THE STONES CRY OUT: SCRIPTURAL CONFIRMATIONS OFTEN OVERLOOKED.


MODERN research has not discredited our Scriptures, but has strongly confirmed them. Alas! These confirmations are by some discarded, by many unknown, and by others overlooked. Dr. Yahuda has said that “it is thought highly scientific to challenge things Biblical.” Certainly many prefer to be classed as unscriptural rather than unscientific. Yet many Modernist theories are but ancient doubts in modern attire. Denials of miracle and the supernatural are but Lucian and Celsus up to date. Archaeology has changed many Modernist theories. It has shown that monotheism preceded polytheism, and was not a progression from animism, totemism and polytheism, but was a direct revelation from God and the original faith of the race. It has shattered the theory that the Mosaic age was an
age of illiteracy and ignorance, and that the Pentateuch is of Exilic origin; it has made untenable the late dates of the Exodus and the Fall of Jericho, and undermined the theories which led to the rejection of the Book of Daniel.

These archaeological confirmations of the Bible have been so numerous and so widely diffused that if fictitious they would require many fabricators for the whole topography, and then their agreement would require explanation. Not simply the identification of a few place-names and isolated cases of topography require accounting for, but vast numbers of places, covering large areas ranging from Aswan, in Upper Egypt, to Nineveh, in North Iraq.

A forger may have access to historical documents and correctly name certain kings; but here are identified obscure persons and things: Phoenician workmen, a king's steward, a Temple placard, or a tax-collector's ostrakon; and these are contemporaneous with Biblical history. The cumulative value of these numerous corroborations gives us confidence to triumphantly assert that the Scriptures are true. If archaeology be rejected or neglected, the student of Scripture is not up to date, however much he may desire to be thought so. The spade digs the grave of sceptical theories, but unearths new proof of scriptural truth.

Let us divide our lecture chronologically into three parts: I.—The Ancient Dynasties. II.—The Period of the Kings of Judah and Israel. III.—The Christian Era. And as our title is The Stones Cry Out, we will eliminate all manuscripts and papyri from our survey.

I. The Ancient Dynasties.

The Creation Tablets.

Higher Critics contended that the story of the Creation in Genesis was legendary, and when Creation tablets were found in Babylonia they at once concluded that these tablets were the origin of the Biblical story. But comparisons of both Babylonian and Assyrian tablets with the scriptural story show the latter to be the more primitive record, the tablets being marred by later legendary lore. The moral grandeur of the Genesis record is seen in the Creation of Light; the tablets record a fight between Marduk (light) and Tiamat (darkness); but the Bible records the Divine fiat, "Let there be light". "The finger of God agitating the ether", as Sir James Jeans asserts. The
Genesis narrative preserves the monotheism of the early revelation—it reveals not only creation but the Creator. "I believe that the first chapter of Genesis and science are in accord", wrote Professor Dana.

The Flood of Noah.

The story of the Flood, long considered folk-lore, is now accepted as fact. At Ur, Sir Leonard Woolley found eight feet of clean, water-laid clay, below which were stone implements, flints and pottery of an early type. At Kish, Professor Langdon found the same clay stratum, and agreed with Sir Leonard Woolley that it was the Flood of Noah, exclaiming, "There is no doubt about it". Peake's Commentary says, "The story cannot be accepted as historical" (p. 143), but its recent Supplement (1936) states, "Evidence of the Flood has come to light at Ur and Kish" (p. 4). The Nineveh Tablets of the story of Gilgamesh confirm the scriptural account in many details. World-wide traditions further confirm it, while the Weld-Blundell Tablets actually contain a list of Babylonian kings divided by the words, "The Deluge came up", and a list of "Ten Kings who ruled before the Flood".

The Hittites.

"Only since 1900," says Dr. T. R. Glover, "have we known that the Hittites ruled from the Euphrates to the Aegean; prior to that date we had only references in the Bible." Professor F. W. Newman smiled at the Syrian host being alarmed by so insignificant a tribe (II Kings vii, 6). We now possess their sculptured slabs, inscriptions, and even Code of Laws, from their capitals of Carchemish and Boghaz-Keui. From these the Hittite empire has been reconstructed. It dated from about 2500 B.C., and its conquests extended from Asia Minor to the Euphrates, Palestine and Lower Egypt. Geologists once agreed that no active volcanoes were more than 100 miles from the sea. Then Sir Percy Sykes brought sal ammoniac and sulphur from Kuh-i-Taftan, in Persia, 200 miles from the sea, and the theory collapsed (R.G. Journal, Sept., 1938). Similarly burst the balloon of the Hittite myth.

Bashan.

Bishop Colenso ridiculed the Biblical statement that in Bashan were "three-score great cities with walls and brazen bars"
(I Kings iv, 13), but Dr. Porter’s *Giant Cities of Bashan* and Dr. Selah Merrill’s excavations at Gerash and Rabbath-Ammon, with their almost endless ruins, have dissolved the Bishop’s illusion as the rising sun disperses the morning, mountain mists.

**The Pentateuch.**

Higher Critics denied that Moses wrote the Pentateuch, because *he, and his age, were too illiterate*. But they overlooked the fact that he was selected by God, and, as Dr. Yahuda says, “steeped in the lore of Egypt.” Professor Wellhausen held that the five books of Moses were composed by many authors, extending from the days of Josiah to the priests of the Exile (587 B.C.). But the discovery of hundreds of tablets of the Mosaic age, from *Tell el-Amarna*, which probably refer to the Israelite invasion, prove that writing was widespread in Palestine before the days of Moses (*Peake’s Supplement*, p. 4).

When the *Pentateuchal Ritual* was said to have followed the Prophets, and was relegated to the days of the Exile, because it was far *too advanced* for the Mosaic age, then the stones of the *Serabit Temple* of Queen Hatshepsut, in Sinai, dating from the days of Moses, revealed a ritual of feasts and sacrifices similar to the Mosaic. Also at *Ras Shamra*, on the Syrian coast, tablets were found of feasts and sacrifices, trespass-offerings, peace and wave-offerings, and whole burnt-offerings, agreeing with the Mosaic, and yet dating back 800 years before the Exile.

When the *Laws of the Pentateuch* were held superior to, and therefore of much more recent date than, any which Moses could have decreed, then Assyrian, Hittite and Khammurabi’s *Codes* were discovered, resembling the Mosaic, but antedating them by some 500 years. Thus, as the *Supplement to Peake’s Commentary* (p. 3) well says, “The rich material of these codes has upset some of the epoch-making theories of Wellhausen.” Dr. Driver declared, from the varieties of style, subject and words, that there were at least twelve authors of the Book of Genesis. Then the Rev. A. H. Finn, using Driver’s methods, proved that there were at least twelve Dr. Drivers who produced his work. But, like eleven of the Drivers, J. E. P. H. D. & Co. are phantoms. That the Old Testament was handed down orally until the Exile is now absurd, as Sir Charles Marston stated in his lecture before this Institute. Professor Hommel says, “The more I steep myself in the secrets of the Oriental world, the more I am convinced that the views of Wellhausen
about the late date of the Pentateuch are thoroughly false". With our esteemed President, "We can now say with confidence that the archaeological explorations in the Near East in recent times have confirmed in general the truth of much of the Bible history, and disproved some of the confident assertions of the so-called Higher Criticism formerly made".

_Babylonia and Egypt._

The topography of the Biblical accounts of early Babylonia and Egypt is strikingly accurate, and, as Peake's _Supplement_ says (p. 2), "The excavations tend to corroborate the Biblical narratives, even in matters of local colour and circumstantial detail".

_Other Corroborations._

Jebel Musa has been identified as Mount Sinai, whose rock-wall could be touched. The Exodus is no longer disputed. The Apis Bull worship is reflected in the calf-worship of Aaron and Jeroboam. Hebron, which Dean Stanley said was "the earliest seat of civilised life in Palestine", is beyond doubt, and even the _Encyclopædia Britannica_ accepts the genuineness of the Cave of Machpelah. "Every town mentioned in the narrative of the patriarchs was in existence in their day", says Peake's _Supplement_ (p. 4).

_Ur of the Chaldees._

Mugheir has been identified as the site of Ur, and here were found the clay of the Flood, the death-pits of the Kings, cylinders naming Belshazzar, and priceless ornaments in gold and silver. The Sumerians of Ur used the pictorial script, libraries were established, arts cultivated, and the heavens were studied. Here Abraham dwelt, not as an illiterate, but here he was educated to be the father of nations.

_Abraham and the Four Kings_ (Gen. xiv).

In the Assyrian Eponym Canon is the name of Abraham, a man of Abraham's day, and in Abraham's land, if not the same Abraham. Wellhausen declared the battle of Abraham and the four kings incredible; but Professors Sayce and Pinches have identified all four kings. The story assumes the supremacy of Elam in the Euphrates Valley in 2000 B.C., and the spade has proved it. "How could a post-Exilic Jew obtain information of those early kings?" asks Professor Hommel.
II. The Period of the Kings of Judah and Israel.

The Rosetta Stone.

The finding of the Rosetta Stone, in 1799, a decree written in three scripts—Hieroglyphic, Demotic Egyptian and Greek—and the re-discovery of the priestly Hieroglyphic Code therefrom, by Professor Champollion, became the key to the interpretation of the Egyptian monuments.

The Behistun Wall.

The deciphering of the sculptured wall at Behistun, a trilingual memorial of the conquests of Darius Hystaspes, in Babylonian hieroglyphs, Elamite and Persian, by Sir Henry Rawlinson and others, was similarly the origin of modern Assyriology. In the Providence of God the wonderful secrets of archaeology largely lay buried until the keys were found, and when the stones cried out the interpreters were ready.

Jericho.

Excavations have fixed the date of the Exodus and the Fall of Jericho about 200 years earlier than the Higher Critics. Sir Charles Marston says that the pottery, scarabs and seals all point to about 1400 B.C. for the Fall of Jericho, and 1440 for the Exodus. Rameses II is no longer regarded as the Pharaoh of the oppression. The scarabs of Amenhetep III (1413–1377 B.C.) are the last found in Jericho’s ruins. “The theory that the Exodus was about 1445 B.C. has gained ground among archaeologists, and a combination of arguments—Biblical, chronological and historical—seem to point to that earlier date” (Peake’s Supplement, p. 8). Excavations show that the walls fell outward, filling the ditch, and the Israelites walked over the debris into the city, which they burnt; just as the Bible states. Fragments of charred roofs, rooms and ropes abound. The Romans built another city, a mile nearer Jerusalem, in which Herod the Great erected palace, amphitheatre and hippodrome. This explains what critics call an inconsistency in our synoptic Gospels. Matthew and Mark say that Christ healed Bartimaeus after leaving Jericho, but Luke says the miracle took place before Christ reached Jericho. Matthew and Mark, writing to Jews, refer to the old Jewish city, through which Christ had passed, but Luke, writing to the Gentile world, refers to the Gentile city which Christ had not yet reached.
Jerusalem.

Jerusalem and the Temple area are accepted by all as genuine. Dr. Robinson discovered the Arch which linked the area to the Upper City. On the broad area Solomon erected his magnificent Temple. "Solomon's builders and Hiram's builders, and the Gebalites did fashion them, and prepared the stones to build the house" (I Kings v, 18, r.v.). Sir Charles Warren found these foundation-stones, bearing the Phoenician marks of the Gebalite masons.

Sion, the City of David, has been located on the Hill Ophel, to the south-east of the city, instead of on the Western Hill. Mr. Pott, in Anthony Trollope's The Bertrams, remarked, "I always used to catch it for Scripture geography"; and we need to be careful, too. Professor Macalister has located the Jebusite city on the eastern ridge, which David took and fortified, building the Tower of Millo. These fortifications were strengthened by Solomon and by Hezekiah. Sion is spoken of as being on lower ground than the Temple. The ark was brought "up" from the city to Araunah's threshing-floor, the Temple site (II Sam. xxiv, 18). But if Sion were on the Western Hill, from it to the Temple would be going down. "The Stairs that go down from the City of David" (Nehemiah iii, 15) have been identified, and the pottery of the Jebusites has been found, on the Hill Ophel. Boys playing at the Pool of Siloam, in 1880, noticed letters cut in the rock. Professor Sayce found that they described the making of Hezekiah's aqueduct to bring water from the Gihon Spring to the Pool of Siloam, on the western side of Sion (II Chron. xxxii, 30; II Kings xx, 20). To do this Sion must have been on the Hill Ophel. The tunnel-makers, working from both ends, failed to meet midway, and a uniting-elbow was necessary. Sir Charles Warren, Sir Charles Wilson and Dr. Robinson crept through the aqueduct and noted the elbow-fault.

Samaria.

Amid the numerous columns of Samaria were found the palaces of Omri and Ahab, the Pool of Samaria, the Ivory House, cosmetic vessels reminding us of Jezebel, ostraka, or potsherds (with beautiful writing), and a list of Ahab's stewards, among whom is Obadiah. All these confirm our scriptural accounts.

The Moabite Stone.

At Dibon, east of the Dead Sea, was found a monolith, on which Mesha, King of Moab, records how he threw off the yoke of
Israel, on the death of Ahab (II Kings iii, 4, 5 and 27), and confirming many Scriptural names and sites.

Corroboration of personal names are more convincing than of places, because towns endure for ages, while persons are only of brief duration.

The Stele of Shalmaneser II of Assyria, from Kurkh, records Ahab's furnishing chariots and soldiers for the battle of Karkar. The Black Obelisk, from Calah, records Shalmaneser's wars, and portrays Jehu, King of Israel, rendering obeisance and tribute to Shalmaneser. Kings Omri, Ahab, Jehu and Hazael of Syria are here corroborated.

The Babylonian Dynastic Tablets, which Dr. Pinches translated, prove that the usurper Pul became Tiglath Pileser III of Assyria, as Bernadotte became Charles XIV of Norway and Sweden. The tablets also confirm Ahaz, King of Judah; Menahem, Pekah and Hoshea of Israel; Rezin of Damascus; Hiram of Tyre; and Merodach Baladan, prince of Babylon.

The Taylor Cylinder tells how Sennacherib "shut up" Hezekiah "like a caged bird in Jerusalem, his royal city". But it fails to add how the cage was broken, and the bird escaped. This silence implies disaster. That Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, and made Lachish his headquarters, is recorded both by Scripture and the monuments. The difference in silver talents paid, between the Bible accounts, 300, and the Tablets, 800, may be explained by the currency being increased by palace and Temple treasures (Layard); or by silver in Assyria being three-eighths of its value in Palestine (Kaulen). But why do many college professors prefer the witness of the monuments to that of the Bible, refusing Scripture history unless confirmed by the monuments, preferring a pagan chronicler to a devout historian, choosing an ancient blue book rather than an inspired record? Were not these professors ordained to defend the faith? But maybe some have little faith to defend. Why should miracles be dismissed as incredible? Why must theories of creation and development be refused unless they agree with evolution? The resurrection of our Lord is the miracle of miracles, and, accepting this, others present but little difficulty.

Lachish Letters.

Mr. J. L. Starkey, of the Welcome Expedition, who was murdered by Arabs in 1938, identified Tell el-Duweir as Lachish. The letters are in the early Sinai-Hebrew script, which Dr.
Tortzynor thinks dates back to the days of Moses. They relate the flight of the prophet Urijah to Egypt, and his pursuit by Elnathan, the emissary of King Jehoiakim (Jer. xxvi, 20–25). The names confirm those of the book of II Kings, I Chron., Ezra and Jeremiah.

Small coincidences occur of the Scriptures and the monuments, the cumulative effects of which provide striking corroborations of Holy Writ. In II Kings xviii, 9, 10, Shalmaneser IV besieges Samaria, but “At the end of three years they took it”. The change is significant, for during those three years Sargon overthrew Shalmaneser and took Samaria. Isaiah’s mention of Sargon’s conquest of Ashdod (Isa. xx, 1) was the only reference to Sargon for twenty-five centuries. Now Professor Sayce has translated The Annals of Sargon, which record, “In the beginning of my reign, the city of Samaria I besieged, I captured”.

Nebuchadnezzar.

This conqueror of Palestine and Egypt appears in Scripture as a symbol of ambition, who was smitten with insanity. Do the excavations support this? History records his conquests and the fall of Jerusalem. A tablet in the British Museum records his advance into Egypt against Pharaoh Amasis. An inscription in the Louvre tells of his reaching Syene, near the First Cataract of the Nile, and verifying Ezekiel’s prophecy (xxix, 6, r.v., margin), that he should conquer “from Migdol to Syene”. Sir Flinders Petrie discovered at Tell Defenneh, the Tahpanes of Scripture, the very pavement on which Nebuchadnezzar spread his pavilion, as prophesied by Jeremiah (xliii, 8–10). Three cylinders describing Nebuchadnezzar’s buildings were found under the pavement. Daniel quotes his boasting, “Is not this great Babylon which I have built? ” (Dan. iv, 30). Nine-tenths of his bricks and cylinders record his proud name and building achievements. But one remarkable cylinder says that for four years his building ceased. It admits his neglect of the altars of Merodach, and thanks him for restoration. Nebuchadnezzar’s lycanthropy is unmentioned; monarchs do not record failures. The Rev. Hugh Price Hughes used to say, “I never dwell upon my failures; I meditate upon my successes”.

Belshazzar.

When certain professors were unable to find Belshazzar in profane history, they discarded the Book of Daniel. Dean Farrar said, “History knows of no such king”. But foundation-
cylinders from Ur contain prayers of King Nabonidus for Belshazzar his son. Other inscriptions record Belshazzar's business transactions, and his death when the Persians entered Babylon. Professors Sayce and Pinches show that as Solomon was co-king with David, so Belshazzar reigned with Nabonidus, his father; one captained the troops in the field, the other defended the city. So Belshazzar is found. Professor Sayce declared, "The higher-criticism is now bankrupt"; and Professor Pinches writes, "I am glad to think, in the face of archaeology, with regard to the Book of Daniel, that the higher-criticism is, in fact, buried". Dr. Orr adds, "So Professor McFadyen's apparent revellings in the inaccuracies of Daniel are all outworn and answered". Daniel's history is authentic. He knew Belshazzar because they both dwelt in Babylon. Herodotus and Xenophon did not know him because they lived far away.

Results.

As the result of these many corroborations our Old Testament now commands more respect from Rationalists and Modernists. Even Mr. H. G. Wells says, "On the whole, the Bible story of Hebrew history is evidently a true story, which squares with all that has been learnt in the excavations of Egypt, Assyria and Babylon during the last century". Let us not forget that the Old Testament was the only Bible possessed by St. Paul, St. John and our Lord Himself, and that Christ unequivocally endorses it as the "key of knowledge" (Luke xi, 52), adding, "Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled" (Matt. v, 18). He makes no correction after His resurrection, but enforces "the law of Moses, the prophets and the psalms" (Luke xxiv, 44).

Let Modernists be true to their name by accepting the facts of modern excavations. King Charles V of France possessed a clock which had the Roman iv for 4 'o'clock. He declared it should not have iv, but four strokes. The maker said that the king was wrong, but Charles thundered, "I am never wrong; correct it". So the error continues still on our clocks. King Charles has many descendants among the critics of to-day.

III. The Christian Era.

Let us turn to the New Testament. In 1918 Sir C. M. Watson stated that out of 622 places named in Scripture, west of the
Jordan, 434 had been identified. Now many more may be added.

The Lake of Gennesaret is beyond dispute, and the sites have been found of the chief places once on its shores—Taricheae, Tiberias, Magdala, Safed, Cesarea-Philippi, and Bethesda-Julias. Recently, Emmaus, Chorazin, Bethsaida, Capernaum and Gergesa have been added. We can re-people the ruins and reproduce the incidents and miracles of the marvellous ministry of the Master, of whom His opponents bore witness, "Never man spake like this Man" (John vii, 46). Bethlehem and Nazareth, Joppa and Jerusalem, Hebron and Gaza, Samaria and Jericho, Tyre and Damascus have become household words.

Gergesa and the Miracle of the Swine.

Professor Huxley argued that Gadara was twenty miles from the Galilean Lake, and pictured in ridicule the swine galloping for hours to reach the lake. But research has shown that Ghersa (Kheresa), the modern, shortened form of Gergesa, in the region of Gadara is the scene of the miracle, and here is the only cliff on the lake suitable for it.

Tell Hum (Capernaum).

Stones were found at Tell Hum, sculptured with an ark, the pot of manna, Aaron's rod and vine leaves, indicating the ruins of a Jewish synagogue; but Corinthian columns betokened a pillared basilica, unique in a synagogue. St. Luke's Gospel solved the enigma. The Jews at Capernaum besought Christ to heal the servant of the centurion, saying, "He is worthy... for he loveth our nation, and himself built us our synagogue" (Luke vii, 5). His architect had built the synagogue in the Roman-Corinthian style. Capernaum was identified by its synagogue.

Sychar's Well, where the Saviour talked with the Samaritan woman, and from which Jacob drank centuries before, may be visited to-day.

Jerusalem.

Sir Charles Warren and Colonel Conder declare, "All agree that the Mount of Olives is the chain of mountains to the east of the Temple Hill, and the valley to the west beneath is the Kedron, and Ophel is to the south of it. The valley west of the Ophel spur is the Tyropoean, and the Pool of Siloam is undisputed".
A Temple Placard.

A placard which once hung on the balustrade dividing the Court of the Gentiles from the Court of the Jews, was found by M. Clermont-Ganneau. It read, in Greek, “No stranger is to enter within the balustrade round the Temple and enclosure. Whoever is caught will be responsible to himself for his death which will ensue”. St. Paul was accused of having taken Trophimus, an Ephesian, beyond this “middle wall of partition” (Eph. ii, 14), which led to the riot recorded in Acts xxi, 26–30.

The Columbaria of Rome.

These substantiate the names of members of Cæsar’s household found in the letters of St. Paul to the Romans and to Timothy.

The Catacombs of Rome.

In these are tomb-engravings taken from St. John’s Gospel, and yet dating from A.D. 130 or 140, and showing that “the Gospel was written round about A.D. 100” (Peake’s Supplement, p. 21).

The Temple of Diana, Ephesus.

Mr. J. T. Wood has found the huge drums, capitals and coloured marbles of the great Temple, with its silver shrines of Artemis, magical parchments, and even the name Demetrius. “No error is proved in the historian St. Luke”, says Sir William Ramsay; his officials, pro-consul, town-clerk, asiarch, politarch, temple-keeper, are all correct, adds Dr. T. R. Glover.

Individuals, churches and nations need spiritual revival. Does Modernism, casting its shadow of doubt on God’s Word, tend in that direction? Is it mere coincidence that since its advent heavy decreases have been registered in churches and Sunday schools?

Let us honour God’s Word, accepting its history, believing its promises, assenting to its miracles, preaching its Saviour, crucified, risen and glorified, and claiming the outpouring of the Holy Spirit to save, indwell and purify.

DISCUSSION.

The CHAIRMAN said: I am sure the members here present would wish me to thank Dr. Fawthrop in their name for the interesting paper which he has read to us. With the main thesis of his paper, I cordially agree. There are some statements in it which I should
myself be inclined to put less positively; but I do not think it can be doubted that recent archaeological discoveries have done much to confirm the authority of the Scriptures. There is one suggestion which I should like to make first. I deprecate the use of the term "Higher Criticism" as a term of reproach. Higher Criticism is simply the criticism of the substance of a book, as opposed to Lower Criticism, which is the criticism of its text. Dr. Fawthrop is himself just as much a Higher Critic as Prof. Wellhausen or Dr. Driver. The only question is, which criticism is right?

In some cases, the question at issue is not between what is said in the Bible and what is said by a modern scholar, but between different views taken by modern scholars. Take the question of the date of the Exodus, to which Dr. Fawthrop referred. Not long ago it used to be argued that since the Israelites are said to have built the treasure-city of Raamses (Exod. i, 11), the Pharaoh of the oppression was Rameses II, and the Pharaoh of the Exodus Menephtah (about 1230 B.C.). Recently the excavations of Prof. Garstang at Jericho seem to have shown that that city was destroyed about 1400 B.C., which would place the Exodus about 1440 B.C. These are two alternative conclusions, both legitimate. The authority of the Bible is not in question.

To my mind, the greatest service of archaeology has been the proof of the antiquity of writing. Formerly, it could be maintained that writing was not known in the time of Moses, and consequently that not only the Pentateuch could not have been written in his time but also it could not be based on contemporary records. Now it has been established beyond any possibility of doubt that writing was known in Mesopotamia and Egypt long before the time of Abraham, and that it was in common use in Syria and Palestine in the time of Moses. This is of vital importance. But you must not ask of archaeology more than it can give. It cannot prove that the books of the Pentateuch, as we have them now, were written in the time of Moses. That is largely a question of literary criticism and analysis. What is of importance is that, whenever they were written, they could have been based on contemporary records; just as a twentieth-century historian of the reign of Elizabeth uses the records of the sixteenth century, and can produce a better history of the period than an Elizabethan writer could.
Again, as Dr. Fawthrop has pointed out, it is now impossible to say that the Pentateuchal legislation is too elaborate for so early a date. The discovery of the laws of Hammurabi shows that codes quite as elaborate were in existence in Mesopotamia long before Moses. It is still open to critics to argue that particular provisions in Leviticus point to a later date; but they are always liable to refutation by new discoveries.

I must not, however, go over the whole ground again. You have come here to hear Dr. Fawthrop and not me; and I ask you to express your thanks to him for his paper.

Mr. Percy O. Ruoff said: If the stones did not cry out in confirmation of the Holy Scriptures, many people would. After the skilful array of impressive facts engraved in stones presented by the lecturer, many will cry out with an assured ring in their voices. The "crying stones" have also a double mission. (1) They will be heard in quarters where the human voice has called in vain, and (2) they will effectively silence some who have attacked the historicity of the Bible. Bearing in mind the learned Chairman's discriminating and illuminating remarks on the important question of the interpretation of all excavated and discovered materials, there is, in Dr. Fawthrop's paper, most valuable and convincing data dealing with names and places. The citations from the Supplement to Peake's Commentary are remarkable, especially the reference which states:—"The rich material of these codes has upset some of the epoch-making theories of Wellhausen". Peake's Commentary has been quoted endlessly (especially in Nonconformist pulpits), as though the citations were authoritative and final. The pity is that the Supplement, with its damaging confessions, is not known or at least not cited. I knew of a Nonconformist minister who blatantly trumpeted out that Abraham had never lived. It is to be hoped that men who have spoken like this will have the manhood to acknowledge their error now that the stones have raised such an eloquent and indisputable voice.

The evidential value of this excellent paper is considerable. But, of course, for nearly all Christian men who have had first-hand experience of God through the operations of the Holy Spirit, this kind of evidence is not necessary for their faith, because, believing
the Bible to be the Word of God, they accept the position of what is implicit in the words, "Man shall not live by bread alone but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God" (Matt. iv, 4).

Colonel Skinner said:—The term "Higher Criticism" has unfortunately acquired a bad name, and "give a dog a bad name and hang him". But in reality, as our chairman has so aptly shown, it is a perfectly legitimate term and quite harmless. The real enemy within the gate is "Destructive Criticism". Would it not be well for us to use that term instead? We should then know where we are. How far Higher Critics are themselves to blame for the stigma it is difficult to say; but I fear that too many who should be hunting with the hounds, rather pride themselves in having a run with the hare, and have only themselves to thank if they are hunted.

The Rev. H. K. Bentley said: I hesitate, Sir, to take any of the time at your disposal, for I have no archaeological contribution to make, but I would like to point out that it is to my mind most significant that the scriptural setting of the phrase which has provided such an apt title for Dr. Fawthrop's excellent book and paper, "The Stones Cry Out", finds its counterpart in present-day conditions. When Our Lord used the expression (St. Luke xix, 40), "If these (disciples) should hold their peace, the stones would immediately cry out", it was by way of rebuke to the Pharisees who should have recognised His messianic claims, but had not done so. Furthermore, silence on the part of His disciples would have been answered by the stones. To-day, Sir, we see similar conditions prevailing around us. Many who are professedly leaders of Christian thought are denying the full truth of Holy Scripture; denying, too, the full deity of Our Lord, and scoffing at the idea of His personal (second) coming, and so it is that to-day, in this relative silence as to fundamental doctrine, the stones are crying out, as Our Lord suggested they would.

Not only so, Sir, but it is, to my way of thinking, a most remarkable fact that our God has, in His wisdom and providence, kept in concealment these proofs of the historicity of His word for their discovery in these very days in which they are both needed and
decipherable. The modern apostasy finds its refutation in archaeology, and within the last century the keys have been discovered which have made possible the understanding of so much that has been found—I speak of the Rosetta Stone and the Behistun Inscription.

May I also add that it seems to me that God has subjected the professing Church to a test. Individuals have been called upon to decide whether they would believe the Bible or discredit it in favour of rationalistic doubts. Many have answered; some correctly, some incorrectly. And now what do we find? God causes the answers to be published, and those in favour of the Bible have proved to be right, whilst those against it are shown to have been wrong.

One more thing, Sir. Would it be possible, through the help of your influence, to have some such paper as this that we have listened to, broadcast by the B.B.C.? Surely it would do immense good if good sound information drawn from archaeology could be given to the public in this way.

Written Communication.

Rev. Principal H. S. Curr wrote: The chapters in Genesis which preserve the exquisite story of Joseph, as Principal Skinner calls it, furnish some striking illustrations of the way in which archaeological research confirms the historicity of the Bible. Some reference may be made to these as a supplement to the comprehensive summary of a very large subject which Dr. Fawthrop has provided in his admirable paper. The details in question are so slight that they do not attract the attention of the average reader, but they are none the less significant on that account, since Our Lord’s saying that he that is faithful in that which is least, will also be found faithful in that which is much, applies to the work of the historian or the biographer. If, then, it be discovered that a high standard of accuracy characterises passing allusions to Egyptian manners and customs in these chapters, may not the presumption be that what is true of the less is equally true of the greater, the story itself as well as its setting?

Modern critical scholarship does not deny that the knowledge of Egyptian life in the narratives of Joseph is remarkable, although
few would go the length of Dr. W. H. Bennett who wrote that the accuracy of the detail was so remarkable as to satisfy the champions of the doctrine that the Bible is inerrant. The admission of the truth of numerous little touches in these chapters by authorities who dispute the full inspiration of Holy Scripture is certainly significant.

Examples of these cases are the following. There is, for instance, the allusion to horses implied in the mention of the second chariot, or the state coach to which it would correspond in modern days (Genesis xii, 43). Excavations have revealed the fact that horses were only used on ceremonial occasions of the greatest importance. Again, there is the description of the arraying of Joseph in the attire proper to his office as Grand Vizier of Egypt. "And Pharaoh took off his signet ring from his hand, and put it on Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen (cotton R.V. margin) and put a gold chain (properly 'collar') about his neck" (Genesis xli, 42). These details are all confirmed by ancient engravings. Reference might also be made to the celebration of Pharaoh's birthday (Genesis xli, 20). Yet again we read that Joseph shaved himself and changed his garments before he appeared in the presence of Pharaoh to interpret his dreams (Genesis xli, 14). Additional evidence is furnished by Genesis xl, 11, where we read the words of Pharaoh's chief butler thus: "And Pharaoh's cup was in my hand; and I took the grapes, and pressed them into Pharaoh's hand". The practice of squeezing the fruit of the vine into the cup has been verified by archaeological research. One other instance might be mentioned. It is written that Joseph's brethren sat before him (Genesis xliii, 33). That casual statement reveals an intimate knowledge of ancient Egyptian life. At meals they did not recline but sat upright, more like the modern Western custom. This has also been verified by investigation of contemporary remains.

Dr. Fawthrop calls attention to the astonishing accuracy of detail for which the Acts of the Apostles is so justly famous. These chapters in Genesis are on a similar level of trustworthiness. Is it too much to claim that here we have two witnesses to the historical credibility of the Bible drawn from both Testaments, separated by many centuries, and equally eloquent? Surely in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word of God shall be established!
Lecturer's Reply.

I readily accept the preference of the Chairman and of Colonel Skinner to the word "Destructive," rather than "Higher" Critic. As the Rev. H. E. Anderson stated, Textual Criticism, the attempt to discover from the comparison of the various manuscripts the original text, we all accept. But Higher Criticism, or Destructive, with its fantastic theories of authorship said to be deduced from style and subject-matter, can only be permitted within certain limits. When such criticism conflicts with the Bible's own statement of inspiration, when it produces theories which archaeology proves to be untenable and when the results of its theories prove disastrous to the very churches built for the defence of the truth, it is time to call a halt; the so-called "Higher" has become the "Destructive," denying the miraculous and overlooking the moral.

As to the date of the Fall of Jericho, archaeology has caused students of to-day to accept the date of 1400 B.C. rather than the late date of the critics, 1200 B.C.; and even the Supplement to Peake's Commentary states that "a combination of arguments, Biblical, chronological and historical, seem to point to the earlier date".

As writing was in common use before the days of Moses, even in Palestine; as the ritual of the Pentateuch is similar to the ritual of the Temple of Serabit, in Sinai, also of the Mosaic age; and as the Laws of Khammurabi of Babylon, 500 years earlier than the Pentateuch, are similar to those of that book; there is little reason for supposing that the Pentateuch was a compilation of a much later age. Literary criticism, based upon style and analysis, cannot outweigh these facts.

I am glad that Mr. Percy Ruoff referred to my emphasis of the concessions mentioned in Peake's Supplement. Let us hope that those who so revelled in the criticisms of Peake's Commentary will now have the courage to quote these concessions and corrections. If the wireless would broadcast, as the Rev. H. K. Bentley suggests, these confirmations of Bible-history by archaeology, it would render great service to the nation. How apt it is that in this decadent age, when only one in twenty of the population attends religious services, the Stones are Crying Out.

I thank Principal Curr for directing our thought to the accuracy
of the Egyptian setting, the manners and customs, of the Joseph story. Dr. Yahuda extends this accuracy even to the very words and phrases. St. Luke, as the Principal points out, is also marvellously accurate; and thus we possess two witnesses, Moses and St. Luke, widely separated, who both declare the truth of the history of our Bible. May we not conclude with him that "every word of God shall be established"?