in the lines printed above, and twice in the lines not printed.
4. Jehovah, the name of Israel's God was known to the Moabite king. (Line 18).
5. Chemosh is also mentioned as Moab's God in Numbers 21:29 and Jeremiah 48:7, 13, 46.

* * *

The Tel-El-Amarna Tablets

The discovery of the Tel-el-Amarna tablets constitutes an interesting story and illustrates the significance of small and apparently trifling, commonplace things, especially in the field of archaeology.

In the year 1887 a peasant woman, digging into the earth at a place called Tel-el-Amarna along the Nile River about two hundred miles south of Cairo, found some clay tablets. It is reported that this woman, the original discoverer, sold her rights for fifty cents. A careful search resulted in finding other tablets to the number of almost four hundred. Because of the discovery of their value, they were subsequently sold at prices ranging from five dollars to seven hundred and fifty dollars each. Eighty of them are now in the British Museum; one hundred eighty in the Berlin Museum; sixty in the Cairo Museum in Egypt; and smaller numbers are scattered elsewhere. Tel-el-Amarna was the capital of Egypt built by Amenophis IV, and these clay tablets were found just where the dust of the centuries had covered up his state records.

These tablets were found to be a series of international correspondence between Amenophis III and Amenophis IV of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, and their Asiatic vassals, including Palestine, around 1400 B.C. The letters were written in Babylonian cuneiform (wedge-shaped) characters, and deal with political conditions, social affairs, exchange of gifts, matters concerning slaves, and other things too numerous to mention here.

The Tel-el-Amarna tablets can scarcely be valued too highly because of the light which they throw upon political conditions of Egypt and Asia generally at that time, but students of the Bible have a peculiar interest in them because of their reference to no less than twenty cities mentioned in the Old Testament and to Jerusalem and its king, who was a vassal of Egypt.

One of the letters written by Ebed-Hepha, king of Jerusalem, to Amenophis IV will be quoted. The date of this letter is set at about 1360 B.C. These letters have a very direct bearing upon Bible history, and for that reason a typical one of them is copied here. According to George A. Barton the letter reads as follows:

"To the king, my lord, speak, saying, Ebed-Hepa, thy servant. At the feet of the king, my lord, seven times and seven times I prostrate myself. Behold the deed which Malkiel and Shuardatu have done against the country of the king, my lord! They have won over the soldiers of Gezer, the soldiers of Gath, and the soldiers of Keilah; they have seized the country of the city of Rubute. The country of the king is fallen away to the Habiri [*Italics mine*]. And now also a city of the country of Jerusalem (its name is Beth-shemesh), a city of the king, has gone over to the men of Keilah. May the king hearken unto Ebed-Hepa, thy servant, and send mercenaries that the land of the king may remain unto the king. If there are no mercenaries, lost is the land of the king to the Habiri. This is the deed which Malkiel and Shuardatu have done... May the king care for his land!"

This letter discloses the fact that the kingdom of Jerusalem, which appears to have included considerable territory, especially to the north, was suffering invasion by a people called the "Habiri." Several cities had fallen away, and Ebed-Hepa frantically begs for mercenaries, or

soldiers, apart from whose coming the country will certainly be lost to the Habiri. Both Jerusalem and the Habiri are frequently mentioned.

Among the various theories as to who the Habiri were, the most likely is, that they were the Hebrews, who either under the leadership of Joshua or one or the other of the Judges, were making conquest of the land. This theory is believed by Dr. George A. Barton, Dr. M. G. Kyle, and others. The reader will detect in the word "Habiri" when pronounced, a similarity to our English word "Hebrews." This similarity must not be pressed dogmatically; nevertheless it is worthy of note.

Of course those who accept an early thirteenth-century date for the Exodus, making Rameses II the Pharaoh of the Oppression and Merneptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus, not only have difficulty in identifying the Habiri with the Hebrews, but in identifying them at all.

If the earlier date for the Exodus is accepted, making Thothmes III and Amenophis II of the eighteenth dynasty, the Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus respectively, the Habiri may well have been the Hebrews who were conquering Canaan and were even threatening Jerusalem itself. Every student of the Old Testament is aware of the fact, however, that Jerusalem was not taken by the Hebrews until the days of David, at which time it was in the hands of the Jebusites, from whom David took it, about 1050 B.C.

Thus the Tel-el-Amarna letters mirror political conditions in Palestine exactly like those described in the Old Testament, and if the Habiri were the Hebrew people, they supplement the Biblical record of the conquering of Canaan by them.

* * *

The Results Of The Trial

The Old Testament has been on trial, and witness after witness has appeared -- odd-looking enough, indeed, they have been -- and each has left his testimony. What is the result of the trial? The reader may, himself, be the judge.

It is only fair to say that the witnesses are not exhausted. There are others, too numerous to be heard here, who would certainly contribute their testimony to the trustworthiness and historical accuracy of the Old Testament. Let it be said in conclusion, however, that in all of the developments of the science of archaeology up to the present hour not a single thing has been discovered which contradicts the Word of God, but there have been found many things which corroborate the Bible and testify to its historical trustworthiness.

* * * * *

04 -- BABYLONIAN STORIES OF THE CREATION AND THE FALL

[See hdm2488f.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

Archaeological explorations have in the last several decades brought to light some very interesting ancient documents. Some of these documents have a more or less direct relation to some Biblical accounts, and it is my purpose to make a comparison of several of these documents with the Book of Genesis and other sections of the Old Testament, to show that although these stories are not to be trusted as accounts of the events which they purport to describe, their very existence and in some measure their details corroborate the Biblical accounts. Inasmuch as school boys and girls are hearing of these stories, and they are being referred to in various magazines and from many platforms, every person should know about them.

* * *

A Babylonian Epic Of Creation

This epic of creation has been translated from clay tablets of cuneiform inscription which were found in the library of Ashurbanipal, by an Englishman, George Smith, when this ancient library was unearthed in 1872. It is believed to have been circulated in Babylonia and Assyria about the seventh century B.C. although the story itself may be older. It is a poem, and was written on seven tablets, with an average of about 140 lines each.

Scholars quite generally agree that there is some relation between this ancient document and the creation account in Genesis, the first chapter, but they hold various shades of opinion as to what the relation is.

A few lines given here from several of the tablets are taken from George A. Barton's translation, in *Archaeology and the Bible*. Some of the lines, especially on the first, second, fifth, and sixth tablets, are so broken that a complete translation cannot be made; but enough remains to make intelligible the trend of the narrative.

Then, too, the poem contains much that is irrelevant to the creation story, particularly an account of a contest between the gods; but certain of its lines impress the reader with their similarity to the Genesis account of creation. These are chiefly the ones given here.

Tablet I

1. Time was when above -- heaven was not named
2. Below to the earth -- no name was given.
3. Then the primeval Abyss -- their begetter.
4. The roaring Sea -- who bore them,--
5. Their waters -- together were mingled;
6. No field had been formed -- no marsh-land seen.

7. When no gods -- had ever been honored,
8. No name was formed -- no destiny fixed,
9. Gods were created -- in their midst.

Tablet V

1. He (Marduk) ordained the stations of the great gods;
2. As stars their likenesses as constellations of the zodiac he placed.
3. He ordained the year, into parts he divided it,
4. For the twelve months he established three stars.

Tablet VI

1. Marduk, the word of the gods, when he heard it,
2. His heart was stirred, he formed a brilliant plan.
3. He opened his mouth, to Ea he spoke,
4. What in his heart he had conceived he offered as a plan;
5. "Blood will I bind, bone will I fashion,
6. I will produce a man; 'man' is his name;
7. I will create the man 'man';
8. Verily by the service of the gods he shall give them rest;...

* * *

Similarities

The first two lines of the first tablet remind one of the phrase in Genesis 1:1, "In the beginning," or as the Hebrew correctly translated reads, "In beginning." It is evident that the Babylonian account purports to be giving a narrative of the beginning of things -- creation.

Both accounts assume that the primeval chaos consisted of a mass of waters. The Hebrew account calls it "t'-hom" (one syllable), while the Babylonians called it "tiamat." The two words are supposed to be the same in these two closely related languages.

In Genesis we are told that "the Spirit of God moved (Hebrew, brooded) upon the face of the waters." In the Babylonian epic, the waters, which were thought to be of two genders, were embosomed. In both, it is the beginning of the creative process which is being represented.

Both accounts agree in that the earth and the heavens were formed by division of the primeval ocean by a firmament, called in the Babylonian a covering, which held up a part of the water, so that the earth could be formed beneath. This feature of the two narratives, together with their agreement as to a primeval chaos, has been the strongest argument in favor of a kinship of some sort between the two accounts.

In the fifth tablet mention is made of the placing of stars as constellations of the zodiac. These stars are said to be likenesses of the great gods. Mention is also made of the dividing of the year into twelve parts.

The sixth tablet contains an account of the creation of man, for the purpose, it appears, that the gods might be worshipped. Man, everywhere and at all times, insists upon asking from whence he came, and here is the answer which the Babylonians gave to that question.

There is, too, as can easily be seen, a striking similarity in the arrangement by sevens. The Babylonian epic is arranged in seven tablets or cantos: the Hebrew account, in seven days.

* * *

Differences

The differences are more marked than the similarities, and may be outlined as follows:

In the Babylonian epic the gods are generated; in Genesis, God is assumed as pre-existent.

Most of the Babylonian details differ from the Genesis account -- only a few are similar.

The religious conceptions of the accounts vary greatly. The Babylonian epic is mythological and polytheistic. Its conception of deity is a degraded one. The gods love, hate, scheme, plot, and destroy. Marduk, the great Babylonian god, is the champion who conquers the other gods after a severe struggle. Genesis, on the other hand, reflects a very exalted idea of Deity, and a pure monotheism.

* * *

Other Accounts

There is a fragmentary account of an Assyrian version of the creation which harmonizes with the Babylonian epic in certain particulars, but which varies from it in others. It is too fragmentary for any real value. There is also an Egyptian creation story which is the basis of one

current among the early Greeks. It varies widely from the Babylonian epic, and, like the others, is mythological, polytheistic, and fully as degraded in its conception of deity. The Chinese also have a creation story which has in it a few similarities to these stories found elsewhere. As the human race, always and everywhere, has insisted upon knowing its origin, we should certainly be disappointed if God had not given us an account of man's creation in the Bible.

* * *

Superiority Of The Genesis Account

The Genesis account is seen to be superior in every respect to the other creation stories. Lange, in his introduction to Genesis, compares the account with all other creation stories, and finds all other ancient cosmogonies the product of the time, whose growth can be observed, whose accretions and deposits of physical, legendary, and mythological matter can be traced by quite definite strata. They have their national colorings and bias, and their attempts at philosophy. The Genesis account is no more Hebrew than it is Assyrian, Chaldean, Persian, or Egyptian. It has no philosophy, neither has it any appearance of bias in favor of any class of ideas. It is not an imitation. It is the original painting. Other copies have been made from it, but they are more or less deformed. The Genesis account stands alone in the world, like the towering granite of the Himalayas among the lesser geological formations.

There is no alternative to the conclusion that the Genesis account is revelation. As prophecy is vision of the future, so the Genesis account is vision of the past. In his attempt to brush aside in a single sweep the authority of the creation account in Genesis, a widely known educator said one day: "What would an unlearned, pastoral people, such as the Hebrews, know about the creation of the world?" The answer would be: "They would know nothing about it except through revelation." We are not sure that it was a Hebrew who received the revelation, nor who first recorded it, although we find the record among the Hebrew writings.

Lange says: "At a very early day, to which no profane history or chronology reaches, some man who was not a philosopher, not a poet, nor a fable maker, but one who 'walked with God' and was possessed of a most devout and reverent spirit -- some such man, having a power of conception surpassing the ordinary human, or else inspired from above, had present in his soul in some way, and first wrote down, or uttered in words, this most wonderful and sublime account of the origin of the world and man. He believed, too, what he wrote and uttered. He was conscious of some source, whether by words or vision, whence he had received it, and he had no doubt of its relation to an outward objective truth which it purported to set forth" (Lange's Commentary, Genesis, page 148).

Reckoning with the fact that God has made "of one every nation of men to dwell on all the face of the earth," as the apostle Paul told the Greeks when he addressed them on Mars' Hill (Acts 17:26), there is no surprise that the story of man's creation should have found its way wherever the human race wandered. Neither should it be considered a surprise that this story should take on, among the various peoples, their national colorings, and even their superstitions. But God, who gave by inspiration the account of creation for the purpose of revealing to man the source of all things and the high destiny for which he was created, has given us a record so pure,

so simple, so believable, that the child and the untutored can understand, and at the same time the greatest scholars of the world recognize it as so superior to all other creation stories as to be in a class entirely by itself. They also discover it to be so scientific that, when all other speculations have failed and all other hypotheses have been disproved, the human race must return to God's account of the creation of the cosmos and of man, for the final and authoritative word.

What a marvelous asset it is to the Christian faith, that God has given by inspiration, such a rational, believable explanation of the creation of the earth and of man himself, which harmonizes with true science. In the language of Louis Matthews Sweet, "The Bible runs a circle around all science".

* * *

The Legend Of Adapa

Another Babylonian legend which is believed to have some parallels to the Book of Genesis is the Legend of Adapa, which is compared to the account of the fall of man, in the third chapter. The fragments do not present the entire story, but sufficient is preserved to make it clear that the Babylonians had something in common with the general ideas presented in Genesis concerning the entrance, of sin into the world.

* * *

Similarities

In the first place, Adapa, like Adam, had come into possession of knowledge. The first lines read:

"He possessed intelligence.

His command like the command of Anu (the chief God). Wide intelligence he (Ea, the God who had created him), made perfect for him the destiny of the country to reveal,

Unto him wisdom he gave, eternal life he did not grant him."

This knowledge enabled Adapa to break the wing of the south wind, which appears to have been an attribute of deity. Adam and Eve were tempted to become "like God knowing good and evil." Ea, who had permitted Adapa to become wise, feared that he might gain immortality and told him a falsehood when he left Him to go into the presence of Anu, the chief God, to prevent him from eating food which would make him immortal. Jehovah drove man from the garden, where the tree of life grew. Thus both accounts harmonize in the thought that immortality might be obtained by eating certain kinds of food.

Adapa was subject to disease, restlessness, and destruction for what he had done. Toil, sorrow, and death came upon Adam and Eve for what they had done. It appears also that Adapa was clothed with a garment provided by Anu. The third line of fragment III reads:

"The garment, he commanded him, and he clothed himself."

Adam and Eve were clothed with skins, according to a provision by God.

* * *

Relation Of The Two Accounts

The question arises as to the relation of the Adapa myth to the Genesis account. Is the Babylonian myth an earlier form of the account of the fall of man, which the Hebrews took and purified? Or is the Babylonian myth a degenerate form of the Biblical narrative? Some modern scholars hold to the former opinion, while many hold to the latter, which is, in all probability, the correct position. In either case, as Dr. George A. Barton asserts (*Archaeology and the Bible*, page 261), "The Babylonian story proves the Biblical conceptions to be very ancient, and by its contrasts to that in Genesis, it exhibits the dignity and religious value of the Biblical narrative." In the Babylonian myth the gods Ea and Anu are at enmity, and Ea tells a falsehood to accomplish his purpose. Genesis portrays God as consistently righteous and omnipotent. The superiority of the Old Testament stands out in marked contrast to the Adapa myth.

It is not necessary to conclude dogmatically, that either of the above theories is correct. Whatever the "fall of man" may have been, it was a racial experience, and reports of the same may be expected from various ancient civilizations, of which the Bible doubtless contains a correct and pure version.

It may seem somewhat disturbing at first to one who hears of these documents for the first time, but careful study and evaluation proves them to be, though in themselves untrustworthy, corroborations of the Biblical accounts. Therefore, a knowledge and proper understanding of them contribute to our appreciation of the

* * *

A Pictorial Representation Of The Fall

[See hdm2488g.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

Somewhat akin to the Legend of Adapa, but with no positively known connection with it, is a pictorial representation in the form of a seal cylinder, which evidently reaches back to a very primitive time. It is sometimes called the "Adam and Eve Seal."

This seal, about an inch in diameter, contains no single word of writing and so its meaning can only be conjectured from its group of figures.

In the center of this seal is a picture of a tree, very conventionalized, of course, as all art was in those primitive days; nevertheless the representation of a tree. On one side of the tree sits a man, while on the opposite side of the tree sits a woman. Back of the woman is a serpent with its head reared from the ground, as if to establish contact with the woman in some way or another.

This pictorial representation has been variously evaluated. To one familiar with the story of the temptation this group of figures presents an interesting study. It must be conceded that there is a striking resemblance between this pictorial representation and the Biblical account of man's temptation in Eden.

The human race has always been fond of pictures and has found them one of the most convenient and satisfactory methods of representation. Remembering that the cuneiform or wedge-shaped characters used by the Babylonians and Assyrians, the hieroglyphics of Egypt, and even the Phoenician letters which constitute our English alphabet are, at least in part, only highly conventionalized pictures, it is no wonder that the ancients used pictorial representations. Still more, after all these many centuries of human progress, the picture remains one of man's most successful mediums for the acquisition of knowledge.

Should this clay cylinder, with its silent story, relate to the same event recorded in the third chapter of Genesis, that of the temptation, it could not subtract a single thing from that record. It would only confirm in picture what is there written in words, and would thus constitute a very striking corroboration. Though we cannot answer all the questions which may legitimately arise relative to environments, circumstances, and relations of these two apparently parallel records, there should be no hesitancy in claiming all such objects which come to us out of the distant past as contributions to our knowledge of God and of his dealings with the human race. If our cherished record is from God, as we know it to be, anything which corroborates and confirms that record, regardless of the channels through which it came, must be found ultimately also of God.

* * * * *

05 -- THE BABYLONIAN FLOOD STORY

[See hdm2488h.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

From the library of Ashurbanipal has come another one of the most interesting of Babylonian myths, which bears a close resemblance to the account of the flood as recorded in the sixth, seventh, and eighth chapters of Genesis. It is sometimes called the Gilgamesh Epic, for Gilgamesh, a mythical Babylonian king, is the hero. The tablet was probably written in the seventh or eighth century B.C., but it doubtless records a legend which was orally circulated very much earlier. The story of the flood is only a part of this extensive epic, which is mythical from beginning to end.

The flood story is found on the eleventh tablet of the series. It was first translated, in 1872, by George Smith, of the British Museum, who also discovered it. A number of scholars

have since made translations of the epic. This tablet contains 185 lines in cuneiform, some of which are so broken that they cannot be read. A sufficient number of the lines are whole, however, to make possible a reasonably good translation of the story.

It appears that Gilgamesh had an ancestor, Utnapishtim, who was residing somewhere with the gods. Gilgamesh became afflicted with a much dreaded disease and longed to consult his immortal ancestor as to how he too might become immortal. After weeks of sailing upon the waters, he reached the distant land where his immortal ancestor abode, who inquired of him how he had succeeded in reaching the immortal land and the assembly of the gods, his appearance remaining unchanged. Thereupon Utnapishtim replied to the question of Gilgamesh, and according to George A. Barton in *Archaeology and the Bible*, the interesting narrative runs as follows:

* * *

Gilgamesh Questions Utnapishtim*

[*The headings belong to the author; the translation is Barton's.]

1. Gilgamesh said to him, to Utnapishtim, the far-away:
2. "I look upon thee, O Utnapishtim,
3. Thy appearance is unchanged; thou art like me;
4. Thou art not at all different, thou art like me.
5. Thy courage is unbroken, to make combat,
6. On thy side thou liest down -- on thy back.
7. (Tell me) how hast thou advanced and in the assembly of the gods hast found life?"

Utnapishtim Replies to Gilgamesh

8. Utnapishtim spoke to him, to Gilgamesh:
9. "I will reveal to thee, O Gilgamesh, the secret story,
10. And the decision of the gods to thee will I relate.
11. Shurippak, a city which thou knowest,
12. Is situated on the bank of the Euphrates.
13. That city was old and the gods in it.

14. Their hearts prompted them -- the great gods -- to make a deluge.
15. (There drew near) their father Anu,
16. Their councillor, the warrior Ellil,
17. Their herald, Enmashtu,
18. Their hero, Ennugi.
19. The lord of wisdom, Ea, counselled with them;
20. Their words he repeated to the reed-hut:
21. "O reed-hut, reed-hut, O wall, wall,
22. O reed-hut, harken; O wall, give heed!
23. O man of Shurippak, son of Ubaratutu,

The Babylonian Deluge Story. The Eleventh Tablet of the Gilgamesh Epic

24. Pull down thy house, build a ship,
25. Leave thy possessions, take thought for thy life,
26. Leave thy gods, thy life save!
27. Embark seed of life of all kinds on a ship!
28. The ship which thou shalt build,
29. Measure well its dimensions,
30. Make to correspond its breadth and its length;
31. Upon the ocean thou shalt launch it."...

The Construction of the Ship

56. "The strong... brought what was needed,
57. On the fifth day I raised its frame.
58. According to its plan (?) its walls were 120 cubits high;

59. 120 cubits correspondingly was the extent of its roof.
60. I laid down its hull; I enclosed it.
61. I constructed it in stories, up to six;
62. I divided it (without [?]) into seven parts.
63. Its interior I divided into nine parts.
- 64... I fastened in its midst.
65. I looked out a rudder, and prepared what was necessary.
66. 6 sars of bitumen I poured over its outside (?);
67. 3 sars of bitumen I poured over its interior."...

The Lading and Embarkation of the Ship

81. "With all that I had I laded it (the ship);
82. With all the silver I had I laded it.
83. With all the gold I had I laded it.
84. With all the living things I had I laded it.
85. I embarked on the ship all my family and kindred.
86. Cattle of the field, beasts of the field, craftsmen, all, I embarked.
87. A fixed time Shamash had appointed, (saying):
88. 'When the senders of rain shall rain upon you a mighty rainstorm at evening,
89. Embark upon the ship and close thy door.'
90. The appointed time approached,
91. The senders of rain sent at evening a heavy rain-storm.
92. I observed the appearance of the day,
93. The day was terrible to look upon.

94. I embarked upon the ship, I closed my door.
95. To the master of the ship, to Puzur-Amurru, the sailor,
96. I entrusted the structure together with its contents."

Description of the Storm

97. When dew-dawn began to brighten,
98. There arose from the horizon a black cloud;
99. The god Adad thundered in its midst,
100. While Nebo and Sharru marched before;
101. They went as heralds over mountain and country.
102. Nergal tore away the anchor,
103. Enmashtu advanced, the floods he poured down;
104. The Anunnaki raised their torches,
105. At their brightness the land trembled.
106. The raging of Adad reached to heaven;
107. All light was turned to darkness
108.... the land like...
109. One day (raged the storm [?])
110. Swiftly it raged (and the waters covered) the mountains,
111. Like a battle array over the people it swept.
112. No one could see his fellow;
113. No more were people recognized in heaven;
114. The gods were frightened at the deluge,
115. They fled, they climbed to the highest heaven;

116. The gods crouched like dogs, they lay down by the walls.
117. Ishtar cried like a woman in travail,
118. Wailed the queen of the gods with her beautiful voice:
119. "Those creatures are turned to clay,
120. Since I commanded evil in the assembly of the gods;
121. Because I commanded evil in the assembly of the gods,
122. For the destruction of my people I commanded battle.
123. I alone bore my people;
124. Like spawn of fishes they fill the sea."
125. The gods along with the Anunnaki wept with her,
126. The gods bowed, sat as they wept;
127. Closed were their lips; (silent their) assembly.
128. Six days and seven nights
129. Blew the wind, the deluge the flood overpowered.
130. When the seventh day approached, the deluge was prolonging the battle
131. Which, like an army, it had waged.
132. The sea calmed, the destruction abated, the flood ceased.

The Receding of the Waters

133. I looked upon the sea, the roaring was stilled
134. And all mankind was turned to clay;
135. Like logs all were floating about.
136. I opened the window, the light fell on my cheek;
137. I was overcome, I sat down, I wept;

138. Over my cheek streamed the tears.
139. I looked in all directions -- a fearful sea!
140. After twelve days an island appeared;
141. Toward Mount Nizir the ship stood off;
142. Mount Nizir held it fast, that it moved not.
143. One day, two days, Mount Nizir held it that it moved not,
144. Three days, four days, Mount Nizir held it that it moved not,
145. Five days, six days, Mount Nizir held it that it moved not,
146. When the seventh day approached,
147. I brought out a dove and let her go;
148. The dove went out and returned;
149. There was no resting-place and she came back.
150. I brought out a swallow and let it go;
151. The swallow went out and returned.
152. There was no resting-place and it came back.
153. I brought out a raven and let it go;
154. The raven went out, the diminution of the waters it saw;
155. It alighted, it waded about, it croaked, it did not come back.

The Disembarkation and Sacrifice

156. I disembarked (all); to the four winds I poured a libation.
157. I appointed a sacrifice on the top of the mountain peak;
158. Seven by seven I arranged the sacrificial vessels;
159. Beneath them I piled reeds, cedar wood, and myrtle.

160. The gods smelled the savor.
161. The gods smelled the sweet savor,
162. The gods above the sacrifice collected like flies.
163. When at length the queen of the gods drew near,
164. She raised the great bows (?) which Anu at her wish had made.
165. O ye gods, as I shall not forget the jewel of my neck
166. These days I shall not forget -- to eternity I shall remember!
167. Let the gods come to the sacrifice,
168. But let Ellil not come to the sacrifice,
169. For he was not wise; he sent the deluge,
170. And numbered my people for destruction."

From this point on the story loses its interest as a flood account parallel, for it continues with the experience of Utnapishtim and his wife among the gods. As a myth, the Gilgamesh epic must be recognized as a beautiful story, but its relation to the account of the flood in Genesis, if any, constitutes our present inquiry.

* * *

Resemblances To The Genesis Account

That there are some resemblances between the Babylonian story and the Genesis account no reader can dispute. These may be pointed out as follows:

1. There is in each of them the details of the constructing of a ship after the builder had been apprised of the coming of a great flood. (Lines 56-67).
2. There is a striking likeness in the lading of the ships. (Lines 81-96).
3. There is in both an account of a great flood catastrophe, and the total destruction of life outside of the ship. (Lines 97-132).
4. The ship's lighting upon a mountain is familiar to Bible readers. (Lines 141-145).
5. The sending out of the birds to ascertain the depth of the water, impresses one as a close parallel with the Genesis account. (Lines 146-155).

6. The offering of a sacrifice at the disembarkation reminds the reader of the first act of Noah upon coming from the ark. (Lines 156-170).

* * *

Differences From The Genesis Account

If the similarity between the Babylonian flood story and the Genesis account is marked, the differences are even more marked and may be easily seen when thoughtful comparison is made.

1. The Babylonian account makes the flood local -- a city called Shurippak, a city on the Euphrates: while the Genesis account is of a flood world wide, as the world was then known.

2. The Babylonian flood story gives no purpose of the flood, whatsoever, but reflects the caprice of the gods, through which a mythical person mysteriously reached the assembly of the immortals. The purpose of the Genesis flood is plainly indicated as a punishment of the sinful race and to give the world a new beginning.

3. The time of the coming of the flood, as well as the duration of the waters, differs greatly from the flood described in Genesis.

4. Deity reflected in the Babylonian story is polytheistic and degraded. The true God is not known, but the national deities, of whom Bel was chief, are the gods recognized. The gods are described as hating each other, as crouching like dogs with fear, and, as seen in the closing lines of the quotation from the epic, when the sacrifice was made, they smelled the sweet savor and gathered like flies about the sacrifice.

The last point of difference, alone, is sufficient to convince anyone that despite any similarities in the accounts the Babylonian story cannot compare favorably with the Genesis record. That the Babylonian story is built around the same historical framework may be possible; but the purpose of the account is entirely lost. If it be deemed another version of the same experience of the race, it is so variant and purposeless as to have lost everything except some of the externalities. George A. Barton says: "Nothing could more strikingly illustrate the inspiration of the Biblical story than to measure it against the background of this Babylonian poem, which is clearly a variant version of it" (Archaeology and the Bible).

Of the Babylonian flood story it should be said, that it is no surprise that this experience of the race should have been told and retold wherever man went subsequent to the flood. In the days when men handed down orally, to succeeding generations, the accounts of such events, they could easily take on national bias and local colorings: they could easily degenerate into the polytheism of the peoples by whose lips they were communicated.

That God should give by inspiration a true version, a dignified account of his dealings with a sinful race which reflects the true and only God, should be no surprise, but should be

universally accepted as such, and gratefully received. Neither the Babylonian story of the flood, nor any other version which might come from any quarter of the globe, need distract in the least, nor should it be considered as a liability but as an asset of the Christian faith, for it only proves that this experience of the race so deeply engraved itself upon man that it is impossible for him ever to stray so far as to totally erase the impress stamped upon him.

* * * * *

06 -- THE WORLD'S OLDEST CODE OF LAWS, THE CODE OF HAMMURABI

[See hdm2488i.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

Some reader may be surprised that when reference is made to the world's oldest code of laws the Mosaic, or Biblical, code is not meant. That there is an older code is agreed upon by all reverent and well-informed scholars. The Code of Hammurabi antedates the Mosaic code by about six centuries, reckoning the generally accepted date of Hammurabi as about 2100 B.C., and the date of the Exodus as 1491 B.C. There is also a Hittite code which has been deciphered and which dates to about 1350 B.C. But the Code of Hammurabi, being the older and having been fully translated, furnishes a better opportunity for a study of two very ancient codes of laws.

While excavating in Susa (Sushan), the ancient capital of Elam, during December, 1901, and January, 1902, a French expedition under de Morgan found a block of black diorite, about eight feet in height, which has proved to be one of the most interesting of finds. It contained the code of Hammurabi. Hammurabi belonged to the first dynasty of Babylon, and his date is given by Barton as 2102-2061 B.C. (Archaeology and the Bible). The laws are written in Semitic Babylonian, and the inscription was originally set up in Esagila, in Babylon, in the temple of Marduk, but was carried to Elam by an Elamite conqueror, as a trophy, when he overran Babylon.

Hammurabi is identified with the king Amraphel of Genesis 14, in the days of Abraham. To students of the Bible this adds another item of interest.

The code contains 282 items of legislation. It is divided by Barton into thirty-seven sections, as follows:

Against Witches; Concerning False Witness; Against Reversing a Judicial Decision; Against Theft; Against Stealing Children and Slaves; Housebreaking and Brigandage; Stealing at a Fire; Duties and Privileges of Soldiers; Constables; Tax Collectors; Agriculture; Horticulture; Bankruptcy; Partnership; Agents and Merchants; Wine Merchants; Deposits and Distrains; Debts; Storage of Grain; Deposits and Losses; Against Slandering Women; Chastity; Marriage and Divorce; Inheritance; Adoption; Renunciation of Sonship; Foster-Mothers; Assault and Battery; Physicians; Laws of Branding; Responsibility of Housebuilders; Responsibility of Boatmen; Collision of Ships; Concerning Shepherds; Wages of Animals and Men; Sales of Slaves; and the Penalty for Renouncing a Master. Incidentally this wonderful code of laws shows that civilization was in a fairly high state in Babylon two millenniums before Christ.

* * *

For those who do not have access to a copy of the translation of the Code of Hammurabi so that they can make a comparison, a few items of the two codes which appear strikingly similar will be given here in parallel columns. [In this digital edition I have placed one above the other, instead of in left and right columns. -- DVM] The items from the Code of Hammurabi are taken from Barton's Archaeology and the Bible.

* *

Mosaic Code -- Exodus 21:16: "And he that stealeth a man, and selleth him, or if he be found in his hand, he shall surely be put to death."

Code of Hammurabi -- 14. "If a man steals the son of a man who is a minor, he shall be put to death."

* *

Mosaic Code -- Leviticus 20:10: "And the man that committeth adultery with another man's wife, even he that committeth adultery with his neighbor's wife, the adulterer and the adulteress shall surely be put to death."

Code of Hammurabi -- 129. "If the wife of a man is caught lying with another man, they shall bind them and throw them into the water. If the husband of the woman would let her live, or the king would let his subject live, he may do so."

* *

Mosaic Code -- Exodus 21:18, 19: "And if men contend and one smite the other with a stone, or with his fist, and he die not, but keep his bed; if he rise again, and walk abroad upon his staff, then shall he that smote him be quit: only he shall pay for the loss of his time, and shall cause him to be thoroughly healed."

Code of Hammurabi -- 206. "If a man strikes a man in a quarrel and wounds him, he shall swear, 'I did not strike with intent,' and shall pay for the physician."

* *

Mosaic Code -- Leviticus 24:19, 20: "And if a man cause a blemish in his neighbor; as he hath done, so shall it be done to him; breach for breach, eye for eye, tooth for tooth; as he hath caused a blemish in a man, so shall it be rendered unto him."

Code of Hammurabi -- 196. "If a man destroys the eye of the son of a patrician, they shall destroy his eye. 200. "If a man knocks out the tooth of a man of his own rank, they shall knock his tooth out." 229. "If a builder builds a house for a man and does not make its work strong and

the house which he made falls and causes the death of the owner of the house, that builder shall be put to death."

* *

Mosaic Code -- Exodus 21:28: "And if an ox gore a man or a woman to death, the ox shall be surely stoned, and its flesh shall not be eaten; but the owner of the ox shall be quit."

Code of Hammurabi -- 250. "If an ox when passing along the street gores a man and causes his death, there is no penalty in that case."

* *

Mosaic Code -- Exodus 21:29: "But if the ox was wont to gore in time past, and it hath been testified to its owner and he hath not kept it in, but it hath frilled a man or a woman; the ox shall be stoned, and its owner shall be put to death."

Code of Hammurabi -- 251. "If the ox of a man has the habit of goring and they have informed him of his fault and his horns he has not protected nor kept his ox in, and that ox gores a man and causes his death, the owner of the ox shall pay one-half mana of money."

* *

Mosaic Code -- Exodus 21:30: "If there be laid on him a ransom, then he shall give for the redemption of his life whatsoever is laid upon him."

Code of Hammurabi -- 252. "If it is the slave of a man, he shall pay one-third of a mana of money."

* * *

It will be seen that these very few comparisons are made between the Code of Hammurabi and the statutory laws of Moses, not between the Code of Hammurabi and the Decalogue. The Decalogue, or Ten Commandments, constituted the fundamental laws of Israel, to which all the other laws governing human society sustained the relation of statutory laws. There is no known fundamental declaration to the Code of Hammurabi. There are probably no other parallels to be found in the codes so close as these.

The first items quoted illustrate the fact that both codes had *lex talionis*, the recognized law of revenge, as their basis. This deviation from the fundamental law in the case of Israel was sanctioned for the time because of the absence of greater light, but the ideal was set forth in the Decalogue and Jesus declared the new standards in the Sermon on the Mount as reported in the fifth chapter of Matthew. In this is the fact evidenced that God holds men responsible for the light of their day and measures them with a moral measuring-stick consistent with that light.

It has been the purpose of some archaeologists to prove a very close resemblance between the Mosaic law and this code, hence to force the conclusion that the Mosaic code was borrowed from the Babylonian.

That a good many similarities exist between the two codes, no one will dare to dispute. But there are also a great many dissimilarities. Then too, a number of items in each code have no parallels in the other; and many of the parallels themselves have striking differences. It is quite evident that the matter of pressing analogies can easily be carried too far, and when such is the case a conclusion is usually drawn that one code is, in some way, a copy of the other, with the advantage falling to the Code of Hammurabi as the original code, because of the fact that it is the older.

Against a conclusion that the Mosaic code is borrowed from the Code of Hammurabi, reverent and thoroughgoing Biblical students revolt. George A. Barton observes: "A comparison of the code of Hammurabi as a whole with the Pentateuchal law as a whole, convinces the student that the laws of the Old Testament are in no essential way dependent upon the Babylonian laws." The differences are too striking. Scholars who reject the theory of Moses' borrowing from the Code of Hammurabi do not claim that Hammurabi borrowed from the Pentateuch, but that both codes arose from a similarity of antecedents.

From the classification of the laws of the code, thirty-seven in number, already given, it will be seen that the code is purely a civil one while the Mosaic code is both civil and religious, with the latter predominating.

The very similarity of the codes, though not related but both reaching back to very ancient times, declares unmistakably the presence of the moral element, the sense of right and wrong, in the make-up of the race. It is woven into the very fabric of human nature. Though the Code of Hammurabi knows no religion, much less the true God, it does reflect the moral sense -- that of justice, of right and wrong.

There is positively no reason for supposing that right and wrong did not exist until God engraved upon tables of stone an expression of his own nature, the Decalogue. Long before God wrote his law upon tables of stone he had written his law upon the fleshly tables of the human heart, as is evidenced by pre-Mosaic Biblical history. That copy, much effaced by sin which the human race experienced, is still reflected in every code of human laws even apart from Old or New Testament influence, whether it be the ancient written Code of Hammurabi or a modern unwritten code of a heathen people. Here is eloquent testimony to the universal presence of the moral element in human nature.

At least passing note should be made of the fact that Abraham came from the land of Hammurabi and, as generally believed by scholars, lived contemporaneously with him, as will be seen from Genesis the fourteenth chapter and the first verse, where Hammurabi is called Amraphel. Just how much consideration this fact deserves is a question; but a recognition of it will be helpful, as this knowledge assists in our evaluation of the antecedents of both of these codes. Their backgrounds are seen to be the same geographically; to be not far apart chronologically; and of course, in the last analysis, both have their ultimate source in God.

The Decalogue given to Moses, and through him to the world, consisted of two distinct tables and two equally distinct, though closely connected, relationships. The one table, composed of the first four commandments, related to man in his relation to God. The second table, consisting of the other six commandments, related to man in his relation to man. These two tables contained, in reality, the fundamental or constitutional law upon which all statutory law of the Old Testament rested. The Decalogue also furnished the fundamental or constitutional law, in some very real sense, for the New Testament, and remains the basis for all law among civilized peoples.

The Code of Hammurabi reflected only imperfectly the contents of the second table of the Decalogue. It is scarcely correct to say that the sense of right and wrong in human relationships was stronger in the human race than the sense of right and wrong in man's relationship to the Divine; but it appears that when God has been, in a large measure, lost to the race, the moral sense in human relationships still persisted.

It is exactly at this point that the codes of Moses and Hammurabi differ most. The Mosaic code reveals God, first, as the only object of worship, making it an intensely religious code. Human relationships then come in for treatment in the second table, but with right relation to God as the background. The Code of Hammurabi knows only human relationships and does not have as its background a God with whom right relations are first required.

* * *

Similarities And Dissimilarities

1. The Codes have some points in common, as has been noted previously.
2. The Code of Hammurabi knows no religion, though the great Babylonian God, Marduk, is mentioned. It is almost a purely civil code. The Mosaic is a religious and a civil code, with the religious element greatly predominating.
3. The Code of Hammurabi is what may be called a statutory code, with no fundamental or constitutional law as a basis, such as the Decalogue sustains to the other Mosaic statutory enactments.
4. Hammurabi ascribes to himself the credit for whatever merit the Code, which bears his name, may possess: Moses accredits everything to God.
5. Despite the fact that the code of Hammurabi is a civil code, and ascribes to the lawgiver the credit, Hammurabi, himself, claims to be a descendent of the god Sin.
6. There is much in each code which cannot be found in the other.

* * *

King Hammurabi And The [So-Called] Sun God

[See hdm2488j.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

Whatever else these codes may have in common, there is between them a gulf so wide that only a revelation of God can span it, and it is this very revelation which makes the Mosaic code as different from the Code of Hammurabi as day is from night.

At the top of the pillar containing this interesting code of laws we have been studying, Hammurabi has pictured himself as receiving the code of laws from Shamash, the sun god. The sun god is represented as being seated upon a throne, with a foot-rest, or step, under his feet. The wild and speculative conclusions which even archaeologists sometimes draw to support a theory is illustrated by the fact that a widely-known professor dogmatically stated to a class in archaeology that it was from this representation of Hammurabi receiving his code of laws from the sun god, Shamash, on a mountain, as is pictured on this pillar (which is not a mountain at all, but a throne with a footstool), that the writers of the Pentateuch derived the idea of Moses' having received the law of God upon a mountain.

In conclusion let it be emphasized that the Babylonian and Hebrew peoples were branches of the same Semitic race, and it was natural that they should have much in common. The Babylonian accounts of creation, the fall, and the flood, are corrupted and nationalized. Their similarities are such as to furnish excellent sidelights upon the Biblical accounts; at the same time, the differences are more striking and confirm the divine inspiration of the sacred record. The Mosaic law, though not as old as the Code of Hammurabi, but possessing a number of points of similarity, has differences decided and numerous enough to prove its originality and independence.

* * * * *

07 -- TUTANKHAMEN AND THE EXODUS

Since the discovery of the tomb of Tutankhamen (pronounced Tut-ank-amen) with its untouched treasure of wealth and splendor has occurred so recently at Luxor, Egypt, a brief study of him and the probable time of the Exodus in Egyptian history should find a place in a work of this nature. This discovery is briefly recounted in Chapter 03.

Tutankhamen was the son-in-law of Amenophis IV, the interesting Pharaoh who attempted to break away from the polytheism of Egypt and to establish a kind of monotheism, making the sun god the only object of worship. Perhaps this should be called "henotheism," for there is no evidence that Amenophis IV really advocated a monotheistic religion in the sense in which the term is properly used, as applicable to the worship of one god for all places, and much less did he advocate the worship of the true God.

To make this transition Amenophis IV broke with the priesthood of Egypt and removed his capital from Thebes to Tel-el-Amarna. It was in the ruins of this place that the Tel-el-Amarna Tablets, a number of letters written to Amenophis III and Amenophis IV by their Asiatic vassals

and containing much information concerning the times, were found in 1887. When the young Tutankhamen became Pharaoh he reverted to the former polytheism of Egypt, and having made peace with the priesthood, moved the capital back to Thebes.

Some idea of the wealth of the tombs of the great Pharaohs Of Egypt may be obtained by a study of the contents of the tomb of Tutankhamen, who died when probably yet in his teens and who was no outstanding Pharaoh but a lesser ruler. Objects almost too numerous to mention, many of which were of the most expensive kind, were found in his crowded tomb chambers. There were articles of food, furniture, jewels, ornaments, chariot wheels, art treasures, besides the very costly gold-covered casket itself, and an inner casket of solid gold 22 karats fine, weighing 900 pounds. It is now believed that the youthful Tutankhamen was buried with such wealth as a reward for having restored Egypt to its former, religion of polytheism and the powerful priesthood of Egypt's former religion. With a splendor almost inconceivable this youthful Pharaoh of Egypt was buried in the Valley of the Kings. With what cost and splendor the great Pharaohs must have been buried can scarcely be imagine -- in the light of the luxury and glory accorded to this lesser ruler, whose tomb was the only tomb of a Pharaoh discovered in centuries which had not, long previously, been plundered of its costly treasures.

There appears to have been no direct connection between Tutankhamen and the Israelites in Egypt, or the Exodus; therefore his tomb could scarcely have been expected to furnish anything which would throw special light upon either the sojourn of the Israelites in Egypt or their departure. This outstanding archaeological discovery does furnish, however, a new starting point for the discussion of the time of the Exodus.

Tutankhamen belonged to the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty and lived in the late fifteenth or early fourteenth century B.C. He is now believed to have been the last Pharaoh of the eighteenth dynasty. Whether Tutankhamen ruled while the Israelites were in Egypt must be decided by the date of the Exodus.

Some modern scholars have been led to believe that Rameses II, of the nineteenth dynasty, was the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and that his son Merneptah, was the Pharaoh of the Exodus. To accept this conclusion necessitates the placing of the date of the Exodus at about 1276 B.C., or, according to some, as late as 1225 B.C., a very late date indeed.

Other modern scholars, including Dr. James Orr, Prof. George L. Robinson, A. T. Clay, John Garstang, Sir Charles Marston and others, have concluded that the Exodus must have occurred earlier in the eighteenth dynasty, and look upon Thothmes III as the Pharaoh of the Oppression and his successor, Amenophis II, as the Pharaoh of the Exodus. These two rulers of Egypt belong to the early eighteenth dynasty and were successors of the great Ahmosis I, who founded the powerful eighteenth dynasty which drove the Hyksos out of Egypt back into Asia, and brought Egypt again under the rule of native Egyptians. This conclusion harmonizes with the older and hitherto quite generally accepted date for the Exodus, which is about 1491 B.C.

Other scholars, including Hall and Lieblin; oppose the late date for the Exodus but have not settled upon the particular Pharaohs connected with it. The late G. A. Reisner puts the date of the Exodus at 1580 B.C., which also dates the expulsion of the Hyksos. While visiting the

pyramids in Egypt, this author enjoyed an interview with Harvard's Egyptologist, Dr. Reisner, in his office near Cheops, during which time the Exodus was discussed. Without any hesitation whatsoever, Dr. Reisner declared that there was no place in Egypt's history earlier than the 15th century B.C. when the Exodus could have occurred; that it more likely occurred in the 16th century B.C.

Dr. Albert T. Clay, who has made such a splendid contribution to Biblical Archaeology, in his book *Light on the Old Testament from Babel*, makes out a very conclusive argument against Rameses II being the Pharaoh of the Oppression and Merneptah being the Pharaoh of the Exodus, concluding that the Pharaoh of the Oppression was Thothmes III, and the Pharaoh of the Exodus either Amenophis II or Amenophis III, more likely the former.

The Pillar of Merneptah called the "Israel Stele" because the name "Israel" appears in its inscription, is of much interest and the translation significant.

This Pillar was set up by Merneptah, who ruled as the Pharaoh of Egypt from 1225-1215 B.C., in the fifth year of his reign. Upon it, Merneptah recounted his military victories. In the section devoted to Palestine, as translated by Dr. J. H. Breasted in his *Ancient Records of Egypt*, and quoted by Dr. Geo. A. Barton in his *Biblical Archaeology*, Merneptah inscribed the following:

"Plundered is the Canaan with every evil, Carried off is Askelon, Seized upon is Gezer, Yenoam is made a thing not existing. Israel is desolated, his seed is not; Palestine has become a widow of Egypt."

Since these are the boasted victories of Merneptah, whom some believe to have been the Pharaoh of the Exodus, advocates of the theory that the Exodus occurred during the reign of this man are hard put to it to explain this military record of Merneptah. He reigned only ten years, and forty years elapsed before Israel entered Canaan, and more years expired before Israel could have become a nation to be conquered. It is evident that Merneptah could not desolate her in Palestine when she was not yet in Palestine.

Various theories have been offered with the hope of solving this puzzling problem without abandoning the theory of a late date for the Exodus. One suggestion is that the Exodus occurred in the third year of the reign of Merneptah, and that, later, Israel was attacked by him. Others theorize that possibly not all the Hebrews or Israelites had ever gone to Egypt, but only the so-called "Joseph Tribes". Still others concede the likelihood that all the Israelites had gone down to Egypt, but that the "Leah Tribes" may have left at an earlier date, sometime during the eighteenth dynasty, and that the "Rachel Tribes" made their Exodus during the reign of Merneptah, and that it was the "Leah Tribes" that Merneptah fought and professed to desolate.

As will be easily seen, much of this theoretical maneuvering could be avoided, except for the insistence upon maintaining a certain theory, once espoused, even though wrong.

The theory that Rameses II was the Pharaoh of the Oppression has gained considerable recognition, owing largely to the fact that his name has been found inscribed upon bricks taken

from the ruins of the treasure city Pithom, which city was evidently built by the slave labor of the Israelites.

Naville, who excavated the ruins of Pithom, did not himself find the name of Rameses upon any of the brick, but others have found it, concluding, therefore, that Rameses built the city. Reference to this is made in Chapter III.

It is known that Rameses II was a great builder but that much of his building consisted of rebuilding or repairing, and it has also been found that he was given to the erasing of the names of his predecessors and substituting his own name, thus taking to himself glory which was not his. In certain inscriptions he effaced the name of his own father, Seti I, and substituted his own. Numerous instances of plagiarism on the part of Rameses II are pointed out by Canon Cook, Pollard, and others. Because of this fact Rameses II cannot be considered unqualifiedly as the builder of Pithom.

This author is conscious of the difficulties which are in the way of a dogmatic adjustment of these varying conclusions and does not presume to settle the matter. He has weighed with reasonable care all the evidence known by him bearing upon both sides of the question and is willing to abide the day of fuller knowledge for the final answer, but he humbly records his own opinion in favor of the earlier date of the Exodus, making Thothmes III and Amenophis II the probable Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus, respectively.

As at least a partial justification for this conclusion the following considerations are offered:

* * *

1. The Scripture Statement

The conclusion that the Exodus occurred in the early part of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, as we are here assuming, brings the date of the Exodus in harmony with the definite date assigned to that most epoch-marking event by the sacred Scriptures.

In (I Kings 6:1 we read: "And it came to pass in the four hundred and eightieth year after the children of Israel were come out of the land of Egypt, in the fourth year of Solomon's reign over Israel, in the month Zib, which is the second month, that he began to build the house of Jehovah."

Now Solomon began his reign according to a chronology in which practically all scholars concur, about 1015 .B.C. Four years later, the date in which the construction of the temple began, must, therefore, have been 1011 B.C. Going back from this date four hundred and eighty years, the period mentioned specifically, we arrive at the date of 1491 B.C. It can be very easily seen that to make Rameses II the Pharaoh of the Oppression and Merneptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus, both of the nineteenth Egyptian dynasty, requiring a date for the Exodus about 1276 B.C., presents a difficulty which cannot be satisfactorily explained.

The conclusion, therefore, that the Exodus occurred in the early eighteenth Egyptian dynasty, with Thothmes III as the probable Pharaoh of the Oppression and Amenophis II as the probable Pharaoh of the Exodus instead of Rameses II and Merneptah, respectively, harmonizes with Scriptural dates not purposely intended to indicate the time of the Exodus, but nevertheless doing so.

* * *

2. The Period Of The Patriarchs

The almost universally accepted date for the great Hammurabi of the first Babylonian dynasty is about 2100 B.C. It is also quite generally agreed that Amraphel, mentioned in Genesis 14:1, is the Hammurabi of the cuneiform inscriptions whose code of laws is the oldest known. Accordingly, Hammurabi and Abraham were contemporaneous. So we have a starting date from which to calculate a series of Old Testament events beginning with the patriarch Abraham and culminating finally in the Exodus.

In Genesis 12:4 we are told that Abraham was seventy-five years old when he left Haran. Abraham, then, was seventy-five years old about 2100 B.C., and must then have been born about 2175 B. C. According to Genesis 21:5 Abraham was a hundred years old when Isaac was born. If Abraham was born in 2175 B.C., and Isaac was born when he was one hundred years old, Isaac must have been born about the year 2075 B.C. Isaac was married to Rebekah at the age of forty (Gen. 25:20). According to Genesis 25:26, Isaac was sixty years old when Jacob was born, which places Jacob's birth year as 2015 B.C. Jacob, as he informed Pharaoh, was a hundred and thirty years old when he came down into Egypt (Gen. 47:8, 9). Subtracting one hundred and thirty years from 2015 B.C., the time of the birth of Jacob, we arrive at the date of 1885 B.C., the approximate time when the sojourn in Egypt began. By subtracting four hundred and thirty years, the period of the sojourn in Egypt as given in Exodus 12:40, from 1885 B.C., the time at which the sojourn in Egypt began according to our computation, we obtain the date of 1455 B.C. as the date of the Exodus.

Our figures obtained in this way vary but little from the quite definite Scriptural date given for the Exodus, and the slight variations can easily be accounted for by the assumption necessary in the calculation. If we reckon the period four hundred years, in round numbers, as Stephen did (Acts 7:6), and according to Genesis 15: 13, we would subtract four hundred from 1885 B.C., giving us the date of the Exodus as 1485 B.C. This date, arrived at in this manner, is one which comes close to the date quite definitely assigned by the Old Testament for the Exodus.

Some scholars assume that the four hundred years mentioned in God's covenant to Abraham recorded in Genesis 15:13, during which time his posterity should be afflicted, began with the call of Abraham. If so, an earlier date for the Exodus would be found necessary instead of a later one, for the four hundred years subtracted from the call of Abraham, which we have reckoned as 2100 B.C., would fix the date of the Exodus at about 170 B.C. Of course such a very early date for the Exodus should not be taken too seriously, but it can readily be seen that the late date suggested by some scholars is very unlikely.

Should it be proved that Hammurabi lived somewhat later, thus moving the basis of the foregoing calculation, it would only change the result of the calculation as much as the time set for Hammurabi brings him this side of 2100 B.C., which cannot be very much. It is very seldom that anyone suggests a later date for Hammurabi than 2100 B.C., and about as often some suggest an earlier date. It is not very likely that Hammurabi's date will vary from the almost universally accepted date of 2100 B.C.; therefore our calculation has a reasonably certain basis.

* * *

3. The Period Of The Judges

The date generally assigned for the beginning of the monarchy with Saul is 1095 B.C. though Kautzsch gives the date as 1020 B.C. From 1276 B.C., the date suggested by some for the Exodus, to 1095 B.C., the time of the rise of the monarchy, would be only one hundred and eighty-one years. Within this relatively short space of time the following events would have to be crowded: the wilderness wanderings, the conquest and settlement of the land of Canaan under the leadership of Joshua, and the whole period of the Judges, of whom there were fifteen.

In accepting the date of 1491 B.C. for the Exodus, and the date of 1095 B.C. for the beginning of the monarchy, we have a period of three hundred and ninety-six years for the series of events which followed each other between these two great epochs in Israel's history. This is a more reasonable period of time during which so many things could have occurred, and it corresponds more nearly with the dates which the Scriptures give.

The chronology of the period of the Judges is confessedly difficult, owing to gaps between the periods of individual judges, in some instances, and to overlapping in other instances; but it is easily seen that 181 years allow too short a period for all of the great events intervening in the period between the Exodus and the beginning of the reign of Saul.

Israel had inhabited Heshbon, Aroer, and the coast of Arnon for a period of three hundred years up to the time of Jephthah, the ninth judge, according to Jephthah in his communication with the king of Ammon when the latter proposed to make war to recover the territory, and the former protested his claims, as is recorded in Judges 11:26. This reference, if it is to be taken as a correct statement, together with the consideration that no small space of time was necessary for other events occurring in the period which intervened between the Exodus and the kingdom, compels the conclusion that approximately four hundred years were necessary for the period lying between the Exodus and the beginning of the reign of Saul.

The chronological consideration is conceded by good scholarship as a reasonable argument against the suggested late date for the Exodus. Three hundred and ninety-six years, the period our calculation allows between the Exodus and Saul, are none too many for this succession of events with their necessary periods.

* * *

4. The Evidence From Jericho's Ruins

Excavations of the ruins of ancient Jericho were begun as early as 1907, when the Deutsche-Orient Gessellschaft, a German archaeological society conducting excavations in Palestine, Babylonia, Assyria and Egypt, under the direction of Professor Ernest Sellin of Vienna, undertook the work, continuing it for brief periods through the three summers of 1907-1909.

At the time Jericho was excavated the technique of the science was not yet very well understood, and although certain facts were discovered and valuable deductions concerning the size, construction and strata of the city were made, the work came to be looked upon as quite unsatisfactory. A re-working of the mound appeared desirable and warranted.

That the ruins of ancient Jericho should be re-excavated was made all the more imperative, because its earlier examination had not yielded its evidence relative to the date of the fall of the Canaanite city, in the days of Joshua, and therefore had not yielded its definite contribution in relation to the time of the Exodus.

In the meantime, pottery-dating has been discovered, and developed. The story of this is told, and the bearing of the new technique upon the whole science of Archaeology is described, in the closing chapter of this volume. So important was this discovery that archaeologists sensed the justification of re-working early excavations, that, if for no other reasons, the knowledge of pottery-dating might be employed in the work.

It was in 1933 that Sir Charles Marston and Dr. John Garstang, both Englishmen, began the re-examination of the ruins of Jericho. Their work was continued in 1934, and the results have been given to the world in their respective volumes, Garstang's *The Foundation of Bible History* and *The Story of Jericho*; and Marston's *New Bible Evidence*.

Our chief interest in the recent finds at Jericho pertains to the results obtained from pottery-dating, including, too, those from the closely-related aspect of scarab-dating -- also described in the closing chapter of this volume. The testimony from pottery and scarabs found in the various Jericho strata and in tombs about Jericho, has made a very positive contribution to our knowledge concerning the date of the Exodus. All the more has this information been awaited because of the dispute which has been going on among various scholars relative to the Exodus date.

Despite the fact that pottery-dating has come to be conceded as the surest factor in determining the chronology of events, some latitude must be reckoned with in determining the exact date of particular occurrences. As an illustration, a certain type of pottery, with all the earmarks of a particular people and period, in sufficient quantity, establishes the fact that that certain people lived in the given community. The particular stratum may bear certain evidences of the fact, without providing sufficient data to determine the exact year. The possibility of variations of time, in connection with a stratum in the work of excavation, makes this chronological latitude necessary.

Students of pottery-dating believe that a reasonable allowance should be made for possible variations in archaeological strata, perhaps to the extent of forty to fifty years. This may appear as a considerable period of time and, in the lives of individuals, but not very long in the sweep of archaeological history. But even granting this necessary latitude in pottery-dating, no more accurate time-measurement for archaeological calculation is likely ever to be discovered.

With this necessary prefacing, we recount that, upon the basis of the pottery (and scarabs) found in the ruins of ancient Jericho, Garstang and Marston have concluded that the fall of Jericho occurred about 1400 B.C. When we add the forty years which intervened between the Exodus and the fall of Jericho, we are taken back to 1440 B.C., a date closely approximating the one to which the three previous approaches led us. For complete treatment of the subject of the fall of Jericho and the time evidence based upon the pottery and scarabs, Garstang's previously mentioned volumes must be examined. Marston, the colleague of Garstang in these excavations, concurs with Garstang, citing Garstang's conclusions and adopting them for himself in his above-mentioned volume. Dr. Garstang's study of the subject is so thorough that it apparently can never be successfully refuted.

In the light of all these testimonies, the conclusion appears inescapable, that the Exodus occurred at an early date, during the eighteenth dynasty, and not at a later date, sometime during the nineteenth dynasty.

Our earlier statement that Tutankhamen's tomb could scarcely be expected to contain anything of a specific character relating to the Israelites in Egypt, is particularly true if our reasoning is correct and Israel left Egypt at the time of the early eighteenth Egyptian dynasty. They would have then been gone from Egypt before the short reign of the youthful Tutankhamen, making less likely anything relating to them than had they been in Egypt during his reign. If nothing more, the recent discovery of the untouched tomb of this Egyptian Pharaoh furnishes a text for a revival of the much-discussed problem of the Pharaohs of the Oppression and the Exodus.

* * * * *

08 -- LIGHT ON THE LANGUAGE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

For a long time students of the New Testament in its original language, the Greek, have known that the Greek of the New Testament differs considerably from the Greek of the classics, This difference was accounted for by what were called "Hebraisms," meaning Hebrew forms of speech transliterated into the Greek; originations, or the formation of new words; and grammatical errors.

Though this accounting for the difference between the Greek of the New Testament and that of the classics was not always satisfactory, the theory was generally accepted, and New Testament Greek lexicons and grammars were prepared accordingly, as the helps for the classic Greek could not meet the needs of the student of the Greek New Testament. An occasional scholar would suggest that the New Testament must have been written in the common language

of the Greek-speaking Christians of the Apostolic Age, which accounted for its variation from the classic Greek; but this was merely conjecture, and could not be conclusively proved.

It is to Professor Adolph Deissmann, that the world probably owes its greatest debt for the light which it now has on this subject. Before the discovery of the papyri, he ventured courageously into the comparison of the Greek of the New Testament with the Classic Greek, and as an enthusiastic student of the papyri has been able, not only to confirm his former conclusion, that the Greek of the New Testament was a distinct dialect of the classic, but also fully to establish his thesis.

* * *

Light From The Papyri

[See hdm2488k.jpg in the Graphics Folder on this disc.]

Until late in the last century little was known of papyrus -- the ancient, cheaper material which was used for the keeping of records, for correspondence of all kinds, and for business documents, Papyrus is nothing more nor less than a coarse kind of paper, and papyrus-making is the antecedent of our present paper manufacture. To our modern product we have appropriated the same name by transliterating the Greek word papyros into the English word "paper."

Papyrus was made from the papyrus plant, a reed which grew in the lowlands along the Nile and in other places. It was in a basket made of the reeds of the papyrus plant, called in the English version "bulrushes," that the infant Moses was securely hidden along the banks of the Nile among the rushes of a similar kind.

Papyrus was made by laying the reeds in a row, side by side, and then another row crosswise, after which the reeds were beaten or pressed into a pulp, smoothed out, and laid in the sun to dry. There is something in our present process of manufacturing coarse paper or cardboard which reminds one of the ancient method of papyrus-making. When the sheets were dry they were cut into regular sizes -- from nine to eleven inches long, and from five to six inches wide. These were sometimes joined together to form a roll when they were to be used for literary purposes.

Papyrus was used by the Egyptians, by the Greeks from the days of Alexander, and later by the Romans. It was the commonly used writing material in the days of Christ and the apostles. The apostle John refers to this when he says, in closing his Second Epistle: "Having many things to write unto you, I would not write them with paper and ink: but I hope to come unto you, and to speak face to face, that our joy may be made full." (II John 12).

It is highly probable that all of the New Testament books were originally written upon papyrus. Parchment and vellum were in use during the earliest centuries of the Christian era by the wealthy classes; but as the Christians belonged, in the main, to the common people, they doubtless employed the commoner materials. This, in all probability, accounts for the fact that we have no Greek manuscripts of the New Testament which date further back than the fourth

century, A.D. Papyrus could not withstand the ravages of climate and time, and so the earlier documents have long since perished. It was not until the fourth century A.D., when Christianity received the sanctions of the Roman government and the support of a wealthier class, that parchment and vellum were employed for the making of the manuscripts of its Holy Book. From that time on we have preserved to us excellent manuscripts of the Greek New Testament, four or five of the best copies extant dating to the fourth and fifth centuries of the Christian era.

The Christian community, however, extended to various parts of the Mediterranean world, including Egypt. In upper Egypt there is no rainfall and no freezing, which makes possible the preservation of antiquities in a way not possible anywhere else in the world. Here, in tombs and various places, papyri have been found which date back several centuries before Christ.

It was not until near the close of the last century that papyri were discovered in such quantity and of such nature as to attract the attention of scholars generally. All discoveries of papyri prior to the work of Professor Petrie in 1889-1890 were accidental. In the years just mentioned Professor Petrie secured a large number of papyri from Egyptian mummy cases, but the deciphering of these was difficult.

It was in 1896-1897 that Dr. Grenfell and Dr. Hunt found at Oxyrynchus, Egypt, about 120 miles south of Cairo, where had existed in the early centuries a Christian community, a vast number of papyri containing writing of a miscellaneous character, including letters touching family, business, civil and social affairs, records and fragments of the Gospels and of the so-called Sayings of Jesus. In the same district, at Hibeh and Tebtunis, Grenfell and Hunt while digging for sarcophagi, containing Egyptian mummies, came across a cemetery of crocodiles -- mummies wrapped in sheets of, and in some instances stuffed with, papyri. From this cemetery a large number of papyri were secured containing official documents of various kinds. These documents afforded some information concerning the administration of Egypt during the early centuries of the Christian era and greatly enlarged the stock of documents which disclosed in much detail the language of that period.

No sooner had these discoveries been made than scholars set themselves to the task of reading and classifying the documents. The work was scarcely begun when it became evident that the Greek of these papyri of the first to the third centuries A.D. was not of pure literary character, but reflected the language and life of the people generally. It was also discovered readily that there was a very marked similarity between the language of the papyri and that of the New Testament. The deciphering of the papyri has completely confirmed the expressed belief of a few scholars that the language of the New Testament was the common spoken language of the Greek-speaking Christians of the first century, which fact accounts for its variation from the Greek of the classics. Interest in the papyri spread with much rapidity among scholars, who became conscious of the fact that the discovery was not of an ordinary nature and that our knowledge of the language of the New Testament was being speedily revolutionized by the findings obtained from the papyri.

In attempting to evaluate the light which has been thrown upon the language of the New Testament by the discovery and deciphering of the papyri, Camden S. Coburn in his book

entitled *The New Archaeological Discoveries and Their Bearing upon the New Testament* gives his conclusions, from which the following results are deduced:

The papyri have disclosed the fact that the New Testament was written in the koine, the vernacular, the language of the common people; not in the language of books, or of the schools, but in the language of life.

Of the five thousand words, including all their varied forms, in the New Testament, only about three thousand can be found in the classic Greek. The other two thousand are from the vernacular.

Some of the supposed Hebraisms are found not to be Hebraisms, but idioms of the Greek as spoken in New Testament times. Of course there still remain some real Hebraisms.

Very few of the supposed originations are originations at all, but are words which were in common use in the vernacular of the first and second centuries of the Christian era. Concerning Paul, to whose credit the vast majority of originations was conceded, there remain only a very few words which have not been found in the papyri. To other New Testament writers scarcely any originations may be credited.

The supposed grammatical errors are now seen not to be grammatical errors at all, but the common forms of the koine, or vernacular.

The New Testament is to the classic Greek what *Pilgrim's Progress* and Longfellow's poems are to Browning, Macaulay, Emerson, and Shakespeare. Of course there are portions of the New Testament which rise to almost classic perfection, especially in the Pauline writings, but in the main the vernacular is employed. The language of the common people has been lifted to a new dignity and meaning -- has been glorified.

After a fashion similar to that by which Luther's German translation of the Bible made a literary language out of a tongue scarcely literary before, so the New Testament, especially the Gospels, made the spoken Greek of the early centuries a language of literature.

The papyri have also thrown much light upon various words used in the New Testament; as a consequence meanings somewhat obscure have been made clear and forceful. Space fails for a discussion of individual words here.

As a result of the discovery and reading of the papyri new lexicons and grammars for the study of the New Testament have been made imperative. The findings from the papyri must be reckoned with by all careful students of the New Testament. This fact has called forth such recent works as A. T. Robertson's *New Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, Vincent's *Word Studies*, and others.

In this connection it might be observed that the Septuagint, the Greek translation of the Old Testament made between 285 B.C. and 150 B.C., in a small measure reflects the koine, as it deviates slightly from the classic Greek. The conquests of Alexander, in the latter part of the

fourth century B.C., disseminated a world-wide knowledge of the Greek language, which appears to have had some influence upon the Septuagint. This translation, which was the Bible of our Lord and his apostles, may be considered a transition, as far as the Greek language is concerned, breaking away somewhat from the classic in favor of the spoken language. The writers of the New Testament, who quoted frequently from the Septuagint, found no difficulty in employing the vernacular of their day instead of the classic. It was doubtless the form of the Greek in which Christ and the apostles preached, and that may have been, in part, the reason why it is said of Christ, that "the common people heard him gladly."

* * *

The Papyri And The Evangelical Theory Of Biblical Inspiration

And now, what is the meaning of all this? Do the facts discovered in the papyri militate against our evangelical theory of inspiration? Shall we think less or more of the New Testament since it was given to us in the language of the common people? Are we made poorer or richer by our knowledge of these facts?

My answers are these: Our evangelical theory of an inspired (literally, God-breathed) book is not militated against in the least. The New Testament should be esteemed more highly, rather than less, because it came to us in the language of the common people. We are enriched, instead of impoverished, by the fact that the New Testament was given to us in the language of life rather than in the language of the schools and of books.

The author remembers well the delight he found in his earlier experience as a theological instructor in eulogizing the great apostle Paul. "He was a double graduate -- in Greek from Tarsus, and in Hebrew from Jerusalem. He stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries. He exceeded the vocabulary of his day, and whenever he needed new words he originated them." After a fashion similar to this, the author's comments on the great apostle Paul would run. Imagine his feelings when he became apprised of the results coming from the reading of the papyri of Paul's day, disclosing the fact that practically all the "originations," or words which Paul was supposed to have coined, were really not words which he had originated at all, but were words in common use in the spoken Greek of Paul's day.

Paul is still to this author "the great apostle," the learned man who stood head and shoulders above his contemporaries; but whatever the glory with which he was crowned as an originator of new words, that is gone. But a new and more radiant glory crowns the head of the apostle Paul. It is the glory which comes to one who, though he was capable of and sometimes did attain to classic perfection in his use of the Greek language, and though he was accused of madness because of much learning, yet chose to speak and write to men in the language they were certain to understand, even though it was the vernacular instead of the classic. This author now believes it to be infinitely greater to say of the apostle Paul that he deliberately chose to use the vernacular than to eulogize his ability to originate words.

The preacher who, though learned and profound, brings a living message in the language of the common people, will never want for audience. Here is one of the secrets of God's Book.

Profound and deep as is its message, it is a living message, brought to men in a language which breathes and pulsates, because of which it receives a response wherever human hearts are found, and because of which it can never die.

* * * * *

09 -- THE PLACE OF POTTERY IN THE SCIENCE OF ARCHAEOLOGY

The subject of pottery-dating in the science of Biblical Archaeology has been referred to in a previous chapter. It remains for us here only to sketch the history and description of the technique, and suggest a system of chronology for Palestine, based upon its pottery.

For the principle of pottery sequence as used for the dating of archaeological events the world is indebted to the late Sir Flinders Petrie, who began his work in the field of archaeology in 1880, and continued active in it throughout his long life which closed in 1942. As will be seen, Professor Petrie is entitled to be called the "Father of Pottery-Dating Chronology".

Professor W. F. Stinespring, of Duke University, in his article on Sir Flinders Petrie immediately after his death, which appeared in the September issue of the "Biblical Archaeologist" describes the beginning of pottery-dating thus:

"In 1890, with a growing reputation as an excavator, he [Petrie] was hired by the Palestine Exploration Fund for a short campaign of only six weeks at Tell el-Hesi. In spite of its brevity, this campaign has been called 'fateful' for the history of Palestinian archaeology. The reason is that Petrie used, for the first time in Palestine, the principle of pottery sequence for determining relative dates. He observed that the pottery of Tell el-Hesi, like that of Egyptian sites, varied greatly from level to level, and he used these variations to construct a chronological series of pottery types. This method is now absolutely fundamental in Palestinian excavation. No longer need any archaeologist be at a loss as to whether the level in which he is working is Canaanite, Israelite, Persian, Hellenistic, or Roman, thanks to the development of scientific pottery chronology begun by Flinders Petrie."

In a following paragraph of the same article, Professor Stinespring further describes the technique which Professor Petrie employed, and which has been adopted with very gratifying results by all archaeologists.

"'Sequence Dating' is Petrie's best known and most important contribution to our knowledge of Prehistoric Egypt. He had excavated thousands of tombs in the sand bordering the Nile valley. His problem was to date them. To discover a key to this puzzle he closely observed the gradual changes in pottery fashions. He took his cue from a type of storage jar with ledge handles on the sides, which we now know was imported from Palestine between about 3500 and 3200 B.C. The longer the Egyptians made this type of jar, the more stylized it became. He decided correctly that the best examples were the earliest, since the most conventional shapes were found in the tombs of the earliest Egyptian kings. Having arranged the examples of this jar in a sequence, he studied the other types of pottery and objects which appeared with them, and gradually sorted his mass of material into a series. He then gave numbers to the various stages of

the series, and called them 'Sequence Dates.' Of course, these 'dates' mean nothing as far as the real or absolute dates are concerned, but they do furnish a convenient relative chronology so that we are able to say that this group of tombs is earlier or later than that group, etc. Subsequent discoveries have confirmed the general accuracy of the system, even though several attempts have been made to disprove it."

It is easy to see why correct dating is of such importance in the study of archaeology, and why pottery-dating has become such a dependable factor in the science.

In the first place, the use of pottery goes back to prehistoric times. In all periods of man's history his subsistence was accomplished by his habits of eating, and this, in turn, required vessels with which to prepare and eat his food. The clay of earth was early discovered to lend itself to the making of vessels, an art which was crude to begin with, but which was improved gradually, as time passed. The history of pottery making is an interesting study. Not only did the ancients need vessels with which to prepare and eat their food while living, but their belief in a future life led them to employ such vessels in which to prepare food for their dead, and deposit it in their graves.

In the second place, the texture of the clay used in the making of pottery, together with the shapes, sizes, types of handles, and decorations are earmarks of periods and localities. When the periods and localities of certain types of pottery become known, a canon or measuring norm has been discovered, so that when similar pottery is found anywhere, its date can be determined and its source traced.

Then, too, through the observing of pottery, tides of immigration and migration can be traced, and influences of peoples foreign to those of a given locality can be detected and followed. An illustration of this process is found in the case of the Cypriotes, the Cretans, and the Philistines. Each of these peoples, all of them from various islands of the Mediterranean Sea, had developed distinctive types of pottery which came to be recognized as peculiar to each. Therefore, when any one of these particular types of pottery is found in sufficient quantities in excavations anywhere in Palestine, by that same token, the influence of that people upon the given locality in Palestine is quite definitely known.

Of course, the quantity of pottery in any given stratum of excavation will determine whether or not people dwelt there in larger or smaller numbers. Pottery having been used so universally and for so long a time, digging into the earth almost anywhere where people have ever lived results in the finding of broken pieces of pottery of some period. Naturally, the country-side yields only a negligible quantity. On the other hand, sites occupied for a long time by cities and having a number of strata (because various cities have been destroyed and the same site again built upon) yield large amounts of broken pottery. Since cities in Palestine have, from pre-historic times, been built upon hills, for the sake of defense against enemies, pottery is found in large quantities, whenever and wherever these long-vanished city sites are excavated. As many as ten or twelve distinct strata are sometimes found, each stratum representing a period and a city, usually having been destroyed by fire and having left the tell-tale layer of blackened ashes to mark the stratum divisions.

Archaeologists occasionally have the unique experience of lost city hunting, which sounds decidedly novel and, indeed, is. This author, together with Dr. William F. Albright, Excavation Director, and several other members of the staff of the Pittsburgh-Xenia-American School of Oriental Research Expedition, set out one day on such a hunt for the lost city of Beeroth, referred to in Joshua, the ninth and eighteenth chapters, and also in 2 Samuel, the fourth chapter. Beeroth, is also referred to by both Josephus and Eusebius, but today is unknown, The geography of the city, as noted in the preceding references, was followed. A certain hill -- a likely city site -- was selected, and then the examination was begun on the basis of surface pottery.

As the result of erosion, even long-buried pottery remains are sometimes uncovered and can be gathered from the top of the ground. The writer picked up a shard which Dr. Albright, an expert in pottery, identified as belonging to the Early Iron II Age, from 900 to 600 B.C., the period of the Divided Kingdom. Other pottery was found which represented both the Middle Bronze Age, 2000 to 1600 B.C., the Late Bronze Age, 1600 to 1200 B.C., and some of the Early Iron I Age, 1200 to 900 B.C.; also, a small quantity of Early Iron III Age, 600 to 300 B.C. This "hunt," though only superficial, resulted in the information, upon the basis of the pottery found, that that particular location had, in all probability, been inhabited from 2000 B.C., continuously down to 300 B.C. In the event that this location should at some time be excavated, and its identity proved by evidences still lying covered up, not the least of which would be the pottery, already the pottery exposed by erosion would have played an interesting part in challenging the archaeologist to further effort.

In addition to the previously mentioned contributions made by pottery to archaeology, there is yet another. Broken pieces of pottery, sometimes called ostraca, were used as writing material. With a sharp instrument, letters were cut into these ostraca, leaving a permanent record. The so-called "Lachish Letters" found by the Starkey expedition in 1935, in the mound of Tell es Hesi, believed to have been the site of ancient Lachish, are written on a dozen or more pieces of ostraca and, in this instance, with carbon ink. They were written in the days of King Zedekiah, early in the sixth century B.C., and in Biblical Hebrew characters. They are letters written from a subordinate officer, whose name was Hoshaiah, to his superior military officer Jaosh.

Sometimes names were cut into the sides of bowls and pitchers, probably for the purpose of ownership identity. This author discovered such an inscription on pieces of pottery at Kirjath-sepher. It was the name "Gerah" done in Hebrew script, dating back to the time of Hezekiah, the late eighth century B.C.

Sometimes handles of jars were inscribed with the names of their owners; sometimes, with the name of the king to whom the tax payment was brought in produce, in that particular vessel.

* * *

Value Of Egyptian Scarabs To Archaeology

The Egyptian scarabs belong, in a measure, to the general subject of pottery, although some of them were cut from precious or semi-precious stones. Scarabs function in the matter of archaeological chronology in a way similar to pottery, so that the two together often produce strong chronological testimony.

The scarab is a reproduction of the scarabaeus or beetle, a small insect which was deified by the early Egyptians, and which they considered a symbol of eternity. The scarabs were cut out about the size of the average beetle, and were worn as charms by common people; with the royal cartouche, or seal of the Pharaoh, they were used for the purpose of sealing contracts, and for investing high officials, or even vassals, with authority. The case of Joseph, as related in Genesis 41:41, 42 is a good example of such use. Some scarabs taken from the tomb of Tutankhamen are three or four times the customary scarab size.

Dr. John Garstang in his book, *The Story of Jericho*, has much to say about the Egyptian scarabs found in the tombs about, and in, the ruins of Jericho. The fact that these scarabs were found in such numbers immediately prior to Jericho's fall, and that they bore the seal of the Egyptian Pharaohs up through the reigns of Thothmes III, Amenophis II, and Amenophis III, but that no scarabs later than the reign of Amenophis III were found, proves that the destruction of Jericho was practically contemporaneous with the reign of the Egyptian Pharaoh, Amenophis III. The closing date of the reign of this Pharaoh, whose empire extended into Palestine, is fixed at approximately 1400 B.C.; therefore, the presence of the Egyptian scarabs before that date, and their absence after that date, have a direct bearing upon the time of Jericho's destruction, and, indirectly, upon the time of the Exodus. It should be remembered that many archaeologists believe Thotmes III to have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression, and Amenophis II, the Pharaoh of the Exodus. Therefore, the scarabs found in the remains of Jericho, as well as the pottery, testify to the Exodus as having occurred during the reign of the father of Amenophis III, who was Amenophis II, or about 1440 B.C. I have given this treatment of the scarab in order to show how efficiently and unmistakably pottery, and, in lands where Egypt's influence was prominent, the scarab, bear upon archaeological chronology.

It would seem as though scarabs alone, could satisfactorily determine the date of an event of this historical character in places where Egyptian domination was prominent; but in this particular case pottery and scarabs together bear strong and expert testimony. As mentioned in the previous chapter, and hinted at in a preceding paragraph from Professor Stinespring, some latitude must be granted in the determining of dates from pottery sequence; but in this instance pottery is supplemented by scarabs, thus constituting a double check upon the time of the fall of Jericho.

The number of shards (broken pieces of pottery) which the Garstang expedition to Jericho collected is reported by Dr. Geo. L. Robinson in his recent book entitled *The Bearing of Archaeology on the Old Testament*, page 176, as "more than 100,000." In addition, "fifteen hundred broken pottery vessels" and eighty scarabs were also discovered, and examined. In the excavation at Kirjath-sepher, in which I personally participated, the daily volume of pottery fragment approximated about fifteen bushels.

Returning to the subject of pottery, the following table of Pottery Chronology of Palestine, as prepared by Dr. Wm. F. Albright, and published in The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Volume IV, is reproduced by permission of the Eerdmans Publishing Company of Grand Rapids, Michigan, publishers of the Encyclopedia. Although the designation of the "Late Patriarchal Age" is a little late as a synonym for the Late Bronze Age, on the whole, the chronological scheme for Palestinian pottery is very satisfactory.

* * *

Pottery Chronology Of Palestine

[Note: The numbers in brackets refer to pictures of the various pottery types found on a plate which accompanies the chronology in the Encyclopedia.]

Bronze Ages:

Early Bronze (Before 2000 B.C.) Before the Age of The Patriarchs -- Types of Pottery: flat bottoms (all); ledge handles (3); tiny lug handles (2); high loop handles (4-6); projecting spouts (2); net designs and modified forms of such designs (2, 4); rich burnished slip of red ochre (5, 6).

Middle Bronze (2000-1600 B.C.) Early Patriarchal Age -- Types of Pottery: pear-shaped juglets with high loop handles and button base, generally black, with white incisions (1); similar juglets with flat bottoms (2); elongated vases with pointed base, generally covered with cream slip (3); graceful vessels with carinated bodies (4, 6); globular jugs with small mouths and loop handle on shoulder (5).

Late Bronze (1600-1200 B.C.) Late Patriarchal Age -- Types of Pottery: small vessels, generally painted, with two tilted horizontal lug-handles (1); Mycaenean stirrup-vases, imported from Greece between fifteenth and thirteenth centuries (2); Cypro-Phoenician wine pitchers (3) and bilbils for perfumes (7), imported throughout Late Bronze Age; pilgrim flasks (5); miscellaneous painted vases (4, 6).

Early Iron Ages:

Early Iron I (1200-900 B.C.) Period of the Judges and United Monarchy. Types of Pottery: black burnished juglets for perfume (1-3); small bowls without ornamentation (4); pitchers with handle above mouth and filter-spout (5); burnished pitchers with pinched lip (6); libation chalices (7); pilgrim flasks (8).

Early Iron II (900-600 B.C.) Period of Divided Monarchy Types of Pottery: baby rattles of clay (1); black burnished perfume juglets (2); elongated vertically burnished juglets (3); small pitchers of various shapes (4); ring-burnished water decanters (5); ring-burnished plates and shallow bowl (6); squat one-handled juglets (7); deep two-handled cooking pots (8).

Early Iron III (600-300 B.C.) Post-Exilic and Early Hellenistic Types of Pottery: native vessels mostly very simple and practically never decorated (1-2, 4-7); imported Greek pottery in constantly increasing quantities, including especially lekythoi with red-figured drawings (3).

* * *

There is no desire to over-exalt, in this chapter, the importance of pottery in relation to the science of archaeology, but to give it the place which it rightly deserves. Many discoveries of importance have made, and continue to make, their contribution to this youthful science. Pottery cannot supply details of history as do the various inscriptions which have been deciphered, nor is the contribution of pottery as direct as the contributions of the discovered libraries, but pertaining to the chronology of ancient civilizations, pottery speaks the first and the most certain and constant word of information.

* * * * *

THE END