

[\(Click here for Table of Contents\)](#)

# BIBLE vs. MODERNISM

A COMPENDIUM  
OF  
SUNDRY CRITICAL HYPOTHESES  
AND  
THEIR REFUTATION

*By*

ALLISON N. TRICE  
Author, "Bible vs. Romanism," etc.

and

CHARLES H. ROBERSON, B.S., M.A.  
Author, "What Jesus Taught," etc.

Professor, Bible and Biblical Languages, Abilene Christian College, Abilene, Texas  
One Time Instructor, Bible Chair, Church of Christ, at University of Texas

Copyright, 1935, by the authors

[NOTE—The Bible text and quotations used in this volume, except as otherwise noted, are taken from the text of the American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible, copyright, 1929 by the International Council of Religious Education, and used by permission.]

Printed in United States of America  
McQUIDDY PRESS  
ROCK CITY PUBLISHING COMPANY  
110 Seventh Avenue, North  
Nashville, Tennessee

# CONTENTS

(Click chapter title for text)

	<i>Page</i>
PREFACE .....	7
INTRODUCTION .....	9

## PART I

### DESTRUCTIVE HIGHER CRITICISM

#### CHAPTER I—REVELATION

<i>Section I</i> —THE BIBLE .....	15
<i>Section II</i> —HOW WE GOT OUR BIBLE .....	17

#### CHAPTER II—THEORIES OF CRITICS

<i>Section I</i> —THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS .....	21
<i>Section II</i> —ELOHIM (GOD) AND YAHWEH (JEHOVAH) .....	23
<i>Section III</i> —REPETITIONS .....	27
<i>Section IV</i> —LATE DATES ASSIGNED TO BOOKS OF THE BIBLE .....	28

#### CHAPTER III—CRITICAL METHODS .....

36

#### CHAPTER IV—CRITICAL EVIDENCE .....

45

#### CHAPTER V—CRITICAL WORK

<i>Section I</i> —POLYCHROME BIBLE .....	55
<i>Section II</i> —POLYCHROME BIBLE NOTES .....	56
<i>Section III</i> —THE REDACTOR .....	59

#### CHAPTER VI—INSPIRED AUTHORSHIP .....

62

#### CHAPTER VII—CRITICAL ARGUMENTS

<i>Section I</i> —PRIESTHOOD AS EVIDENCE .....	66
<i>Section II</i> —ALTARS OR SANCTUARIES AS EVIDENCE .....	67
<i>Section III</i> —THE SETTING OF DEUTERONOMY .....	70
<i>Section IV</i> —GIANT CITIES OF BASHAN .....	71
<i>Section V</i> —BUILT BY GIANTS .....	72
<i>Section VI</i> —THE SILENCE ARGUMENT .....	74

#### CHAPTER VIII—CRITICAL ARGUMENTS REFUTED

<i>Section I</i> —MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH .....	78
<i>Section II</i> —NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE .....	81

#### CHAPTER IX—OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

<i>Section I</i> —FIRST OBJECTIONS .....	83
<i>Section II</i> —FALSE CHARGES AND INTERPRETATIONS .....	88

	Page
<b>CHAPTER X—SCIENCE VS. CRITICAL CLAIMS</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —SCIENCE OF THE BIBLE .....	93
<i>Section II</i> —ASTROLOGY .....	98
<i>Section III</i> —MIRACLES .....	99
<b>CHAPTER XI—FRUITS OF MODERNISM</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —FALSE PHILOSOPHY AND IMMORALITY .....	104
<i>Section II</i> —APOTHEOSIS .....	105
<i>Section III</i> —FREUDISM .....	108
<i>Section IV</i> —A NEMESIS OF HIGHER CRITICISM .....	110
<b>PART II EXTERNAL EVIDENCE</b>	
<b>CHAPTER I—SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —ARCHAEOLOGY .....	117
<i>Section II</i> —ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY .....	118
<i>Section III</i> —THE ROSETTA STONE .....	121
<b>CHAPTER II—LIGHT FROM EGYPT</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —EGYPT .....	124
<i>Section II</i> —THE OLDEST BOOK .....	124
<i>Section III</i> —WHAT OF THE FLOOD? .....	125
<i>Section IV</i> —THE PYRAMIDS .....	127
<i>Section V</i> —ELEPHANTINE RECORDS .....	128
<b>CHAPTER III—ANCIENT EGYPT CONFIRMS THE BIBLE</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —SCRIPTURE CONFIRMATIONS—EGYPTIAN .....	131
<i>Section II</i> —THE HITTITES .....	132
<i>Section III</i> —BIBLE ONLY SOURCE OF MONOTHEISM .....	132
<i>Section IV</i> —TEL-EL-AMARNA TABLETS .....	133
<i>Section V</i> —MERNEPTAH .....	135
<i>Section VI</i> —THE PHARAOHS DEALING WITH MOSES .....	136
<b>CHAPTER IV—LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT EAST</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —CUNEIFORM WRITING DECIPHERED .....	150
<i>Section II</i> —THE BEHISTUN INSCRIPTION .....	150
<i>Section III</i> —ASHURBANIPAL'S LIBRARY .....	151
<b>CHAPTER V—THE CRADLE OF CIVILIZATION</b>	
<i>Section I</i> —MESOPOTAMIA .....	155
<i>Section II</i> —ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA .....	156

	Page
CHAPTER VI—THE TRUTH IN CUNEIFORM	
<i>Section I</i> —SCRIPTURE CONFIRMATIONS—CUNEIFORMS .....	160
<i>Section II</i> —AT BABYLON .....	160
<i>Section III</i> —AT THE TOWER OF BABEL .....	162
<i>Section IV</i> —INFLUENCE OF DANIEL AND THE TRUE GOD .....	163
<i>Section V</i> —UR OF THE CHALDEES AND BELSHAZZAR .....	164
<i>Section VI</i> —AT KHORSABAD .....	164
<i>Section VII</i> —IZDUBAR (OR GISDUBAR) AS NIMROD .....	165
<i>Section VIII</i> —AT NINEVEH .....	166
CHAPTER VII—NINEVEH AND JONAH .....	170
CHAPTER VIII—ANCIENT HEBREW RECORDS CONFIRMED	
<i>Section I</i> —THE CHALDEAN ACCOUNT OF THE DELUGE AND ISRAEL'S RELIGION .....	174
<i>Section II</i> —ABRAHAM .....	177
CHAPTER IX—EVIDENCE FROM NOMENCLATURE. ....	181
CHAPTER X—EXPLORATIONS IN PALESTINE .....	186

PART III

NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM

CHAPTER I—NEW COVENANT MESSAGE	
<i>Section I</i> —THE GOSPEL STORY .....	193
<i>Section II</i> —ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE .....	193
CHAPTER II—DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE .....	197
CHAPTER III—PROPAGANDA VS. FUNDAMENTAL TRUTH	
<i>Section I</i> —AGENCIES FOR PROPAGANDA OF UNBELIEF .....	203
<i>Section II</i> —THE SETTING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT .....	206
<i>Section III</i> —A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE .....	207
CHAPTER IV—INTERNAL EVIDENCE CONCLUSIVE	
<i>Section I</i> —CREDIBILITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE .....	211
<i>Section II</i> —INTERNAL EVIDENCE .....	211
<i>Section III</i> —NEW TESTAMENT GREEK .....	212
CHAPTER V—CONFIRMATIONS FROM MANY LANDS	
<i>Section I</i> —SPECIFIC CONFIRMATIONS .....	215
<i>Section II</i> —MISCELLANEOUS CONFIRMATIONS .....	215
<i>Section III</i> —AT MOUNT SINAI .....	216

CHAPTER VI—EVIDENCE ON PARCHMENT, VELLUM, AND PAPYRUS	
<i>Section I</i> —THE DIDACHE OR TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES .....	221
<i>Section II</i> —TATIAN'S DIATESSARON—OR HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS ..	221
<i>Section III</i> —THE TRINITY AND INCARNATION. ....	223

#### PART IV

FALSE CLAIMS OF EVOLUTION CHAPTER I—HYPOTHETICAL AND CONJECTURAL PHILOSOPHY	
<i>Section I</i> —EVOLUTION A FACT. ....	229
<i>Section II</i> —STATUS OF EVOLUTION .....	229
<i>Section III</i> —DARWINIAN EVOLUTION .....	230
CHAPTER II—ASSUMPTION AS MAJOR PREMISE	
<i>Section I</i> —VARIATION AND INHERITANCE .....	235
<i>Section II</i> —DISSIMILARITIES .....	239
<i>Section III</i> —DARWIN'S PURPOSE .....	240
<i>Section IV</i> —SOCIAL EVOLUTION .....	242
CHAPTER III—THEISTIC EVOLUTION	
<i>Section I</i> —DARWINISM vs. THE BIBLE .....	245
<i>Section II</i> —CONJECTURAL PHILOSOPHY .....	246
<i>Section III</i> —DOES CHRISTIANITY OPPOSE SCIENCE? .....	248
CHAPTER IV—DARWINISM REFUTED .....	252
CHAPTER V—FOSSIL REMAINS AND ENIGMAS	
<i>Section I</i> —THE MISSING LINK .....	259
<i>Section II</i> —PROOF (?) BY RECONSTRUCTION .....	260
<i>Section III</i> —THE SEVEN ENIGMAS OF EVOLUTION .....	262

#### PART V

##### THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION

CHAPTER I—EDUCATION .....	269
CHAPTER II—RELIGIOUS EDUCATION .....	271
CHAPTER III—CHRISTIAN EDUCATION .....	273
CHAPTER IV—RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS .....	275
CHAPTER V—BIBLICAL LITERATURE .....	278

## PREFACE

**Reason for This Treatise.** Solomon said: "Of making many books there is no end; and much study is a weariness of the flesh" (Eccles. 12:12). Job said: "Oh . . . that I had the indictment which mine adversary hath written!" (31:35). The fact that the adversary has written an indictment against truth and righteousness which has been widely distributed throughout the civilized world is sufficient excuse for this defense, adding another to the ever-increasing number of books offered to the reading public. "Of making many books" propagating error and falsehood there seems to be "no end," and, if "a lie will travel a league while the truth is putting on her boots," wisdom suggests that counteracting principles should be continually and energetically used by all who love the truth. So long as error and falsehood abound just so long should the truth be taught. Truth makes men free.

**Purpose of Opposing Publications.** The conflict between truth and error has raged since the beginning of man's existence on the earth and will continue while men exist in the flesh. This conflict was begun by the enemy of truth who is also the enemy of mankind. This enemy often objects to a review of his false theories and cries, "Peace, peace, when there is no peace"; his plea is "Let us alone," while he continues his activities in spreading false doctrines and false theories. Each year brings a number of new books filled with indictments, in varying degrees of unbelief, against the Bible as the inspired word of God. The authors of many of these profess adherence to faith in the Bible, but a careful examination of their teaching reveals an obvious purpose of reducing to nothingness the claims of inspiration.

**The Non-Bible Readers.** A chief aim of this work is to present evidence which cannot be disputed, for the consideration of truth seekers who are not disposed to "search the scriptures" for the truth of the claims of the Bible, whose fetter binding them to the thralldom of unbelief is an intellectual illusion of scientific authority which is constantly changing, "ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth" (2 Tim. 3:7). To flow thus with the current of philosophy with no fixed standard of truth as authority is to drift inevitably farther and farther away from truth and more and more into the grasp of error and agnosticism.

**Both Kinds of Evidence.** The story is told of a minister of the gospel who attempted to convert a skeptical lady by quoting scripture. The lady replied that she did not believe the Bible, and the minister, not being well versed in external evidence, failed in his efforts. No doubt the evidence found in the Bible itself is the most convincing when the unbeliever can be reached with it in its simple, unaltered form. We believe the present age is one calling for the use of the many proofs of an external character for the claims of the Bible.

**Sources.** It is evident that no one is sufficiently equipped to discuss adequately the various phases of modernism with exhaustive firsthand knowledge. Recourse has been had to standard authorities listed at the close of this book, many of which have been consulted or quoted. Much of the material has been published in various forms and has been used by the authors in the classroom and in lectures for a number of years so that specific reference to the original source of some discoveries mentioned would be difficult or impossible, but such portions may be easily verified from various authorities. To all such authorities we acknowledge our indebtedness.

**Style.** The authors have aimed at accuracy and clearness of expression. As far as possible, unfamiliar and technical terms have been avoided, and only a few well-known Latin phrases have been used, thus adapting the work to the average reader. Plain and simple language will appeal to all alike when the subject matter is of general interest.

**Method and Viewpoint.** We make no claims to originality, but, by patient study and labor, the fixed purpose in presenting this treatise to the public has been to bring together in orderly form what thoughtful men know to be the truth on the subjects treated. We believe there is need for a treatise, the "Bible versus Modernism," from the viewpoint of implicit faith in the Book of Books. How well we may have succeeded in these efforts is left to the reader for his individual decision.

THE AUTHORS.



## INTRODUCTION

**Hypotheses.** In treating the subject of modernism it will be necessary to cover quite a variety of human thought, for the term includes a number of theories, chief among which are the Documentary Hypothesis and the Evolutionary Hypothesis. The present work does not propose to cover all features of these hypotheses, but will be devoted largely to *Higher Criticism* and *False Claims of Evolution*, including some of the teachings usually connected with these hypotheses.

**Higher Criticism.** Professor McGarvey defines higher criticism as "the art of ascertaining the authorship, date, credibility, and literary characteristics of written documents."<sup>1</sup> Lower criticism deals with the text of written documents. A large part of the work of higher critics is directed against the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. There are several schools or classes of higher critics, but for practical purposes they may be divided into "Radical or Rational" critics and "Evangelical or Conservative" critics.<sup>2</sup> The former deny that any part of the Pentateuch was written by Moses except possibly the Decalogue. The latter admit the Decalogue and the "book of the covenant" given in Ex. 20-23, but deny the rest of the Pentateuch to Moses.

**Hexateuch and Sources Claimed by Critics.** Higher critics add the book of Joshua to the Pentateuch and call the six books the Hexateuch, denying the historicity of Joshua along with the Pentateuch and claiming all six are compiled from documents, fragments of which they claim to see in all six books. These documents have never been discovered and have no existence except in the imagination of the critic who claims to establish them by a process of literary analysis. These so-called sources are primarily five in number and are represented as J, E, P, D, and H. But, as will be seen later in this work, other designations are used to indicate other sources discovered later by a similar process.

**Apology for Higher Criticism.** In the "New Commentary on Holy Scripture," by Charles Gore and some fifty contributors, Anglican scholars, published in 1928 (referred to in this work as "Anglican"), T. H. Robinson is given as authority, with approval, for the following excuse for modern higher criticism:

---

<sup>1</sup> J. W. McGarvey: "Authorship of Deuteronomy" (1902), p. iv

<sup>2</sup> Ibid., p. vi.

p. vi.

He tells of a group of Sunday school teachers who had met to discuss the lesson for the next Sunday. It was the story of Joseph and his brothers (Gen. 37), and as they studied it with a view to teaching it they found difficulties in reconciling the contradictions it contains. In one place Joseph is said to have been sold to Ishmaelites, and in another to have been carried off by Midianites; while in one part of the story Reuben tries to rescue him by suggesting that he should be put in a pit; in other verses it is Judah who saves his life by proposing to sell him to Ishmaelites. The case seemed hopeless until the leader of the group suggested that possibly two stories were intertwined here. At once a line of solution was offered, and in half an hour, with nothing but the English AV before them, they had disentangled two narratives, each of which was in itself practically complete. . . . These young people would probably have been much surprised if they had been told that they were doing "higher criticism," yet that is exactly what they were doing.<sup>3</sup>

**Fallacy of the Apology Exposed.** The above-named commentary adopts this as the excuse for the Documentary Hypothesis which is claimed to analyze the five books of the Pentateuch and to distinguish "with reasonable accuracy the documentary sources which have been combined in the composition." It would seem, however, that at least one of these fifty or more scholars should have known enough to prevent such a charge of "contradictions" from appearing in their "New Commentary on Holy Scripture." By consulting Judges 8:22, 24 it will be seen that Midianites were Ishmaelites, for the passages plainly say so. Again the tribesmen are named indifferently Ishmaelites and Midianites (see Gen. 37:25, 28, 36). They stood in close relations with descendants of Hagar's son. As to Reuben and Judah, the record is clear. Reuben suggested the pit instead of murder; then, while Reuben was not present, Judah suggested selling him "and let not our hand be upon him." The cause of criticism must be hard pressed indeed if it has to be maintained by such perversions.

**Holy Spirit as Authority.** It may not matter much as to certain books of the Bible being by this or that author so long as it is believed that the Holy Spirit is the author who inspired the writer, except that when the Holy Spirit gives the name of the author or writer through whom the revelation is made it must be accepted, if the Bible be accepted.

"Higher critical theories now in vogue had their origin and elaboration in Germany ... in Britain and America are largely of the nature of importations."<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Gore et als.: *Op. Cit.*, p. 23.

<sup>4</sup>James Orr: "Problem of the Old Testament" (1917), p. xvi.

**Widespread Influence of Evolution.** The evolutionary theory has secured a firm hold upon the civilization of the world in modern times. While Darwin did not originate this guess, he promulgated it in such form and manner as to attract public attention, and with such plausibility as to find acceptance with the unwary and those who do not investigate the merits of the philosophy in the light of the Bible and known truth. The doctrine has become a fundamental element in most of the literature and thought of the present age; it plays a large part in our histories, our fiction, and all other kinds of literature, and is taught in the textbooks on geology, biology, zoology, entomology, sociology, and other branches of science used in our schools and colleges; it is found in nearly all of our daily papers, magazines, and journals, and is even deep-seated in the beliefs of religious organizations. And yet the doctrine of evolution rests on nothing more than an hypothesis, a fact which its advocates have almost universally admitted.

## SYNOPSIS

## PREFACE

Of making many books—Solomon.  
 Indictment of the adversary—Job.  
 Counteracting principles should be used.  
 Purpose of opposing publications.  
 The enemy of truth objects to a review of his false theories.  
 An effort to nullify the claims of inspiration.  
 Effect of flowing with the current of popular philosophy.  
 Difficulty of reaching the skeptic with scripture quotations.  
 External evidence may reach those who will not read the Bible.  
 Sources—standard authorities.  
 Simplicity, accuracy, and clarity of expression.  
 Viewpoint of authors.

## INTRODUCTION

Two main hypotheses.  
 Definition of higher criticism—two classes of critics.  
 The "Hexateuch."  
 Critical sources derived from literary analysis—five groups.  
 Apology for higher criticism given by Anglican commentary.  
 Midianites were Ishmaelites.  
 Suggestions of Reuben and Judah.  
 Holy Spirit as authority.  
 Widespread influence of the dogma of evolution.  
 Rests on nothing more than a guess—hypothesis.

PART I

DESTRUCTIVE HIGHER CRITICISM

CHAPTER I  
REVELATION  
*Section I—THE BIBLE*

**The Bible as Literature.** Critics of all shades and degrees delight to refer to the Bible as "literature," and as such they continually sing its praises and admire its beauty of expression, its lofty ideals, its noble sentiments, and its superior code of morals; yet they underrate its value, its purpose, its inspiration, its authority, and influence in the world. Most of the critics would deal with the Bible as mere "literature," ignoring and disparaging its influence and power as the word of God.

**The Bible Unique.** That the Bible is unique cannot be successfully denied. It may not be compared with other books, even with those of a religious character, because only things of the same class or kind can be compared. There is no other book competing with the Bible in the same aim and purpose of salvation, in the science and art of true happiness, and a life of bliss beyond the grave.

**Religion of the Bible.** "Externally the religion of Israel resembles other religions in temple, priesthood, altars, sacrifices," and perhaps to some extent in ritual, but it is wholly unlike other religions in its purpose, its origin, and its authority. Heathen religions have some ethical concepts, but generally these are not featured, and their importance is smothered and overshadowed by idolatry, mythology, and most debasing rites and ceremonies. Dr. James Orr says:

We need only recall the spirit worship and magic of Babylonia; the animal worship and ancestor worship of Egypt; the stone worship and tree worship, the human sacrifices, the lustful rites, the self-immolations, which enter so deeply into most non-Biblical religions. How great the contrast when we come to the religion of Israel!<sup>1</sup>

**Bible Religion Monotheistic.** Of course, the religion of Israel, the system revealed by God, cannot be logically condemned because it was perverted and corrupted by some who adopted the vices and idolatry of surrounding nations. A very striking contrast between the religion of the Bible and that of the heathen is found in the fact that only Judaism, Christianity, and Mohammedanism (which borrowed from the Bible) are monotheistic, while all others are polytheistic.

---

<sup>1</sup> James Orr: "Problem of the Old Testament" (1917), p 39,

**Source of Literature of Ancient Israel.** The Bible contains all the literature that has been preserved and handed down to us from ancient Israel through a long period of time and gives us by the pen of inspiration the history of true religion in the world from the beginning of man's existence on the earth. Moses did not write from personal experience and observation when he wrote the book of Genesis. He wrote by supernatural endowment of the Holy Spirit when he gave us the record of events dating some 2,500 years before his time. Nor is the view so often expressed by those who claim to believe the writings of Moses—that he got all his information concerning the creation, the fall, and the deluge from written documents handed down to him from remote ages of antiquity—tenable and worthy of acceptance.

**An Inspired Record.** Moses was an inspired writer and could write of things beyond his personal experience and observation retrospectively as well as prospectively. The same God that endowed him to predict some 1,500 years beforehand that "I will raise them up a prophet from among their brethren, like unto thee; and I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak unto them all that I shall command him" (Deut. 18:18) could likewise inspire him to give a true record of the past, reaching back to the beginning of mankind and beyond. Some have thought that Abraham wrote the book of Genesis, but no convincing evidence of it is available, and, besides, the same difficulty would attach to Abraham as to Moses so far as concerns personal experience and observation, the span of past history in his case being about four and a half centuries less than that of Moses. History makes use of human sources of information, oral tradition, written laws and documents, ancient monuments. No tradition can reach beyond the time of man's introduction upon the earth. The record of the beginnings must be a supernatural revelation. There seems to be evidence that the patriarchs could write, and doubtless this is also true of the antediluvians, but we do not have any of their writings, and, in the absence of contemporary evidence, mere speculation is futile.

**Character and Nature of Contents.** The divine origin of the Bible is attested by the character and nature of its contents. It contains narratives of the most tender and touching interest, of heroic deeds, of wise administrations, of adherence to duty even in the most trying circumstances. It contains poetry of the rarest beauty, gems

of thought and wisdom unequalled in any other literature in the world. It discourses on the most profound themes that ever engaged the thought of man, treating of God, of the creation, of sin and salvation, and of man's eternal destiny. Its teaching through prophets and the fulfillment of their predictions; its doctrine of righteousness, self-control, and the judgment to come—all this and more testify of the divine origin and inspiration of God's revelation to man—the Bible. No adequate survey of the Bible can ignore its "miracles, its prophecies, and its revealed truth, without which it would be a different book and would lose its appeal to mankind."

**Divine Origin.** A prominent feature of the Bible found in no other book is that it speaks as from God. It never employs reasoning or philosophy in the enunciation of truth. Its edicts are founded upon the principle of right and truth based upon the absolute authority of God. It never expresses or implies doubt or uncertainty nor speaks of things as possible or probable, and its references to the future are as certain and positive as if they were past history.

The only conditions expressed or implied of the future arise from the conditions dependent on man's course. God left man free to choose, and on the choice man makes God's blessing or curse is suspended. The only contingencies of the future depend on the course man may pursue. Otherwise the future in the scripture is foretold with all the certainty of the present or past.<sup>2</sup>

The proof of all this is seen in all of God's dealings with man as recorded in the Bible. Its divine revelation of the beginning of things, of the nature and person of God, of heaven and hell, of man's origin, relations and destiny, of sin and salvation, of a future life, of rewards to the righteous and punishment to the wicked—all this and much more indicate the contents of the Bible could come alone from God.

#### *Section II—HOW WE GOT OUR BIBLE*

**Bible as Evidence.** It will be our purpose to answer this question from the only trustworthy source known to us, that is, the Bible itself. It is surely right and logical to permit the Bible to speak for itself, and in order to set forth the claims made for itself we quote <sup>a</sup> few passages:

Heb. 1:1, 2: God, having of old time spoken unto the fathers in the prophets by divers portions and in divers manners, hath at the end of these days spoken unto us in his Son, whom he appointed heir of all things, through whom also he made the worlds.

---

<sup>2</sup> David Lipscomb in "Bible vs. Theories of Evolution," p. 51.

Heb. 2:1-4: Therefore we ought to give the more earnest heed to the things that were heard, lest haply we drift away from them. For if the word spoken through angels proved steadfast, and every transgression and disobedience received a just recompense of reward; how shall we escape, if we neglect so great a salvation? which having at the first been spoken through the Lord, was confirmed unto us by them that heard; God also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own will.

**Revelation Through Prophets and Apostles.** From the above passages we have the claim set up in the Bible that God spoke in olden times in the prophets and through angels, and that the salvation through the Lord was spoken first by him and then by them that heard, that is, the apostles and prophets. So it is established that revelation came to us through prophets and apostles. But one may ask if the Bible claims this revelation is trustworthy, reliable, and dependable. A few passages on this point will show what the Bible claims for itself:

John 14:16, 17: And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter, that he may be with you for ever, even the Spirit of truth: whom the world cannot receive; for it beholdeth him not, neither knoweth him: ye know him; for he abideth with you, and shall be in you.

John 14:26: But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.

John 16:13: Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he shall guide you into all the truth.

2 Pet. 1:20f: Knowing this first, that no prophecy of scripture is of private interpretation. For no prophecy ever came by the will of man: but men spake from God, being moved by the Holy Spirit.

**Spiritual Endowment Promised.** These passages give the assurance that the apostles would have the guiding influence of the Holy Spirit promised by Jesus himself. Jesus spoke the truth and his apostles were endowed with power from on high to bring to their remembrance all that he had taught them, and they were thus guarded from error and lapse of memory, so that the message of salvation preached by them is infallibly correct and the possibility of any error is thus precluded.

But one may ask again about the authority of the apostles to speak and give the message of salvation to the world. This is most clearly shown from the following words of the Savior:

Matt. 19:28: Ye who have followed me, in the regeneration [the new kingdom which was to be established; that is, the spiritual renewal of the world] when the Son of man shall sit on the throne of his glory, ye also shall sit upon twelve thrones, judging the twelve tribes of Israel.



Matt. 18:18: What things soever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven; and what things soever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven.

Acts 1:8: But ye shall receive power, when the Holy Spirit is come upon you: and ye shall be my witnesses . . . unto the uttermost part of the earth.

**Promises Fulfilled.** In Acts 2:4 we find the literal fulfillment of these promises when the apostles "were all filled with the Holy Spirit, and began to speak with other tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance." In these passages it is clearly taught that the twelve apostles were to sit on twelve thrones judging the twelve tribes of Israel, which evidently means spiritual Israel, God's people, Christians. The apostles are judging Christians today as they live the Christian life according to their teaching, and by that teaching we are to be judged in the last day. These apostles have never abdicated their thrones, nor have they been dethroned; they are on those thrones now and will remain to the end of time. They are never to have any successors (Matt. 19:28).

**Internal Evidence.** As to the Old Testament no one will deny that it was in existence during the time of Christ's personal ministry. He gave his endorsement of the entire Old Testament in Luke 24:44, when he said:

These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me.

It was generally understood at the time that these three divisions covered the entire Old Testament. The only way to reject this evidence is to reject the words of Jesus himself.

Again we have the plain statement in 2 Tim. 3:16f:

Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work.

Jewish tradition concerning inspired prophets and teachers has all along regarded the Old Testament as coming from inspired writers, has accounted the Pentateuch as having been written by Moses, has adopted his claims often repeated that he is giving the message received by him from God himself, and, also, the prophets claim that their messages were written as given by Jehovah. Apparently the final order and arrangement of the canon of the Old Testament is expressed by the passage:

That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed on the earth, from the blood of Abel the righteous unto the blood of Zachariah son of Barachiah, whom ye slew between the sanctuary and the altar (Matt. 23:35; Luke 11:51).

To get the bearing of this passage one should know that, in the arrangement of the Old Testament books in the Hebrew text, Chronicles stands last, and the murder of Zachariah is the last recorded instance in this order, being found in 2 Chron. 24:20f. So it seems as if Jesus in the expression, "from the blood of Abel . . . unto the blood of Zachariah," were including the whole range of Old Testament scripture much as we would say "from Genesis to Malachi." We thus establish the claim of the Bible itself that it comes from God through divinely inspired men.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER I

### *Section I—THE BIBLE*

Critical view of the Bible.

The Bible unique—may not be compared with other books.

Religion of Bible unlike other religions in purpose, origin, authority. Spirit worship and magic of Babylonia, animal worship and ancestor worship of Egypt, stone worship, tree worship, human sacrifices, etc.

Religion of Bible monotheistic—Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism (borrowed from the Bible). All others polytheistic.

Bible contains all the literature of ancient Israel handed down to us.

Moses wrote by inspiration of events 2,500 years before his day.

Prophet as well as lawgiver, predictions 1,500 years before fulfilled.

Character and nature of contents—evidence of divine origin.

Prominent feature—speaks as from God, no reasoning, no philosophy; no doubt nor uncertainty, not as possible or probable—reference to future certain.

Treats of subjects man has no means of knowing except by revelation of God, heaven and hell, man's origin, relations and destiny, sin and salvation, future life, rewards and punishments.

### *Section II—HOW WE GOT OUR BIBLE*

Let Bible speak for itself—quotations.

Revelation came through prophets and apostles.

Trustworthy, reliable, and dependable—quotations.

Promises fulfilled—quotations.

Jesus endorses Old Testament—quotations.

Testimony of prophets and apostles.

Meaning of "from the blood of Abel . . . unto the blood of Zachariah" (Matt. 23:35).

CHAPTER II  
THEORIES OF CRITICS  
*Section I*—THE DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS

**Schools of Infidelity.** Infidelity is divided into some half dozen schools according to certain distinctions as follows:

1. Atheists, who deny the existence of God.
2. Skeptics, who doubt the existence of God.
3. Agnostics, who claim to be neutral, neither denying nor affirming the existence of God. Robert G. Ingersoll was an agnostic, and, when asked if there is a God, answered, "I don't know; I never saw one." He thus repudiates faith entirely. To be consistent, he would have to give the same answer if he were asked if Julius Caesar, or Alexander the Great, or even George Washington ever lived.
4. Deists, who acknowledge a Supreme Being, but deny the Bible as his revelation to man.
5. Destructive higher critics, who profess to believe in God and the Bible, but usually reject its miracles and the inspiration of the Bible. They also usually reject the divinity of Jesus Christ, his virgin birth, and his resurrection.
6. Unitarians, who claim to accept the Bible, but admit only one person in the Godhead, hence the name Unitarian. They also usually hold the views of destructive critics.

While these schools differ in the points named, they are a unit in their opposition to the truth as taught in the Bible, and the major portion of their effort is directed to the destruction of simple Christianity and the influence of the Bible.

**Not Modern.** We propose to give special attention here to the destructive higher critic in his support of what he is pleased to call the Documentary Hypothesis. All schools of infidelity unite in repudiating the account given by the Bible of itself as shown in the preceding discussion. For the sake of brevity we shall refer to these objectors as critics or modernists. They believe their doctrine is up-to-date and modern and that it is the result of new discoveries and scientific investigation of modern times. But in this they are badly mistaken, as most of their conclusions may be found in the early history of the Christian religion. Even their cherished theory, the Documentary Hypothesis, is not very modern. It was invented by Jean Astruck, a Roman Catholic physician, in 1753, and it has been

enlarged and elaborated by different adherents from time to time.

**Not Documentary—Results Claimed.** The name Documentary Hypothesis is a misnomer, as it is neither documentary in the sense of real documents nor in the sense that their supposition is supported by documentary or historical evidence. The word hypothesis means a guess, a supposition, and it is freely admitted that it is a guess. The supposition assumes that the Bible was not written when and where it is claimed to have been written, nor by the writers attached to the various books. It assumes that the Bible is made up of myths and legends and folklore in the form of separate documents, and that these documents were later patched together by an editor who altered, added to and eliminated portions to make what we now have in the various books of the Bible. By a process of literary analysis critics claim to establish the following results:

1. The use of two Hebrew words for the Deity indicates two different writers, the one using Elohim (translated in the Authorized Version God) and the other using Yahweh (translated in the American Revised Version Jehovah). These two documents are designated as E and J, respectively.

2. The style or vocabulary used in certain portions of the Bible is taken to prove certain parts were written by a priestly writer giving priestly duties, etc., as most of Leviticus and portions scattered throughout the Pentateuch. This document is designated P.

3. The book of Deuteronomy presents certain features and a style which are taken to prove a still different writer, and they designate this supposed document D.

4. Another document which is claimed to have been discovered by this analysis is one featuring certain passages on piety and holiness, and this imaginary document is called the holiness document, designated H.

5. The system as first invented was found to be very defective, and a remedy had to be found. Where the theory made lapses, inconsistencies, and contradictions, they placed the blame on an editor or redactor, designated R.

It is claimed that the critical analysis is scientific and that it has proved scientifically that the Pentateuch was not written by one man, Moses, but that it is made up of different documents pieced together by a later writer; that the same writer would not have used more than one word to designate the Deity; that the style shows that a different writer composed each of the supposed documents; that no

one writer could have written both Genesis and Leviticus, nor could any one writer have written Exodus and Deuteronomy. It is pointed out that by their analysis it is found that the account of the crossing of the Red Sea by Israel is made up of two previous documents, each being "practically" complete in itself, likewise the account of the flood and other historical accounts found in the Pentateuch, and that no single writer would have used the repetitions found in these accounts and in the first and second chapters of Genesis where it is confidently claimed there are two distinct accounts, each "practically" complete in itself.

**Not Scientific.** Not only do the critics claim that the Documentary Hypothesis is scientific, but they even make the bold assertion that it is established and demonstrated truth. Dr. Abbott makes the following claim on this point:

The opinion that the historical books are thus composed of preexisting documents is what is known as the Documentary Hypothesis. But the scientific or literary student of the Bible regards this opinion as no longer hypothetical.

He also thinks that these original elements themselves are not original writings, but are composed of preexisting materials, and these materials also, by painstaking study, he endeavors to discover and make clear.<sup>1</sup>

We shall see further in regard to these assumptions and show the flimsy foundation on which they are built. We now propose to examine briefly the principal claims of the critical analysis regarding:

1. Two names for the Deity indicating two different writers.
2. Repetitions or parallelisms indicating still different documents or sources from which the Bible is claimed to be composed.
3. The later dates claimed for the different books.

#### *Section II—ELOHIM (Goo) AND YAHWEH (JEHOVAH)*

**Name Theory Fails.** In the American Revised Bible the name Elohim (Hebrew) is uniformly translated God and the name Yahweh (Hebrew) is always translated Jehovah. Any English reader can, therefore, trace these names in his Bible and see for himself just what there is in this contention. It will be readily seen that this theory does not hold in any part of the Bible, that to separate those portions where the one name is used from those using the other produces much confusion, conflicts, and disconnections and changes a natural, orderly, and connected record into a mass of nonsense. The two Hebrew names are used interchangeably and without discrimination

---

<sup>1</sup>Lyman Abbott: "Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews," p. 35.

throughout the Old Testament. The fact that the two are often used together in the same sentence, in apposition or one as the subjective complement of the other, is quite sufficient to disprove the theory. Jehovah God is used eleven times in the second chapter of Genesis, while God (Elohim) is used three times in that chapter. Jehovah thy God is found five times in the Decalogue and God (Elohim) once. In many places we find "Jehovah is God," "Jehovah our God," "Jehovah your God," etc. Of course, the critics saw this difficulty and a remedy had to be found, so they invented an editor or redactor (designated R) who, according to the theory, put the two documents together, retaining the two names from two different documents, and that in doing this he took great editorial liberty and even put them in apposition or as subjective complement. This compound they designate as JE. This illustrates what the critics will do to carry out their scheme. Where the life of the theory is at stake they think it a light matter to assume whatever is needed to save it.

**Critical Theory Found Inadequate.** The far-fetched schemes adopted by the critics to save their hypothesis would be amusing if the matter involved were not so serious—and they lament the fact that the system has so many misfits and difficulties. It may be of interest at this point to consider a quotation from Professor Chas. A. Briggs, D.D., who was once turned out of the Presbyterian church on a charge of heresy in holding the errancy of the original sacred scriptures, but was later adopted by another religious connection and became professor of Biblical Theology in Union Theological Seminary, New York. In his "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 137, he says:

It is necessary to distinguish between P<sup>1</sup> and P<sup>2</sup>, D<sup>1</sup> and D<sup>2</sup>, J<sup>1</sup> and J<sup>2</sup>, E<sup>1</sup> and E<sup>2</sup>, and thus the problem of Pentateuchal criticism becomes complex and extremely intricate. It is easy for anti-critics to make sport of such work.

**Remedy Attempted by Expansion.** And yet Professor Briggs is a firm believer in "such work." It will be seen from this that they found that the original classification into four documents of J, E, P, and D was not workable in carrying out their scheme and they felt the need of creating four others as indicated. Others have carried this scheme still further, as D<sup>1</sup>, D<sup>2</sup>, D<sup>3</sup>, R<sup>1</sup>, R<sup>2</sup>, R<sup>3</sup>, R<sup>4</sup>, etc.

**Specific Cases of Failure.** Numerous are the cases where the name theory does not hold. In Gen. 3:1, 3, 5 (a J section) the name Elohim is put into the mouth of the serpent, also in Gen. 16:13 (another J passage) Hagar says: "Thou art a God [E] that

seeth." Likewise, Jehovah is found in E passages. In Gen. 22:1-14 (an E passage) Jehovah is found in verse eleven (11) and twice in verse fourteen (14). Also in Gen. 28:17-22 (an E passage), "And Jehovah will be my God." These and many other present unwelcome facts which the critics try in every possible way to get rid of, and, when they can find no other means, the accommodating redactor is made the goat to bear away the sin of inconsistency into the desert of forgetfulness. As illustrating this still further we find Gen. 7:9 has Elohim in a J passage, and to get rid of it some say that the original name must have been Jehovah, while others think verses eight (8) and nine (9) are an interpolation by R (the redactor). Again Jehovah in verse sixteen (16) has to be eliminated, and here also the redactor is blamed for using the wrong name.

In Gen. 28:12 Jacob goes to sleep in E, but wakes up in verse sixteen (16) in a J passage. In Gen. 16 (JE passage) the story of Hagar has "neither beginning nor end" without the P document "which alone mentions Ishmael's birth."

**Exodus 6:2-4.** Critics continually press their claim of contradiction at Ex. 6:2-4, "but by my name Jehovah I was not known to them" (Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob), while the "divine name Yahweh is placed in the mouth of the antediluvians and patriarchs from Genesis, chapter two and onward." The attitude of Professor Briggs and other critics at this point is that either God or one of the documents was mistaken as to the facts.<sup>2</sup> By them no other way is open for an explanation, nothing that would make harmony is to be permitted. As in many other cases, if a road leads to where it branches, one branch leading to the desired goal, while the other leads to a precipice, they insist on taking the one that leads to the precipice and then insist on jumping off to destruction. So in this case one explanation is that, as the author of Genesis, Moses put the name Yahveh into the mouths of antediluvians by way of accommodation, since it was known to Moses and referred to Elohim (God), and all of his readers would understand his meaning. Another explanation, which has the merit of plausibility at least, is given by F. P. Ramsay, Ph.D., as follows:

Ex. 6:2-4 becomes plain if we remember that Hebrew uses the same word for "and" and "but" and has no punctuation like our interrogation point, and translate as follows: "And God spake unto Moses, and said unto him, I am Jehovah: and I appeared unto Abraham, unto Isaac, and unto Jacob, as God

---

<sup>2</sup> Chas. A. Briggs: "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 47.

Almighty; and by my name Jehovah was I not known to them? And I also established my covenant with them."<sup>3</sup>

Another explanation still is that God had not manifested or made himself known unto Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob to the full extent of power and glory indicated by the name Jehovah, though these patriarchs may have known the name.<sup>4</sup> But no explanation is acceptable with the critic except the one that results in contradiction and confusion.

The attitude of the critics here is a plain violation of well-established rules of interpretation and construction. The construction of a contract in law is stated by one authority:

Where a contract appears ambiguous the courts try to determine what is meant by the parties from the construction of the document. ... A contract susceptible of two meanings will be given the meaning which will render it valid; wherever possible it will be construed to render it reasonable rather than unreasonable; the meaning which best gives effect to the intention of the parties will be collected from the whole document.<sup>5</sup>

**Two Witnesses.** If the critics are correct in their claims of two independent documents, J and B, each recording history in its own sphere, we have a most convincing proof of the claims of Bible history and its fixed character fully established by two witnesses instead of one not later than the ninth century B.C., according to critical authority on the dates, for it is admitted that they are practically parallel and in agreement so far as they go.

**Dissecting the Scriptures.** Dr. W. H. Green says: It is obviously possible by such devices, as adopted by the critics, to carry through any hypothesis, however preposterous. If all opposing phenomena can be set aside as interpolations, or as the work of the redactor, the most refractory texts can be tortured into accordance with the critics' arbitrary presuppositions.<sup>6</sup>

Dr. Green gives a striking example of how this may be done by dissecting the stories of the prodigal son (Luke 15:11-34)<sup>7</sup> and the Samaritan (Luke 10:30-33)<sup>8</sup>. The critics meet with difficulty everywhere, but they are greatly multiplied in Leviticus and Numbers. The books of Joshua and Judges have been entirely rejected by the critics as untrustworthy, and this because their dissecting scheme was so unsatisfactory and bewildering when applied to these books, and here the opinions of critics vary to an unwelcome degree.

<sup>3</sup>F. P. Ramsay: "Interpretation of Genesis" (1911), p 33

<sup>4</sup>W. H. Green: "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" (1395), p. 99.

<sup>5</sup> Francis W. Marshal: "Layman's Legal Guide," p. 96.

<sup>6</sup> Green: *Op. Cit.*, p. 116.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 122.



*Section III—REPETITIONS*

**Claim of Duplicate Records.** Critics eagerly seize upon repetitions of certain portions of scripture to establish their theory of different authors. They claim their analysis reveals two "practically" complete accounts of the creation in Gen. 1 and 2, also two accounts of the crossing of the Red Sea with a mixture of P along with E and J documents, and two accounts of the flood, besides many other passages where the writer repeats a portion of a statement in order to bring out more clearly some other features or facts not fully covered in the first statement. But the dissecting which they do invariably produces confusion, contradiction or omission of important facts. Dr. Green says:

When the separation spoils and mars the fabric, we must conclude that what has taken place is not the resolution of a compound into its primary constituents, but the violent rending asunder of what was a unit, the breaking of a graceful statute into misshapen fragments.<sup>8</sup>

**Colored Strands in Cable or Watermarkings in Paper.** The harmony, unity, and purpose, as well as the history of the Bible, are like colored strands in a cable and the dissecting process can only bring destruction to both. These features of the Bible are like water-markings in paper which may not be removed or separated without destroying the paper.

Gen. 1:27 illustrates some of the parallelisms found in the Bible; "And God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them."

This emphasizes the first statement and adds another feature not found in the first clause. But God knew what man needed and knew how to teach. Many things in his divine revelation are repeated again and again. This is a manifestation of his wisdom and love for frail humanity. If all repetitions in the Bible were eliminated the book would be only a fraction of what it is. God's goodness and anxiety for man's eternal salvation are shown in Isa. 28:10, where, in trying to correct wayward Israel, the prophet says: "For it is precept upon precept, precept upon precept; line upon line, line upon line; here a little, there a little."

Modern pedagogy recognizes the value and importance of examination and review and this is in harmony with the universal experience of men.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 126.

**Critical Analysis Produces Conflicts and Confusion.** Much stress is laid by critics on repetitions as indicating a supposed composite character of scripture. But even the separate documents of their making possess this quality where emphasis or recapitulation is desired, or on presenting a new line of thought not included in a preceding statement. Dr. James Orr shows that the document P repeats several times the birth and names of Noah's sons (Gen, 5, 6, 9, 10). Chapter 6 repeats three times the corruption of the earth, all in P. The same is true of entering the ark, and this by P. Other of the documents have the same fault, if it be a fault.<sup>10</sup>

Many gaps and blanks are produced by the critical analysis, such as the mention by P of Jacob's going to Padan-Aram for a wife, but failing to mention his residence there which is related by E; of the enumerating by P of Jacob's children without mentioning previously that he had a wife or family. These lapses do not appear in the Bible text, but the trouble comes from the partition of what is a unit and a connected account into different portions, giving some parts to one supposed document and other parts to another. Critics tell us that the redactor omitted these portions to avoid repetition of parts already included from another source. But if the redactor is so careful here and elsewhere to prevent needless repetition what becomes of the argument based on the alleged double accounts of the flood and the crossing of the Red Sea as claimed to be given by both J and P? One of the chief arguments for the alleged composite character of the Pentateuch is based on repetition. This is a vital point and here again they saw off the limb on which they sit.

#### *Section IV*—LATE DATES ASSIGNED TO BOOKS OF THE BIBLE

**Critical Fashion.** In comparatively modern times it has become the "fashion among critics to deny the authenticity of all ancient works, the evidence for whose authenticity" is not "demonstrative," to give them a late date, to class their contents as "unhistorical" and "legendary," and to charge corruptions, "emendations," falsehood and interpolations of copyists.<sup>11</sup>

**Methods Unsound.** These methods, adopted by critics both as to sacred and classical writings, have been abandoned largely as regards the latter, but modernists cling to this discarded system in their attacks upon the Bible. Only a few years ago, it is said, "out of

---

<sup>10</sup> James Orr: "Problem of the Old Testament" (1917), p. 349

<sup>11</sup> Chas. Harris; "Creeds or No Creeds," p. xvi.

thirty-five dialogues of Plato only two still remained unquestioned by scholars of weight and authority," and that the "Platonic Epistles had not a defender in Europe but Grote." Likewise they rejected the writings of Tacitus and Cicero's orations. "But in the classical field the condition has been changed, and the system is not now considered as consistent with principles of sound criticism. At any rate, those who are minded to flout early testimony will do well to wait until the period of papyrus discovery is safely over."<sup>12</sup>

It is now claimed on high authority that the text of Homer, the great Greek poet, has come down to us practically unaltered from the remote days of the first recension of the text. "Even the Christian 'interpolations' in Josephus are now defended, not only by Professor Burkitt, but also by Harnack and Zahn" (Harris, preface, 18). Critics have learned their lesson in regard to the classics, and they would not now deal with Homer or Plato or Tacitus or Cicero as they still deal with the Bible, or even with the gospels. The papyrus records recently brought to light in Egypt have confuted their theory most completely, and they have been forced to reverse themselves. While the critics have been as completely confuted in the field of Hebrew literature, they are dying hard and hold on with determination in face of defeat at every point.

**Dates Given Critical Documents.** The later dates assigned by critics of the books of the Bible are fundamental to the Documentary Hypothesis and the system is used by them against the facts to bolster tip a false doctrine. Most critics tell us that the so-called J document originated in the southern kingdom about 900 B.C. to 800 B.C., while the so-called E documents originated in the northern kingdom about 850 B.C. to 800 B.C. These imaginary documents cannot be the products of the prophets as claimed by some, since all critics give the prophets a much later date. The so-called Priestly Code (P) (chiefly Leviticus) is given the date of the Babylonian exile (cir. 587 B.C.), while Deuteronomy is claimed by the critics to have originated during the reign of King Josiah (cir. 623-621 B.C.).

Professor Sayce says:

The stones have cried out on behalf of the "Oracles of God" and have shown that the pictures of ancient history given in the Old Testament are only such <sup>as</sup> contemporaries could have drawn, and that books and the art of writing were almost as well known to the age of Hezekiah as they are to the England of today. (Quoted from Stanfield: "The Bible and Modernism," p. 13.)

<sup>12</sup> *Ibid.*, p. xix

Further, he says:

Whenever archaeology has been able to test the negative conclusions of criticism they have dissolved like a bubble of air.<sup>13</sup>

Also he has declared that

The witness of ancient monuments to the Old Testament scriptures is of a twofold nature. It is positive, inasmuch as it proves that they are in agreement with actual facts; and negative, inasmuch as it shows how far this is from being the case with documents which lay claim to the same amount of credibility (as the book of Tobit, the book of Judith, and classical writers such as Herodotus and Ktesias) and deal with the same subject matter, but which really belong to a later age. The critical objections to the truth of the Old Testament once drawn from the armory of Greek and Latin writers can never be urged again; they have been met and overthrown once for all. The answers to them have come from papyrus and clay and stone: from the tombs of ancient Egypt, from the mounds of Babylonia and from the ruined palaces of Assyrian kings.<sup>14</sup>

**From the Records of the Past** comes the evidence which completely overthrows the supposition of the critics regarding the mythical character of the Pentateuch and the late date when they suppose it was written, and proves the high state to which writing and literary education had attained at the time the critics claim writing was unknown, in which period Moses claims to have written the Pentateuch.

**The Law Not Repudiated by Isaiah or Amos.** In one breath the critics tell us that the collection of Old Testament laws was embellished with the name of Moses, for it was he that laid the "foundation of all legislation," and in the next they attempt to discredit Moses altogether and claim he wrote no laws at all and that he is not the author of any ritual whatever. In further support of this supposition they contend that until the Babylonian exile "there was no sacrificial service" that was "even believed to have Mosaic or divine sanction."<sup>15</sup> They further cite the language of Amos (5:21-24) and Jsa. (1:11-14) to show that sacrificial offerings and other rituals were repudiated by God through these prophets and were never included in divine worship till the time of the exile. But this proves too much, for the fact of the mention of these by the prophets long before the exile is proof of the practice in the time of the prophets. But this is not the only mistake the critics make at this point. The passages cited do not sustain the view that God had never authorized such worship or repudiated the same. The context shows that God did not want worship from unclean hands that were full "of blood"

---

<sup>13</sup> A. H. Sayce: "Monument Facts and Higher Critical Fancies," second edition, p 25

<sup>14</sup>Quoted from Stanfield: *Op. Cit.*, p. 14.

<sup>15</sup> Orr: *Op. Cit.* p. 155.

and that he was repudiating hypocritical service. It was an appeal {or "justice" to "roll down as waters, and righteousness as a mighty stream." This contention on the part of critics who claim a high degree of scholarship is nothing short of a manifestation of gross ignorance on their part or a failure to read the context.

**Priestly Code.—Not Myths and Legends.** According to critics the Priestly Code (specially the book of Leviticus) was written in the time of the Babylonian exile or about 587 B.C., nearly 900 years after the time of Moses, but was passed off on the people as coming from Moses.<sup>16</sup> At the same time they claim it is made up largely of myths and legends which were unknown before the exile, that there never was either tabernacle or ark, no priests, no Levites, no Levitical cities, no such thing as tithes, no sacrificial service. They contend that all the Priestly Code, chiefly Leviticus, was nothing but a fraud under the name of Moses whose existence "is doubted or denied."

Evidence of the existence of these exilian scribes who must have devoted much time and labor (if they existed) in working out the details of the Priestly Code is lacking. It is strange, indeed, that we have such minute details of the tabernacle and its furnishings and all the orderly and intricate service of the same, but no trace of such scribes in all history. It is stranger still that such scribes made such convincing pleas for truth and righteousness, yet were guilty of the grossest deception and fraud.

**The gullibility of those Jews** who heard Ezra read the law of Moses, giving the history of Israel and God's leading them out from Egyptian bondage and through the wilderness into Canaan, which was all a gigantic fraud just manufactured and without any foundation in fact, must have been appalling and entirely different from what we know of Jews of today. But nearly a hundred years previously Zerubbabel had reestablished the worship in Jerusalem, including priests and high priests, and all the sacrifices and the Mosaic feasts.

It is evident that the Jews had forgotten much of their law, but it would be difficult to believe they did not retain the history of their people and the religion of their fathers as given by Moses, their reputed lawgiver. It would be difficult to believe that the reading of the law by Ezra would be accepted by them if it were all new and

---

<sup>16</sup>E Sellin, in his "Introduction to the Old Testament," p. 24, says: "As regards the age of this fivefold division [the Pentateuch], all we know is that it is earlier than the LXX." Yet he labors hard to prove it was not written by Moses nor in Mosaic time, but that it was made up of documents written in Palestine hundreds of years later. *Ibid.*, p. 29.

unheard of before, giving a continuous history of their ancestors and God's dealing with them and known by them to be false.

Professor W. H. Green of Princeton regards the documentary theory, J, E, P, D, etc., as "simply the creation of learned ingenuity and a lively imagination." Dr. G. Frederick Wright, professor, author, and one time editor of "Bibliotheca Sacra," says:

Whoever now refers to the documentary theory of the Pentateuch as "a scientifically established fact," confesses himself to be behind the times in scholarship. To do so in the face of all the evidence is scarcely less than criminal. The documentary theory has fallen to the ground.<sup>17</sup>

**Damaging Concessions.** It is conceded by scholars that much of the literary criticism is subjective, arbitrary, and conjectural, and the general view taken of the historical and religious development in Israel is open to the most serious exception.

The Old Testament has its own account to give of the origin of religion in the monotheism of Abraham, the covenants with the patriarchs, the legislation through Moses which cannot be set aside easily and readily in the interests of an hypothesis which rests largely on naturalistic presuppositions.

**Testimony of Archaeologists.** The hypothesis is being pushed internally to such extremes as to discredit it to sober minds, and is undergoing extensive modifications. Archaeologists, in large majority, declare against it, and have adduced facts to confirm the history in parts where it had been most impugned. Professor Erdmans, successor of Dr. Kuenen in Leyden, and a former supporter of the hypothesis, has broken with it in its entirety and brings the whole documentary theory under damaging criticism. Professor Rawlinson has stated well:

When shallow learning and a defective knowledge of the records of the past have led men to think that they had found a slip or a mistake, and a shout of triumph has been raised, profounder research has always, demonstrated the veracity and accuracy of the sacred writer, and has exposed the ignorance of the assailant.<sup>18</sup>

While, therefore, the trend of the prevailing critical theory of the Old Testament, the Documentary Hypothesis, is in a direction nearer the older ideas, yet it is probably too much to expect a complete resuscitation of traditional views. Yet, in its weaknesses, it has quickened interest, enlarged knowledge, and placed the whole facts of the Old Testament in a clearer and more assured light.

<sup>17</sup> Quoted from Stanfield: *Op. Cit.*, p 13.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 12.

**Levitical Cities.** Critics deny the existence of Levitical cities before the Babylonian exile, yet they will not even attempt to show the existence of these forty-eight Levitical cities *after the exile*; nor could the people of Ezra's time be deceived into believing such an account if written then, when every one knew that no such cities existed and that Joshua did not name such cities nor locate the tribes in Canaan at that time. To succeed with such fraud is unthinkable.

**Ancient Worship of Stars.** Professor Briggs says Canon Driver fixed a late date to Deuteronomy by the mention in Deut. 4:19 and 17:3 of the worship of the "host of heaven" or the "sun, or the moon," which he thinks did not occur till the period of the late kings.<sup>19</sup> Star worship seems to have been an enticement to Israel from the first, but did attain special prominence in days of later kings, particularly Manasseh. But if Canon Driver had been careful enough to investigate he could have discovered that the worship of the heavenly bodies is almost as old as mankind. It is well known that the Baal or Bel was worshiped from the most ancient times and scholars tell us that Baal was the sun-god. The Babylonian Bel-Merodach was a sun-god, as also was the Canaanitish Baal-Shemaim, "lord of heaven." The Phoenician writer, Sanchuniathon— "Philo Byblius, Fragmenta II,"—accordingly says the children of the first generation of mankind "in time of drought stretched forth their hands to heaven toward the sun; for they regarded him as the sole lord of heaven and called him Beel-Samen, which means 'lord of heaven' in the Phoenician language." The moon was worshiped by the ancient Babylonians, Assyrians, and Chaldeans under the name of Sin or Sen. In Babylonia it was also called Aku, and there was also Aa, the consort of the sun. Archaeologists have found and published an Egyptian hymn to the sun-god of about 1400 B.C. One of the most ancient temples found at Ur of the Chaldees is that of the moon-god, "Sin," whose worship extended through Assyria, Babylonia, and other parts of the ancient world. Nothing is more certain among the findings of archaeology than the great antiquity of the worship of sun and moon reaching back beyond the time of Moses.

But referring to the proof text from which Professor Briggs thinks Canon Driver fixed the late date to Deuteronomy, Moses was inspired and could see by the spirit of prophecy the dangers which Israel would meet with and he was warning them against the evils

---

<sup>19</sup> Briggs *Op. Cit.*, p. 83.

by which they might and did afterwards corrupt themselves. The language is clearly prophetic.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER II

### *Section I*—DOCUMENTARY HYPOTHESIS

Six schools of infidelity.

Objectors called critics or modernists.

Theory not modern—not result of new discoveries and scientific research.

See encyclopedia for history of Jean Astruck.

Documentary Hypothesis not documentary—reasons.

Critical analysis claims to establish five distinct results in the form of documents designated E, J, P, D, H. Detailed.

Authorship of Pentateuch denied to Moses—claim of separate documents consisting of myths and legends patched together.

Quotation from Dr. Lyman Abbott.

### *Section II*—ELOHIM (GOD) AND YAHWEH (JEHOVAH)

Two Hebrew names for the Deity—Elohim (God), Yahweh (Jehovah), Two names used interchangeably and without discrimination. Examples, Redactor invented. Work of.

Scheme found inadequate. Other documents invented. Briggs quoted. A few of the many cases where the theory breaks down. Was God known to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob as Jehovah? (Ex. 6:2-4.) Some explanation. Quotation from F. P. Ramsay. Construction of a contract in law. Quotation.

If J and E are established, they constitute two independent witnesses. Dissecting the scriptures. See Green's analysis of prodigal son, etc.

### *Section III*—REPETITIONS

Critics' claim of two accounts of creation, two of crossing Red Sea, two of the account of the flood. Dr. Green quoted.

Harmony, unity, purpose, history of the Bible like colored strand in cable, or like watermarkings in paper. Effect of removing.

Parallelisms frequent. Examples cited.

Even in the critical documents repetitions often occur. Examples.

Gaps and blanks result from critical analysis. Redactor blamed. Example.

If Redactor omitted items to prevent repetitions, another leading argument is nullified. Given.

### *Section IV*—LATE DATES ASSIGNED TO BOOKS OF THE BIBLE

Critical fashion.

Methods unsound, and recent discoveries of papyri have completely upset their theory as to the classics. Equally confuted in Hebrew literature, but stubbornly refuse to admit it.

Dates assigned by critics to their imaginary documents. Given.

Quotation from Professor A. H. Sayce.

Sacrificial service before the time of the exile denied by critics.



Amos and Isaiah cited as proof that God repudiated sacrifice, and therefore such existed. Proves too much. These passages shown to be grossly perverted by critics.

Priestly Code, said by all critics to have originated in the time of the exile and composed of myths and legends. Charge of fraud here not proved. No account of such exilian scribes.

Were the Jews so gullible as to be deceived by Ezra when he read to them the law, purporting to have come from Moses?

Quotations from Professor W. H. Green and Dr. G. Frederick Wright.

Testimony of archaeology. Quotation from Professor Rawlinson.

Levitical cities before the exile, but no attempt is made to locate them after the exile.

Worship of the "host of heaven" as evidence offered by Briggs.

Proof that sun, moon, and stars were worshiped from the earliest times.

Moses was inspired and warned against evils to come.

### CHAPTER III CRITICAL METHODS

**Literary Analysis.** The critics call their dissecting of the Old Testament scriptures a literary analysis, claim the process is scientific and the results "assured." In this discussion these claims will be briefly reviewed in the light of known facts for the one purpose of ascertaining the truth regarding these claims. It is freely admitted that many critics have devoted much time and effort in making analyses for the support of their Documentary Hypothesis. It is claimed by them that there are great differences of style and vocabulary used in the different parts of the Pentateuch and other portions of the Old Testament as shown by their literary analysis, and these different portions have been classified and certain ones attributed to one author and others attributed to another author. Nearly all the critical discussions of the Pentateuch during the past century have been based on analysis, though historical difficulties also have been given as a reason for their theory in more modern times. "The lists of such marks of style as are set forth as criteria for the various documents of the Pentateuch cover about thirty-five pages in the Oxford Hexateuch."

**Style and Diction.** It is deemed, therefore, important to give some special attention to the question of style and diction as marks of different authors of the dissected portions indicated by critical analysis. In this discussion our attention will be directed largely to the style of the literature of the Pentateuch, though much of what will be said will also apply to other portions of the Old Testament affected by the critical analysis.

It is admitted that the vocabulary is different in the different parts of the Pentateuch just as any author would employ suitable diction in writing on different subjects or for different purposes. It is axiomatic that one author would require different words for the discussion of different subjects and purposes, just as a multiplicity of authors would do. Yet this simple fact has been almost universally ignored by the critics who have written hundreds of volumes and spent weary hours of study in an attempt to establish a supposition by analysis without a shadow of historical evidence in its support.

**Correct Analysis Sustains the Pentateuch.** But the fact just stated has been recognized by scholars who are not biased by preju-

dice, the facts on the subject have been accurately and scientifically set forth by analyses, and the result is as dependable as the Pentateuch itself. But the real secret of the whole critical view is that the critics do not believe the Pentateuch is dependable and when the sacred record gets in the way of their theory they do not hesitate to say it is not historical or that the particular statement is an interpolation, etc. And yet, strange as it may appear, the critics undertake to establish their position by evidence which they contend is not trustworthy when used to support the opposite view, the plain and oft-repeated claim of Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch.

The casual reader of the Pentateuch will readily observe that in all of the legal codes of the Pentateuch the superscriptions give Moses as the author and this claim is often repeated by a subscription. Professor Robert Dick Wilson, in his "Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament," enumerates the passages in detail and adds: "Here, then, are twenty separate documents all ascribed to Moses in the proper place and manner with date and place affixed." In every case the place of the giving of the laws by Moses is either expressly stated or implied by the context. It is a fact, too, that in all of the Old Testament there is not to be found any law, or judgment, or statute or regulation ascribed to Moses which is not in the Pentateuch and there attributed to Moses. In executing the law of Moses detailed directions as to how it shall be done are often given by prophets and kings, but none of these directions is attributed to Moses. Jehoshaphat appointed judges, setting forth their duties. Hezekiah "set the Levites in the house of Jehovah with cymbals, with psalteries, and with harps, according to the commandment of David, and of Gad the king's seer, and Nathan the prophet; for the commandment was of Jehovah by his prophets" (2 Chron. 29:25). David divided the priests into courses and ordered the tabernacle worship (1 Chron. 23). Joab took the census of the people as commanded by David (1 Chron. 21). All of these commands and regulations and many others throughout the Old Testament were given without reference to the Mosaic law or as being commanded by Moses. In the apocryphal book of 2 Mac. Judas directed the offerings of sacrifices for the sins of the dead (2 Mac. 12:43f); Judas also wielded a sword of gold at the command of Jeremiah (2 Mac. 15:15-17). Not even in the apocryphal books nor in any pre-Christian literature has any example been found of a law ascribed to Moses which is not included in the Pentateuchal

laws. Nor is any Pentateuchal law ever ascribed in any pre-Christian literature to any author but Moses.

The critics would have an impossible task, quite equal to the one they are working on, if they should undertake to explain away all of the testimony favorable to Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. Josephus, Philo, Jewish rabbis, Jews and Samaritans, Jesus Christ, and the apostles—all testify to the claims of the Pentateuchal laws as coming from the pen of Moses.

**Pentateuchal Laws Classified.** Another outstanding feature of I the Pentateuch that will readily appear is to be found in the classifications of laws as "commandments," "judgments," and "statutes." These terms are not synonyms as might be supposed by a careless reader, but they represent distinct kinds of laws and are used as technical law terms in the strict sense. Classification is shown by groups of laws often bearing a title that indicates the kind of laws in the group, the title being placed sometimes at the beginning of the group and sometimes at the end of the group. The classification may be seen from the following partial list of groups with title specified:

#### COMMANDMENTS

Ex.20:1-17; title 20:6. Deut. 27:1-8; title 1.

#### JUDGMENTS

Ex. 21:1 to 23:19; title 21:1. Num. 35:24, 29; 36:13.

#### STATUTES

Ex. 27:20, 21; title 21.

Ex. 30:17-21; title 21.

Lev. 3:1-17; title 17.

Lev. 10:8-11; title 9.

Lev. 16:24-34; title 29 and 34.

Lev. 17:1-9; title 7.

Lev. 23:1-44; title 14, 21, 41.

Lev. 24:1-4; title 3.

Lev. 24:5-9; title 9.

Num. 1 to 10; title 9:12, 14 and 10:8.

Num. 15:1-16; title 15.

Num. 18:20-32; title 23.

Num. 19:1-10; title 2 and 10.

Num. 19:11-22; title 21.

Num. 30:1-16; title 16.

Deut. 17:14-30; title 19.

In addition to the above list of laws bearing titles, there are laws having the same characteristics given throughout the Pentateuch without title expressed. Another classification consists of those laws with title of *Statute of Judgment*, these being judgments, but having the character also of a statute.

**Combinations.** There are also groups of laws consisting of more than one of these classes, these being designated *Judgments* and *Statutes*, or *Commandments* and *Statutes*, or *Commandments*, *Judgments*, and *Statutes*. But in every case of a mixed title the group of laws indicated will be found to contain all the kinds of laws indicated by the title.

**Judgments** [decisions of judges] are really rules established by authority and correspond closely to our common law, the unwritten law (*Lex Non Scripta*). These laws covered social relations and dealings among the people and pertained to matters morally wrong (*mala in se*). Such laws did not originate with Moses, but were already known to civilized peoples, including the patriarchs. Their form is semipoetic in the Hebrew which feature they perhaps acquired from long usage in verbal forms, being often committed to memory and are thus called mnemonic. Many such laws or laws similar to these are found among the 282 laws of Khammurabi, king of Babylon, of about the time of Abraham, and also among the Precepts of Ptah Hotep of Egypt, of even an earlier date. Not all of these old laws were adopted by Moses, but those that were adopted were authorized by God himself and became binding upon the people of Israel when Moses was specifically commanded to give them.

**Commandments** as a technical law term refers to the Ten Commandments, as indicated at Ex. 20:1-17 (title 20:6) and at Deut. 27:1-8 (title 1). But in addition to this term being used in a technical sense it is more frequently used in a general sense, and includes laws of other kinds or all kinds. This, however, does not militate against its technical use. Like the other technical terms *Commandments* is found sometimes with groups of mixed laws. And, like the *Judgments*, the *Ten Commandments*, excepting possibly the fourth commandment, were not new to the people when given by Moses. They represent moral laws that were already known to ancient peo-

ples, but when given by Moses they had special divine sanction and were thus binding upon the people with greater emphasis and authority.

**Statutes** in general are those laws which have been enacted by a legislative authority. In the Pentateuch the word means a decree, a regulation or direction, and usually includes all laws or ordinances ! not classed as judgments or commandments in the technical sense. Infringement of a statute was not "a thing wrong in itself, *mala in se*, as was an infringement of the judgments, but wrong only because of the statute, *mala prohibita*."<sup>1</sup> Such are the laws found in Leviticus, ] regulating priestly functions and duties regarding burnt offerings, sin offerings, trespass offerings, meat offerings, peace offerings, etc.

In Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers the wilderness wanderings of the Israelites are given in journalistic form, a detailed record of events at each place of encampment, with the various kinds of laws given by God through Moses inserted in proper and orderly style. If these laws were dropped out the record would still be a complete journalistic record of their journey for forty years in the wilderness.

**Egyptian Influence on Ritual of Israel.** The Sumerians, perhaps the most ancient people known to profane history, had an elaborate system of rituals in their religious services. Long after their time the Egyptians with whom the Israelites had dwelt are found to have used an elaborate system of rituals consisting of "offerings, vestments, libations, incense, 'fine twined linen,' jeweled breastplates, choirs of singers, platoons of attendants such as were the Levites, sprinklings and genuflections, overshadowing wings, and veiled faces, every act and all the materials that go to make up the forms of the ceremonial service" (Kyle).<sup>2</sup> It would have been impossible for God to create a thing already in existence. He made use of material ready at hand with which the children of Israel were familiar, selecting such items as divine wisdom saw proper in appropriate forms, breathed into them the "breath of life," and gave them the authority of the Most High when Moses received the law at Sinai. This principle obtains also in the erection of the tabernacle in the wilderness. It is known that the tabernacle was built on a plan strongly resembling Egyptian architecture, featuring the threefold division of Egyptian houses consisting of the court, the reception room, and the private apartment. This type was characteristic of all Egyptian houses from the humble peasant home to the king's palace, including even the

---

<sup>1</sup>M. G. Kyle "Problem of the Pentateuch," p. 20

<sup>2</sup> Kyle: *Op Cit.*, p. 105.

tombs of the dead and the temples of their gods. The furniture of the tabernacle is said to conform closely with Egyptian style. But Moses was to "make all the things according to the pattern showed in the mount." A strong proof of the divine origin of the Pentateuch is found in these facts confirming the history of the record as to the place or source of origin and completely refutes the critical claim that the Priestly Code was written at Babylon at the time of the exile.

To show that these technical legal terms were distinct and that each must have had a specific meaning we quote a few passages where all three terms are used in the same connection:

But as for thee, stand thou here by me, and I will speak unto thee all the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which thou shalt teach them, that they may do them in the land which I give them to possess it (Deut. 5:31).

Now these are the commandments, the statutes, and the judgments, which the Lord your God commanded to teach you, that ye might do them in the land whither ye go to possess it (Deut. 6:1).

Thou shalt therefore keep the commandments, and the statutes, and the judgments, which I command thee this day, to do them (Deut. 7:11).

Like use of the word *commandments* occurs in Deut. 8:11; 11:1; 26:17; and 30:16.

**The term "statute of judgment"** refers to such laws as the providing for cities of refuge. The crime of murder was covered by a law called a judgment, but the provision for modifying this judgment is a statute. Hence, the law is called a "statute of judgment" (Num. 35:27-29). See also Num. 27:11 with title. In these passages, the Hebrew word rendered statute means literally *statute of judgment*.

Where a word is used in two senses, as appears to be the case with some of these legal terms, we may expect to find instances of uncertainty, and when we consider that language is an imperfect medium for conveying a great variety of ideas, we may expect to find instances which appear to be exceptions to the general use of the technical terms, but this fact will not militate against the prevailing use, especially when there are so few, if any, of such apparent exceptions.

**Hortatory laws** as found in the book of Deuteronomy constitute another classification not heretofore mentioned. This book is not mnemonic, nor is it descriptive. It is not journalistic in form, but rather a summarizing of what the lawgiver had taught the children of Israel during the previous forty years of wilderness wanderings, <sup>at</sup> the close of which, in the plains of Moab, the borderland of Canaan,

Moses recounted in three addresses their experiences since their departure from Egyptian bondage, with the necessary narrative connecting the different parts to make the record complete and orderly, having all the marks of a literary product "struck off at one time."<sup>3</sup> "These addresses in Deuteronomy have all the appearance of review lectures at the close of a long course of teaching and training, exactly as, indeed, they purport to be."<sup>4</sup> The book is plainly not a journal, not fragmentary, but a monograph.

**Four Classes of Laws.** A few minutes spent in reading the "judgments" of Ex. 21:1 to 23:19, followed by a brief examination of the "statutes" giving account of the building of the tabernacle found in Ex. 25 to 30, or of the ceremonial laws of Leviticus, remembering the Ten Commandments of Ex. 20:1-17, and the final exhortations of the book of Deuteronomy, will convince one that we have in the Pentateuch four distinct classifications—the Ten Commandments as a constitution; the "judgments" in rhythmic form as common law; the "statutes" in narrative or descriptive form as the ceremonial law; and the summary of Deuteronomy, in oratorical and hortatory form, to emphasize and impress what had been taught. These are potential facts establishing a divine purpose which must not be ignored.

**Kyle's Analysis.** Professor M. G. Kyle, in his admirable treatise, "The Problem of the Pentateuch," beginning at page 35, gives an analysis consisting of "the whole list of groups of laws in the four books of the Pentateuch containing' laws, together with the associated narratives," including the noting of their titles, the discussion of their peculiarities in detail, and the question of possible exceptions to the technical use of these terms. This analysis covers Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy, requiring forty-two pages. We give below the conclusion of Professor Kyle's detailed analysis in his own words:

All the books containing the law have now been examined in detail. Every instance of the use of these technical law terms, "commandments," "statutes," "judgments," has been considered, and the discriminating use of these terms has been found to be everywhere maintained. Laws denominated "judgments" are found to be exclusively "judgments"; those denominated "commandments" are found to be "commandments"; and those denominated "statutes" to be "statutes." Groups of laws having complex titles have in them always the various kinds of laws indicated by these titles and no others. In places where parts of complex groups of laws have simple subtitles, these subtitles are, also,

---

<sup>3</sup> Kyle: *Op Cit.*, p 114. <sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 114.



found to be used with accuracy for those subgroups. The technical character and use of these law terms is thus absolutely established. The terms "judgments" and "statutes" have very extended technical use. The term "commandments" has but a limited technical use, but is clear as to that limited use."<sup>5</sup>

This analysis is strictly scientific and most complete and shows that the divisions of the Pentateuch with separate authors as claimed by the critics have no sort of proof by their literary analysis. Their divisions are so nearly identical with those from kinds and uses that comparisons are made easy, and it is clear that the differences in style and diction are fully and completely accounted for from the subject matter of the Pentateuchal text. It is absurd to suppose an author could use the same vocabulary in discussing history, and law, and ritual. No critic could do that and yet he condemns Moses for failing to do the impossible.

Throughout this chapter Scripture quotations are from the King James Version, since the word ordinances is used instead of judgments in the American Revised Version.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER III

Literary analysis claimed to be scientific and results "assured."

Nearly all discussions of last century based on analysis.

Claim of style and diction indicating different sources.

Different vocabulary required for discussing different subjects, the same being true of one person as of many. Ignored by critics.

That different words are required for discussing different subjects and for different purposes is an important fact which has been recognized by unbiased scholars.

A scripture which gives trouble to the critic is set aside as not historical, or as an interpolation. And yet the critics attempt to establish their view from such source.

In all the legal codes of the Pentateuch the superscriptions give Moses as the author, the same claim being often repeated by a subscription.

In every case the place of the giving of a law by Moses is expressly stated or implied by the context.

No law, or statute, or judgment ascribed to Moses in the Old Testament which is not found in the Pentateuch, though directions in carrying out the law of Moses are given by others. Examples of Hezekiah in regard to musical instruments and the command of David regarding the taking of a census and other cases are cited, but no reference to the law of Moses is made.

Some witnesses for Mosaic authorship.

Pentateuchal laws classified—commandments, judgments, and statutes.

Statute of judgment.

---

<sup>5</sup>Kyle, *Op. Cit.*, p. 77.

Judgments and statutes; commandments and statutes; commandments, judgments, and statutes. All kinds indicated in title included.

Judgments, decisions of judges, like our common law.

Judgments covered matters morally wrong (*mala in se*). Mnemonic.

Laws of Khammurabi, king of Babylon of about time of Abraham,

Precepts of Ptah Hotep of Egypt.

Commandments as technical term—also in general sense.

Statutes, enacted in general by legislative enactment, covered not a thin "wrong in itself" (*mala in se*), but covered items prohibited by the statute (*mala prohibita*).

Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers give wilderness wanderings of Israelites in journalistic form, including narrative and law.

The Sumerians had ritual.

Egyptian influence on the ritual of Israel. Specified.

Divine wisdom adopted items of ritual similar to those of Egypt.

The reason for this discussed.

Similarity of other features of their civilization shows that Israel had sojourned in Egypt.

The pattern God showed in the mount stamped the ritualism with divine authority.

Quotations to show that the technical legal terms were distinct.

Example of "statute of judgment."

Hortatory laws in Deuteronomy, a second giving of the law which had been given during the wanderings in the wilderness for forty years with the necessary narrative to connect the different parts.

These three addresses of Moses like review lectures at the close of a long course of teaching and training.

The four distinct classifications of the Pentateuch. Itemized.

Professor Kyle's analysis, covering different kinds of laws found in Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy.

Kyle's conclusion quoted.

The analysis strictly scientific and most complete. Does not support the critical claim.

Differences in style and diction fully and completely accounted for from the subject matter of the Pentateuchal text.

The same vocabulary would not suffice for discussing history and law and ritual. Moses could not do the impossible.

## CHAPTER IV CRITICAL EVIDENCE

**Influence on Old Testament Literature.** Many and varied are the reasons offered by critics for rejecting the claims of genuineness and authenticity for the various books of the Old Testament. Scores of books have been written presenting what is claimed to be scientific, historical, archaeological, and philological reasons for refusing to credit the Bible as a trustworthy record. It will be our purpose in this chapter to give what appears to be competent evidence from the standpoint of scholarship and to compare the same with some of the claims of critics. It would be too great a task to examine all of their objections, and, besides, we believe such would be both unprofitable and undesirable if it were possible.

There are such general literary characteristics displayed in the writings of the Pentateuch as that, when compared with Egyptian literature on the one hand and with Babylonian and late Hebrew literature of the time of the exile and after on the other hand, show the Hebrew language to have become fixed in its literary forms by sacred books in contact with Egyptian influence, rather than Babylonian influence, and the Pentateuch to have proceeded from exodus times and not from exilic or post-exilic time.<sup>1</sup>

Scholars who are familiar with Egyptian literature tell us that there is a striking similarity between the structure of the Hebrew sentence and the Egyptian of the period of the exodus. In each of these languages the verb is set forth early and the object follows, while in Babylonian the verb is placed at the end of the sentence.<sup>2</sup>

**Egyptian Influence on Pentateuch.** Ezekiel, a late work, is admitted to have been written in Babylonia, and is said to show Babylonian influence in the arrangement of the main ideas in the sentence not to be found in the Hebrew of the Pentateuch. If the so-called P document, including portions of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, and nearly all of Leviticus, originated in Babylon in exilic or post-exilic time, we should expect to find in this document the same Babylonian influence as is shown in Ezekiel. But instead of this we are told by scholars familiar with Hebrew and Babylonian languages that not a trace of such characteristics is found in the entire P document. Nor does this P document, which the critics claim originated in exilic or post-exilic time, contain any of the Babylonisms

---

<sup>1</sup> M. G. Kyle: "Problem of the Pentateuch," p. 221.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 223.

and Aramaisms which do occur in those books having Babylonian contact, The so-called P document makes no claim of Babylonian contact (the critics make this claim) and no Babylonian influence is seen in it, nor should it be expected. But this document, coming as it does from exodus time, does claim Egyptian contact (which is denied by critics), and Egyptian influence is seen in it as should be expected, which will appear more fully in this discussion.

**Source of Legal Terms a Puzzle to Critics.** Critics claim the so-called J and E documents were written by legal writers and P by ritualistic or ecclesiastic writers. They date the former about 850 B.C. to 750 B.C. and the latter at about the time of the exile, fifth century B.C. The JE document has only "judgments" (A. V.), no "statutes" being found in it. Then how can we account for the technical law term "statutes" so frequently occurring in Deuteronomy (D document) ? Shall we suppose that D borrowed the term "judgments" (A. V.) from JE, who wrote some 150 to 250 years before? If so, where did D get his references to "statutes" so freely used in Deuteronomy ? He could not have obtained them from JE, for JE does not use the term. The P document abounds with "statutes," but the critics tell us that P was not written for some 200 years after D, and that would preclude the possibility of D's getting "statutes" from that source. Again we ask where did D obtain the term "statutes"? The only possible answer would be that D borrowed "judgments" (A. V.) from JE and then coined "statutes" and loaned it to P. Nobody but a critic would dare make such a wild guess.

Professor Robert Dick Wilson, in his excellent book, "A Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament" (1929), made extensive analyses and tabulations from the Old Testament and says:

We find that in 143 cases of transliteration (of names) from Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian, and Moabite into Hebrew and in forty cases of the opposite, or 184 [183] its all, the evidence shows that for 2,300 or 3,900 years the text of the proper names in the Hebrew Bible has been transmitted with the most minute accuracy.<sup>3</sup>

This implies a care on the part of the original scribes which is marvelous, and the fact that these names have come down to us with practically the same degree of accuracy after being transcribed so often through a period of many centuries is a phenomenon unequalled in literature. If the nomenclature of the Old Testament has come to us with such accuracy in spelling, it is highly probable that the

---

<sup>3</sup> Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, p. 81f.

Biblical record of the sayings and deeds of the kings in their dealings and contacts with the Israelites is also correct.

**Extra-Biblical Records Confirm the Bible.** In all cases of contact between the Israelites and their neighboring kings the Bible records the same events in practically the same order and date as shown on the monuments and other extra-Biblical records. It is said that the kings having contact with the Hebrews of the Bible number about forty, whose dates range from about 2000 B.C. to about 400 B.C. These include kings of Egypt, Babylon, Assyria, Persia, Moab, Damascus, Tyre. The Biblical record of contact between Israel and Judah and these several nations is in practical agreement with the extra-Biblical records in all transactions recorded by two or more nations, including date, place, and order of occurrence. Such evidence is most complete and convincing as to the trustworthiness of the Biblical history.

**Moses Familiar with Egyptian Life and Language.** Besides the proper names, Asenath, Potiphar, Potiphera, etc., the Hebrew Bible contains "Egyptian common nouns, as *akhu*, Egyptian for swamp pasture lands; *shesh*, Egyptian for linen, the 'fine white linen' of Leviticus; *year*, the Egyptian word for 'stream,' applied especially to the Nile and its canals." The use of these Egyptian words, found in all of the so-called documents of the critics, can be accounted for only upon the ground of a single author for the Pentateuch who was familiar with "Egyptian life and language" and who wrote the Pentateuch at the time of the exodus.<sup>4</sup>

**Evidence from Hebrew Grammar.** Not many years ago critics were trying to prove late dates for the books of the Bible from the grammar:

1. By the abstract formations in *uth*, *on*, and *an*.
2. By the use of Hebrew tenses.
3. By the syntax of the numerals.
4. By the expression-----the king.
5. By the infinitive with prepositions *b* and *k*.

Professor Wilson shows from a complete analysis with concordance, locating every passage containing words ending with *uth*, *on*, or *an*, that there is nothing in these contentions to support the late dates of the critics. He shows that in the

Assyrio-Babylonian there are three of them in the seven creation tablets, six in the letters and inscriptions of Hammurabi, thirteen in the code of Hammurabi,

---

<sup>4</sup>M. G. Kyle: "The Problem of the Pentateuch," p 320.

thirteen in Dennefield's omen tablets, fifteen in the Amarna letters, eighteen to twenty in the inscriptions of Tiglath Pileser I, two in the incantations published by Thompson, and ten in the astrological tablets of the same editor. These inscriptions were written from 2000 B.C. to about 625 B.C.<sup>5</sup>

Certainly these records do not show late dates.

In the Old Testament we find from forty-one to fifty-five words of this form (fifty-five if we count the forms in *uth* from verbs whose third radical was *waw* or *yodh*). These forms are found in every one of the twenty-four books of the Hebrew canon except the Song of Songs, Ruth, and Lamentations. Unfortunately for the argument that the ending denotes lateness, nine of these words occur in Isaiah, eighteen in Jeremiah, seven in Proverbs, seven in Samuel, one in Hosea, one in Amos, two in Ezekiel, two in Deuteronomy, two in H, and four in JE. Of the documents that some or all critics place after the captivity, Ezra has two words ending in *uth*, Nehemiah three, Chronicles three, Haggai one, Daniel one, Job one, Psalms five, P two, Esther one, and Ecclesiastes five or six. Joel, Jonah, Malachi, Ruth, the Song of Songs, Lamentations, and the parts of Zechariah, Proverbs, and Isaiah placed by the critics in post-captivity times have no words with this ending (Wilson).<sup>6</sup>

From the foregoing facts it is evident that the ending *uth* or *ut* is no proof of lateness of Hebrew documents, for it appears as often in the most ancient documents as in exilic or post-exilic documents, and this is shown to be true of even Assyrio-Babylonian documents, some of which date back to 2000 B.C.

That Hebrew nouns ending in *n* (*nun*), i. e., the forms in *on* and *an*, should be considered late is even less justifiable than in the case of *uth*. For there are about 140 of such nouns in Hebrew occurring in all ages of the literature; and they are found also in Babylonian, Assyrian, and Arabic, as well as in New Hebrew and in Aramaic.<sup>7</sup>

In fact, the same authority claims such nouns "have been found in no Aramaic dialect of any age," and therefore they could not have been derived from a source where they do not exist.

**The Use of the Hebrew Tenses.** "Again it is charged that the frequent use of *waw conjunctive with the perfect* in Ecclesiastes is a proof that the book is one of the latest in the Old Testament."<sup>8</sup>

This claim is exploded by citations from the late Hebrew documents, including Daniel, where the construction does not hold, while it is found twice in the fifth chapter of Judges, "which many critics consider to be the earliest document in the Old Testament." Num. 23 and 24 are cited as examples where the rule of critics fails to

<sup>5</sup> Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, p. 107.

<sup>6</sup> Robert Dick Wilson: "Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament" (1929), p. 107f.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 110.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. III.

hold. The analysis also shows that the rule of the critics utterly fails in the late Hebrew of Ben Sira and the Zadokite Fragments, both of which are of recent discovery. Thus, again the evidence against the critics is most conclusive.

**Syntax of Numerals.** Another effort to establish late dates as claimed by critics is by the use of the expression "a hundred of" instead of "a hundred." This claim is based on the fact that, according to critical authority, the word for "hundred" "occurs fifty times in P (a late document according to critics) and only five times in E, twice each in J and D, and once in H" (these all being much older than P according to critics). But this is to beg the question at issue. This kind of argument involves the recognition of the documentary theory of such divisions as J, E, P, and D, which we deny, and therefore such assumption is not permitted according to rules of logic. Much of the reasoning of critics is of this sort.

Critics themselves, admit that the expression "a hundred of" sometimes appears in the older documents and this would defeat the argument and show the critics are hard pressed for evidence. But the extra-Biblical evidence completely nullifies the critical argument here also. Professor Wilson says the expression is found in the Moabite inscription (a form of Hebrew) of about 900 B.C. and in the Siloam inscription of about 700 B.C.<sup>9</sup> The necessary conclusion is that here also the critics are grabbing at straws to save their hypothesis.

**The Expression — The King.** Critics charge the book of Daniel was written after Nehemiah because in Dan. 1:21 and 8:1 the name of the king precedes the title, and they think this order indicates post-exilic writing, while in the older Hebrew the order is the "King David." Answering this argument Professor Wilson by his analysis shows that in the books written before 550 B.C. the name precedes the title sixty-one times and follows it nine times, and that in the books written after 550 B.C. the name precedes the title thirty times and follows it twenty-seven times. He further shows that 'Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, and Nehemiah all use the exact phrase which is produced as evidence that Daniel is later than they."<sup>10</sup> Besides the critics produce no example from the age subsequent to Nehemiah to show what late usage was on this point. Again we must conclude that the critics are uncritical and careless.

---

<sup>9</sup>See Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 113, 116.

<sup>10</sup>Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, 117f.

**The Infinitive with the Prepositions b and k.** Another argument of the critics is that the use of the prepositions *b* "in" and *k* "as" in Daniel and Chronicles shows a date subsequent to Nehemiah.<sup>11</sup> Here again the analysis shows that Ezekiel (574 B.C.) uses *b* with the infinitive forty-nine times, while it is found in Daniel (534 B.C.) only seven times. It would rather appear that the more frequent use of this form in the older document does not indicate a later date for Daniel, if, indeed, the form generally indicates late Hebrew. Besides, analysis shows the Hebrew of Ben Sira (180 B.C.) "has about ten per cent of one example per page as against sixty per cent for Ezekiel." So the later Hebrew has the smaller percentage of this form, which, on their own basis, turns the argument against them.

**Words Alleged to Be Late.** The critics claim to establish dates centuries later than the historical setting of Daniel and Jonah by the presence of certain words in these books upon the assumption that such words are of late origin and peculiar to late Hebrew documents such as the Talmud. After giving a list of some twenty-five words and phrases from the book of Daniel to prove that "in all distinctive features it resembles, not the Hebrew of Ezekiel, or even of Haggai or Zechariah, but that of the age *sub-sequent to Nehemiah*," Canon S. R. Driver says:

The *Persian* words *presuppose* a period after the Persian empire had been well established; the Greek words *demand*, the Hebrew *supports*, and the Aramaic *permits* a date after the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great (332 B.C.).

This is a surprising statement to come from a scholar such as Canon Driver. See his "Literature of the Old Testament," p. 508. It is well known that these nations had their own languages long before this period, that the city of Babylon was a cosmopolitan city and had close contact with the leading nations of the world. It should not be supposed that the Persian language sprang into existence with the conquest of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, nor that the Greek language had no existence prior to the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great.

But if it can be shown that a great preponderance of the words of Daniel were of late origin and peculiar to late Hebrew this might

---

<sup>11</sup> Josephus says Alexander the Great (356-323 B.C.) "was shown the book of Daniel wherein Daniel declared that one of the Greeks should destroy the empire of the Persians, he supposing that himself was the person intended" ("Antiquities of the Jews," Vol. 1. book xi, p. 418). This contradicts the critical claim of 160 B.C. or later for the book of Daniel.



be admitted as evidence, though not conclusive by any means. Here again the complete analysis shows

that Daniel, Jonah, Joel, and the Psalter, and other documents of the Old Testament have no larger percentage of such words than those which the critics assign to an earlier date, and that Isa. 24-27 and Psalm 89, which they consider to be among the latest parts of their respective books, are distinguished from most of the other parts of the Old Testament by having no such words at all (Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, p. 132f).

In his "Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament" Professor Wilson gives on page 135 a table showing the number of words occurring in the Old Testament five times or less and in a parallel column the percentage of these words in the Talmud (late Hebrew). This table shows nothing favorable for the critics, but a

kind of proof that will prove almost everything to be late, and especially the parts considered late to be early, is absurd and inadmissible as evidence in a case designed to prove that some documents are later than others because they contain words of this kind.<sup>12</sup>

Of the words listed in said table, including all the books of the Old Testament, a percentage ranging from 14.3 per cent to 59.3 per cent is shown to be found in the Talmud.

In the parts of Isaiah ascribed by the critics to Isaiah there are 121 words occurring five times or under in the Old Testament, of which 22.3 per cent are found also in the Talmud (late Hebrew); whereas in the parts ascribed to the exile or later there are eighty-four words, of which 23.8 per cent are found in the Talmud. Chapters 24-27 have no such words, but are the latest of all, according to most of the radical critics (Wilson).<sup>13</sup>

This same author cites many other cases showing the futility of this effort of the critics.

The Alleged Aramaisms. Critics undertake again to establish late dates for certain books of the Bible by charging that certain words found in said books are Aramaisms, i. e., that they were borrowed from the Aramaic language which they assume did not exist when the older documents of the Bible were written. The mere fact that a word appears in two different languages does not prove borrowing. It may indicate that the later language borrowed from the earlier, but, even so, this fact does not establish the date of a document absolutely.

The Tel-El-Amarna letters written about 1400 B.C. contain "more than 100 explanations in Hebrew of Babylonian words, which shows that Hebrew was understood at the court of the Egyptian kings,

---

<sup>12</sup> Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, 133.

<sup>13</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 137.

Amenophis III and IV. This confirms the Biblical account of the residence of Israelites in Egypt before the time of Moses"<sup>14</sup> and the existence of the Hebrew language before the earliest Biblical documents were written. "The existence of tribes speaking Aramaic can be proven from the monuments as far back as the Tel-El-Amarna letters," and it is not denied that "since the Aramaic literature in which any of the words (in question) occur was written by Jews who had adopted Aramaic, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Jewish writers of Aramaic documents borrowed from their own literary and native language than that early Hebrew writers borrowed from the Aramaic."<sup>15</sup>

The presence of an Aramaic word in Nehemiah (3:15), *tillel*, "to cover," might be expected, since he wrote "at a time when the Jews of Elephantine, Samaria, Jerusalem, Susa, and Ecbatana, all used the Aramaic as the language of business."<sup>16</sup>

The inscriptions as well as the Old Testament itself "show that the Hebrews and Arameans were closely associated from a time long precedent to that at which the critics claim that the oldest documents of the Old Testament were written."<sup>17</sup>

Of the 350 words used in the Old Testament, which critics claim as being "certainly, probably or possibly" of Aramaic origin, "150 do not occur in form and sense in any Aramaic dialect." Further:

It is evident that of these 350 words, about 100 have not been found in any Aramaic document, and that, according to the dates affixed to the Old Testament documents by the critics themselves, about 120 more of these words were ] used by the writers of the Old Testament from 350 to 700 years earlier than they have been found in any Aramaic document.<sup>18</sup>

Critical Position Most Vulnerable. These facts are shown from scientific investigation and represent the ripest scholarship of modern times. These exposures of the false claims of critics are made possible because their positions are most vulnerable. Hypothesis is their guide and only creed, and it has brought them to grief wherever their false claims have been examined in the light of truth. The result of scientific methods applied to critical hypotheses is that they are shown to be unscientific and uncritical and careless in their methods, and when they do not have the desired proof they do not hesitate to venture a guess. The result is also largely accounted for by Professor Wilson, a linguist of the highest order, who says:

---

<sup>14</sup> Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, p. 178.

<sup>15</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 150.

<sup>16</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 146.

<sup>17</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 152.

<sup>18</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 157.

He (Delitzsch) was one of the greatest Hebrew scholars of his generation, and fifty years ago his testimony on a matter concerning the history of the Hebrew language was as good as possible. But a history of the Hebrew language was in his time not possible. Gesenius, Ewald, Delitzsch, Keil, and all those brilliant scholars of the nineteenth century are as much behind the times today as expert witnesses to the history of the Hebrew language as Professor Langley would be in aeronautics, or a surgeon of the Civil War in comparison with a professor in Johns Hopkins. For since Delitzsch wrote the above (referring to matter not quoted here), the Tel-El-Amarna letters, the works of Hammurabi, the Hebrew Ecclesiasticus, of the Zadokite Fragments, and of the Samaria Ostraka, the Sendschirli inscriptions, the Aramaic papyri and endorsements, and thousands of Egyptian, Babylonian, Assyrian, Phoenician, Aramaic, Palmyrene, Nabatean, Hebrew, and other documents throwing light on the Old Testament and its language have been discovered.<sup>18</sup>

Ever since the beginning- of modern criticism new discoveries have from year to year made such inroads upon its claims that today it has been robbed of even plausibility.

It may be proper to state here that we have covered the main fundamental claims of destructive higher criticism. In this discussion we have presented the very *heart and soul* of their so-called Documentary Hypothesis or scientific analysis by which they claim to discredit the Bible. While this is true there are many other features of their creed, subordinate to the fundamentals already reviewed, some of which will have our attention in the remainder of this treatise.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IV

Influence on Old Testament literature.

Critics' claim of scientific, historical, archaeological, and philological reasons for rejecting the Bible as a trustworthy record.

Language of the Pentateuch shows Egyptian influence rather than Babylonian. Striking similarity between structure of the Hebrew and Egyptian of the period of the exodus, the verb being set forth early in both, while the Babylonian has the verb at the end of the sentence.

Ezekiel, a late work, written in Babylon, showing Babylonian influence in the arrangement of ideas in the sentence not shown in the Pentateuch.

The P document, including portions of Genesis, Exodus, Numbers, and Joshua, and nearly all of Leviticus, if originated in Babylon in exilic times, should show Babylonian influence like Ezekiel. But instead it claims Egyptian contact and shows Egyptian influence.

Source of legal terms a puzzle to critics.

No difficulty is encountered if Moses wrote the Pentateuch in exodus times.

Quotation from Professor Robert Dick Wilson.

---

<sup>19</sup> Wilson: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 105-6.

Transmission of proper names being so accurate it is fair to presume that the history is dependable.

Extra-Biblical records confirm the Bible. Countries having contact with Israel specified, their records being in agreement with the Biblical records.

Moses familiar with Egyptian life and language, as shown by the use of Egyptian names and words in his writings. Examples.

Evidence from Hebrew grammar claimed by critics.

Professor Wilson shows by complete analysis that Hebrew grammar gives no comfort to the critical view. Quotations from Wilson.

The use of Hebrew tenses shows the same disastrous result with the critics' claim.

Syntax of numerals—"a hundred of and "a hundred"; critics claim the former belongs only to the late documents. This claim is also found to be utterly false as shown by Professor Wilson.

Here also the critics beg the question by comparing the frequency of the term in the P document with that of E and H, thus assuming a recognition of the documentary theory, the question at issue.

The expression "a hundred of" also found in the Moabite inscription of about 900 B. C. and in the Siloam inscription of about 700 B.C.

The expression — the king. Examples of how this claim of late dates fails to hold.

Infinitive with the prepositions *b* and *k*. Examples from Wilson's analysis showing the argument against the critical view.

Words alleged to be late in Daniel and Jonah centuries later than the setting of these books. Again analysis shows nothing favoring the critical view.

The alleged Aramaisms. Claim of borrowing from the Aramaic language which they think originated at a late date and the books using such words could not have been early. The borrowing idea is not proved, but if true it is not known which did the borrowing. Aramaic spoken by certain tribes as far back as 1400 B.C. Proof shows that the Hebrews and Arameans were closely associated long before the date given to any of oldest Biblical documents.

Tel-El-Amarna letters of about 1400 B.C. contain more than 100 explanations in Hebrew of Babylonian words, showing that Hebrew was known at that date at the Egyptian court and the existence of the Hebrew language before the earliest Hebrew documents were written.

Figures on the 350 words in the Hebrew which critics claim were borrowed from Aramaic.

These exposures made possible because the critical view is most vulnerable Scientific examination of critical hypotheses shows the critics to be unscientific, uncritical, and careless or reckless in their claims.

Quotation from Professor Wilson on Hebrew scholars.

Heart and soul of destructive higher criticism.

CHAPTER V  
CRITICAL WORK  
*Section I*—POLYCHROME BIBLE

**Covering Books of the Old Testament Only.** About 1898 plans were perfected and assignments made of certain books of the Bible to certain scholars for the publication of what is known as the Polychrome Bible (many-colored Bible) with notes thereon. The plan contemplated twenty volumes of a critical edition of the Hebrew text, printed in colors with notes prepared by eminent Biblical scholars of Europe and America under the editorial direction of Professor Paul Haupt of Johns Hopkins University, but some of the proposed volumes were never published, only sixteen volumes in Hebrew having been issued to date, and only five volumes have been published in English.

The assignments for the volumes in Hebrew were as follows:

1. Genesis, C. J. Ball.
2. Exodus, not published.
3. Leviticus, S. R. Driver and H. A. White.
4. Numbers, J. A. Patterson.
5. Deuteronomy, not published.
6. Joshua, W. H. Bennett.
7. Judges, G. F. Moore.
8. Samuel, K. Budde.
9. Kings, B. Stade and F. Schwally.
10. Isaiah, T. K. Cheyne.
11. Jeremiah, C. H. Cornhill.
12. Ezekiel, C. H. Toy.
13. Minor Prophets, not published.
14. Psalms, J. Wellhausen.
15. Proverbs, A. Muller and E. Kautzseh.
16. Song of Songs, Ruth, Esther, etc., not published.
17. Job, C. Siegfried.
18. Daniel, A. Kammphausen.
19. Ezra-Nehemiah, H. Guthe.
20. Chronicles, R. Kittel.

The five volumes published in English are the following:

1. Leviticus, S. R. Driver and H. A. White.
2. Joshua, W. H. Bennett.

3. Judges, G. F. Moore.
4. Psalms, J. Wellhausen.
5. Isaiah, T. K. Cheyne.

The purpose of these publications was to indicate in different colors the different documents from which the critics suppose the Bible is made up, but the scheme failed, was never completed, and it is now difficult to obtain many of the volumes in English from our largest libraries. Yet the critics still cling to their Documentary Hypothesis with great determination and zeal. The appearance of this Bible is somewhat like that of a crazy quilt, the color being changed in some cases as many as a dozen times or more on a single page.

Different color schemes are adopted for different books. For the books of Isaiah and Judges, black print (on white background) equals the so-called J document, dark blue equals E, light blue equals E<sup>2</sup>, dark purple equals JE, etc. Other supposed sources are indicated by different characters, but these will give an idea of the nature of the work.

**Sample of Patchwork from Critical Analysis.** We give below an illustration of the patchwork of critics from the fourteenth chapter of Exodus showing three of the supposed documents patched together:

Verse 18 (P) And the Egyptians shall know that I am Jehovah, when I have gotten me honor upon Pharaoh, upon his chariots, and upon his horsemen. 19 (E) *And the angel of God, who went before the camp of Israel, removed and went behind them;* (J) and the pillar of cloud removed from before them and stood behind them; 20 And it came between the camp of Egypt and the camp of Israel; and there was the cloud and the darkness, yet gave it light by night: and the one came not near the other all the night. 21 (P) And Moses stretched out his hand over the sea; (J) and Jehovah caused the sea to go back by a strong east wind all the night and made the sea dry land, and the waters were divided.

This illustration is taken from "Documents of the Hexateuch," by W. E. Addis, who uses different type instead of colors to indicate the supposed scraps or fragments of this passage. In this illustration plain type indicates the supposed P document, italics indicate the supposed E document, and heavy type indicates the supposed J document.

#### *Section II*—POLYCHROME BIBLE NOTES

**Isaiah.** T. K. Cheyne, M.A., D.D.. Oriel Professor of Interpretation of Holy Scripture at Oxford, 1899, did the book of Isaiah. His comments on Isa. 7:14 make no mention of reference to a coming Messiah, born of a virgin, though Matthew (1:23) does. On

Isa. 9:6, 7 which reads as follows: "For unto us a child is born, unto us a son is given; and the government shall be upon his shoulder: and his name shall be called Wonderful, Counsellor, Mighty God, Everlasting Father, Prince of Peace," etc., the notes simply ask, "Who is this king?" without answering the question, and conclude by casting doubt on the passage as coming from Isaiah. On Isa. 9:2 no reference is made in the notes to the light in the person of Jesus that should come to the people that walked in darkness, but the gospel of Matthew quotes and makes application of the passage (Matt. 4:14ff). On Isa. 11: Iff it is barely admitted that the passage refers to an "ideal king," but this is followed by an expression of doubt that Isaiah wrote it. On Isa. 29:13, which refers to the hypocrisy of the Jews as drawing nigh with their mouth and lips, while their heart is far from the Lord, the notes are silent, but Jesus quotes the passage and makes application of it to the Jews of his day (Matt. 15:7). On Isa. 35:5f: "Then the eyes of the blind shall be opened, and the ears of the deaf shall be unstopped. Then shall the lame man leap as a hart, and the tongue of the dumb shall sing," etc., no mention is made of the work of Jesus, verses five (5) and six (6) being passed over in silence. On verse ten (10), having the double reference to the return of Judah from the exile and the kingdom of Christ to be established at Zion, this comment is made:

A vague poetical description of a vision which cheered the heart, but had no basis in the dull world of reality. The great return of the exiles is long past, and the restoration of the Jews of the dispersion is a hope which has no roots in the present.

But the gospels show this prophecy most literally fulfilled. The return of the exiles was some 200 years after Isaiah's time. On Isa. 42: Iff no intimation that the "servant" mentioned refers to Christ is seen in the notes, but this passage is quoted by Matthew where the application to Jesus is specific (Matt. 12:17ff). On Isa. 53 the notes ignore all reference to the passion of our Lord which is so minutely and literally fulfilled in the gospels. The expression, "and with the rich in his death" (Authorized Version, verse 9), is claimed to be 'more than probably based on a corruption of the text.' The final statement under verse 10 is: "The passage, however, has become mutilated, and we can only draw hesitating inferences by the help of some probable emendations."

The Messianic prophecies are thus ignored throughout the notes of this learned doctor and "Interpreter of Holy Scripture." Some

six colors are used for Isaiah in the Polychrome Bible, but the prevailing claim of critics at that time was that Isaiah was written by two authors designated Isaiah I and Isaiah II. In later times, however, the critics have added two more scraps to the partition of the book of Isaiah designated as Isaiah III and Isaiah IV. It seems uncertain as to whether they are done yet with this work of splitting the book of Isaiah.

**Leviticus.** The book of Leviticus was assigned to S. R. Driver and H. A. White. It is admitted that in the book of Leviticus the alleged sources are so thoroughly scrambled that no attempt is made in the Polychrome Bible to identify the supposed documents further than to designate the law of holiness (H) in yellow, and the "main body of priestly narrative and laws (uncolored), and a few laws which may for several reasons be regarded as later in origin than P (colored brown)." No attempt is made to distinguish between J and E, though Yahweh (Jehovah) and Elohim (God) are freely used, and in a great many cases they are used together in the same sentence. The critics suppose the so-called priestly writer used only Elohim for God, but he either forgot his bearings in Leviticus or else the redactor played havoc with his text.

**The Book of Joshua** has been a puzzle to the critics. They use a different color scheme here, but with all their devices they have not been able to unscramble the material composing this book to their own satisfaction, and the same is true of the book of Judges. In the book of Joshua the Polychrome Bible has thirteen scraps or fragments represented by six colors on one page. They admit that here the distribution of the alleged "material cannot be always made with entire confidence," and it is further admitted that some portions of the work are "not universally accepted."

**The Book of Psalms** was handled by J. Wellhausen, D.D., one of the most radical of rationalists, for the Polychrome Bible. A careful reading of his notes on the Psalms reveals the fact that in all cases commonly believed to refer to Jesus as Messiah he makes no such application. In passages which strongly point to the future Messiah he often claims the text is corrupt or applies it to "David and his descendants forever" (170). He denies all the Psalms to David, claiming that all are post-exilic. Much more could be given from the Polychrome Bible notes, but it is believed that the foregoing is quite sufficient to show the aim and purpose of the work—that of destruction of faith in the Bible as a trustworthy record.



*Section III—THE REDACTOR*

**The Editor Who Is Supposed to Have Scrambled the Documents.** The redactor (R) is the creature of the critics. He is claimed by them to have combined the original documents into their present form in the various books of the Bible. These original sources, or documents, consist of myths, legends, and folklore which the redactor put together, using great editorial liberty in changing, adding to, modifying, and deleting at will in order to produce harmony and beauty of expression. Critics place upon him a grave responsibility which they claim he has faithfully observed *in preserving the style and peculiar ideas of the separate sources so that each source or document may be definitely identified after he has scrambled them.* But it is difficult to believe that he can be depended upon at all when we consider the serious charges preferred against him by his creators, the critics. These charges include deliberate manipulations, additions, deletions, and substitutions. Some of these supposed manipulations suit the purpose of the critic who gives him unstinted praise and approval, but many, many of them are not to the critic's liking, and in these cases the critic does not hesitate to charge him with ignorance, wilful perversion, gross negligence, and deliberate falsehood. If he is unfaithful in these last items, as the critics say he is, who can rely on his faithfulness in preserving the style and the subject matter?

All the critics are guilty of continually switching from hearty approval of the redactor to unstinted condemnation of his work, as the occasion may demand. If he has preserved the style and thought of the sources in his supposed combination the critic commends him, but, on the other hand, if the redactor has been guilty of creating an embarrassing situation or producing something which upsets or destroys the hypothetical view, he is at once accused of being utterly unreliable, and critics do not hesitate to repudiate his work at such point. He is skillful, honest, and careful; or he is awkward, dishonest, and reckless, as may be required by the needs of the critic, and further, according" to Dr. Green, he may retain contradictory narratives, placing both side by side, or he may include duplicate records said to be in almost perfect accord.<sup>1</sup> His stupidity may cause him to make the most glaring blunders, while his recklessness and dishonesty may cause him to omit most important sections which ruins the document, and he may make additions and interpolations of his own. On the side of the reliability and capability of the redactor,

---

<sup>1</sup> W. H. Green "Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch" (1895), p. 86.

Wellhausen, the great German critic, is quoted as saying: "There is no primitive legend, it is well known, so well-knit as the Bible one."<sup>2</sup>

Dr. Orr says it is

not a thing upon the surface—not a thing that could be produced by any number of editorial touchings and interpolations, and ingenious piecing together of fragments—but is ingrained into the very substance of the history, is part of the texture, is, to use the happy figure of Bushnell about the image of Christ in the gospels, like a watermark in paper, which cannot be destroyed without destroying the paper itself.<sup>3</sup>

It was not the ingenuity of men, but the overruling power and wisdom of God that produced such a scheme of unity, purpose, and grace as we have in the Bible.

**A Creature Without a History.** There is no part of the critical theory about which the critics are more cocksure and unanimous than about the work of the redactor, and yet this redactor has never given an account of himself or any evidence of his existence except as a figment in the mind of the critic. He renders faithful service to his creator and saves the critical theory when all other means fail. The contradictory traits of character imputed to the redactor with his freely changing and manipulating the supposed original documents ruin the verbal criteria by which critics attempt to prove different sources.

**The School Theory.** Some critics think the documents J, E, P, D, etc., are the products of schools covering a period of perhaps centuries instead of individual writers. But this theory utterly destroys the individual style argument so much relied on by critics, in which it is claimed that each document has a different style, a different vocabulary, a different set of phrases, different ideas, and different terminology. This school idea of a number of writers engaged for centuries in revising, changing, and embellishing the work of predecessors completely destroys one of the main arguments for the Documentary Hypothesis, and yet there is no more evidence for the existence of such schools than for the existence of the separate documents, and that is none.

**An Impossible Fraud.** Professor Chas. A. Briggs admits the archaic style of Hebrew throughout the Pentateuch, while the language of Jeremiah and the Kings shows a later development of Hebrew, but he argues that Deuteronomy was made up of older documents "recodified" by a later editor who was *influenced to use an*

---

<sup>1</sup>James Orr "Problem of the Old Testament" (1917), footnote, p. 63.

<sup>2</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 63.

*archaic style to preserve the "flavor" of the original.*<sup>4</sup> By this charge of fraud and dishonesty the critic is barred from any of the sacred writings as evidence. "The theory destroys the trustworthiness of evidence for itself. The theory commits suicide in order to escape conviction."<sup>5</sup> By such methods as the critics use one may prove anything he desires, for what is to hinder if one may manufacture evidence at will or discard evidence that stands in his way?

SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER V  
Section 7—POLYCHROME BIBLE

Covering books of the Old Testament only.

Published about 1898 under the direction of Professor Paul Haupt. Contemplated twenty volumes. Only sixteen published in Hebrew. Five published in English. Difficult to obtain.

Purpose of these publications.

Sample of patchwork from Polychrome Bible.

*Section II*—POLYCHROME BIBLE NOTES

Isaiah by T. K. Cheyne. Examples of perversion and efforts to discredit the prophet. Isaiah I, II, III, IV.

Leviticus by S. R. Driver and H. A. White. Color scheme not followed except yellow to designate the law of holiness (H), and the main body of priestly narrative and laws uncolored, with a few regarded as later colored brown. J and E are not distinguished, though Yahweh and Elohim are freely used.

The book of Joshua a puzzle to critics. Critics not able to unscramble the text to their satisfaction.

The book of Psalms by J. Wellhausen. Ignores all reference to Jesus as Messiah. Denies all Psalms to David.

*Section III*—THE REDACTOR

Creature of the critics. No history. Exists only in the imagination of critics. His work described.

The school theory. Destroys the individual style argument. Has no history.

An impossible fraud. A charge of Professor Chas. A. Briggs that Deuteronomy was recodified by a later editor who used an archaic style to preserve the flavor. The theory commits suicide. By such methods may prove anything.

---

<sup>4</sup> Briggs: "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 88.

<sup>5</sup> F. P. Ramsay: "Interpretation of Genesis," p. 35.

## CHAPTER VI

### INSPIRED AUTHORSHIP

**Deuteronomy.** Professor Chas. A. Briggs said Herman Strack used the following words in 1882: "Keil is now about the only prominent Old Testament scholar who holds to the Mosaic authorship of the entire Pentateuch." Briggs then adds, "Keil died soon afterwards, and with him scholarly opposition ceased in Germany."<sup>1</sup>

**The New Commentary on Holy Scripture**, by Chas. Gore and his fifty and more associates, Anglican scholars, published in 1928, says: "No scholar of reputation today holds that the Pentateuch, as it stands, was written by Moses."<sup>2</sup> This is a broad statement to come from a source boasting of its scholarship and honest dealing. It rules out those once great scholars who, upon full investigation, have deserted the camp of the critics and have accepted the claims of the Bible as the inspired word of God. This act on their part turns them out of the critical school, to be sure, where they once held exalted positions in scholarship according to critical standards. But it is seriously denied that all the brains and scholarship in the world are bound up in that school of self-styled scholars. Their claim bars from their fellowship such great men and scholars as A. H. Sayce, Professor Fritz Hommel, W. H. Green, J. W. McGarvey, Halevy, -Professor Eerdmans, successor of Dr. Kuenen, and many others too numerous to mention here. Sayce, Hommel, Halevy, and Eerdmans were all former advocates of the critical view and wrote extensively on that side of the question till in later times they learned their error. Dr. Hommel has written some of the most scholarly works on critical subjects extant. His "Ancient Hebrew Tradition," published in 1897, while he held the chair of Semitic languages at the University of Munich, Germany, is a masterpiece, and is so regarded by scholars of the highest rank.

Dr. Driver, having stated that Hommel agreed with Wellhausen's analysis of the Pentateuch (*Expos. Times*, December, 1896), Hommel replied (to the late Professor Green of Princeton) that the citation was from an earlier publication, and that he no longer held these views, but was increasingly impressed with the utter "baselessness" of the view of Wellhausen. It has been the same with Professor Sayce. Halevy, at a meeting of the International Congress at

---

<sup>1</sup>Chas. A. Briggs: "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 63. 2 *Op. Cit.*, p. 20.

Paris in 1897, made a strong defense of the essential truth of the Mosaic history, as against the Wellhausen school, with which he had been identified.<sup>3</sup>

Kuenen of Leyden was one of the chief apostles of the critical view. His successor, Professor Eerdmans, was likewise a supporter of the same doctrine, but later broke with it entirely and brought damaging criticism against the whole documentary theory.<sup>4</sup> Others, both in America and in Europe, are entitled to credit in scholarship equal with any among the critical school, but because they do not accept the critical view are repudiated by the critics. Real scholars have not written much in recent years on this subject, perhaps because the work was done so completely a few years ago, and further because the critics have brought out nothing new to be exposed by a review.

The position of most modernists is that the Bible is not the inspired word of God, but that it contains the word of God. This leaves each person to decide for himself just what portion or portions of the Bible constitute the word of God. This precludes the idea of a universal standard of authority in religion, and produces conflict and confusion.

**Late Dates.** Referring to Deuteronomy, the "New Commentary" (Anglican) says it is "based on the teaching of the prophets of the eighth century<sup>1</sup>" and "was promulgated during the reign of Josiah," or about 900 years after Moses. It claims that P (especially Leviticus) was not completed till the time of the exile or about 450 B.C., that E belongs to the time of Amos and Hosea or about 800 B.C., and that J is somewhat older, not later than 850 B.C.<sup>5</sup>

Deuteronomy has been selected as the main object of attack since this book contains reference to records of preceding books (classed by the critics as J and E documents) which they admit were written before Deuteronomy. They felt that a late date must be found for Deuteronomy in order to save their theory, for it would never do to admit that Moses wrote Deuteronomy and then be forced to claim J and E were written before Moses. This would ruin the whole scheme.

The passage: "And Moses wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi. . . . And it came to pass, when Moses had made an end of writing the words of this law in a book, until they were finished, that Moses commanded the Levites, that bare the

---

<sup>3</sup> James Orr: "Problem of the Old Testament" (1917), p. 397.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. James Orr: "Criticism of the Bible, International Bible Encyclopedia," p. 752

<sup>5</sup> Chas, Gore: "New Commentary on Holy Scripture" (1928), p. 26.

ark of the covenant of Jehovah, saying, Take this book of the law, and put it by the side of the ark of the covenant of Jehovah your God, that it may be there for a witness against thee" (Deut. 31:9, 24ff), states explicitly that Moses "wrote this law." It has more than a traditional value and must not be ignored. Again, in Deut. 31:22, it is said that "Moses wrote this song," referring undoubtedly to the song in chapter 32. No other book of the Old Testament has its authorship so explicitly emphasized. The following reasons are given for believing that Moses wrote the book:

### **Internal Evidence.**

1. Deuteronomy closes most appropriately the formative period of Israel's national history.

2. The reference to foreign neighbors is in every case to those who flourished in Moses' own time.

3. His name occurs thirty-six times, and in the majority of instances as the authoritative author of the subject matter. Zerbe says:

The language surely purports to come from Moses; and if it was not actually used by him, it is a most remarkable case of impersonation, if not of literary forgery, for the writer represents himself as reproducing, not what Moses might have said, but the exact words of Moses.<sup>6</sup>

4. The book is a military lawbook intended for Israel on the borderland, eager for conquest. It is expressly stated that Moses taught Israel these statutes and judgments in order that they should obey them in the land which they were about to enter.

5. The book is a book of exhortation. An outstanding feature of Deuteronomy is its hortatory character. Its prophetic exhortations are earnest and come from one who is interested in Israel's political and religious future, warning them not to be conquered in religion through the seductions of idolatry. Its solicitude for Israel stamps it with the genuine Mosaic stamp, not a merely fictitious one.

**A False Charge of Stupidity.** The late dates ascribed by the I critics to the so-called documents, J, E, P, and D, and the untrustworthiness of these imply a grave charge of ignorance and a lack of ordinary human interest and intelligence against the children of Israel, which is not proved by any convincing evidence. Who can believe that the Israelites learned for the first time during the reign of Josiah (cir. 623-621 B.C.) of their fathers' deliverance from Egyptian bondage, of their wilderness wanderings for forty years, of their receiving a law from Moses at Sinai, or their conquest of Sihon, king of the

---

<sup>6</sup>A. S. Zerbe: "Antiquity of Hebrew Writing and Literature" (1911), p. 261.

Amorites, and Og, king of Bashan, and the partition of their land among certain of their tribes, and many other items of absorbing interest to the Hebrews referred to in Deuteronomy?

Critics can believe the ancient peoples of Egypt, Babylonia, Assyria, Chaldea, and other heathen and idolatrous nations had a written history, but they deny any trustworthy history to Israel. Is it possible that a civilized people such as evidenced by the book of Deuteronomy could have had no trustworthy history, tradition, or laws in written form till Deuteronomy came suddenly to light in the time of Josiah? Our critical friends are almost a unit in denying miracles, but if their claim is correct on this point, it will appear that no greater miracle ever occurred than that which Hilkiyah, Josiah, and Huldah the prophetess performed in inducing Israel to accept such unheard-of stories without protest. The fact that King Josiah mentions the failure of their fathers to "hearken unto the words of this book" is proof that the fathers before his time had such a book. (See 2 Kings 22:13.) Were they all deceived, and even Jeremiah? (cf. Jer. 11:3f). Raven pays, "There were many persons in Judah who had powerful motives for exposing this forgery if it was one."<sup>7</sup>

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VI

Deuteronomy. Quotation from Professor Chas. A. Briggs,

Quotation from Anglican commentary.

Rules out great scholars who have deserted the critical camp.

This bars from their fellowship such great men as A. H. Sayce, Fritz Hommel, W. H. Green, J. W. McGarvey, Halevy, Professor Eerdmans, and others. Sayce, Hommel, Halevy, and Eerdmans all former advocates of the critical view till in later times they learned their error.

Quotation from James Orr. Reason why real scholars have not written much on the subject in recent years.

How the critical view precludes the idea of a universal standard.

Result of such condition.

Late dates given by Anglican commentary. Specified.

Why Deuteronomy was selected as a main object of critical attack.

Evidence of Moses. Quoted.

Internal evidence for Mosaic authorship of Deuteronomy. Five reasons stated.

Who can believe the Israelites learned for the first time in the reign of Josiah about their former history?

For Israel to accept such stories as the sudden revealing of the past in the time of Josiah, if not true, would have required a stupendous miracle.

Such a forgery would have been exposed.

---

<sup>7</sup>J. H. Raven: "Introduction to Old Testament" (1906), p. 112. 3

**CHAPTER VII**  
**CRITICAL ARGUMENTS**  
*Section I—PRIESTHOOD AS EVIDENCE*

**The Book of the Law Found by Hilkiah.** Critics claim that the book of the covenant, including the Decalogue (Ex. 20-23), was written by Moses, and that these four chapters constitute the whole of Moses' writings. Since nothing is said in these chapters about priests, they conclude that Moses never ordained any priesthood at all. They claim that Deuteronomy was the next book of the Bible written and made its first appearance when the book of the law was found by Hilkiah in the time of Josiah (cir. 623-621 B.C.), and that this book provides for a Levitical priesthood, which they think is the first mention of priests.

There are several objections to the assumption that the book discovered and published by Hilkiah was no other than portions of Deuteronomy, and of it alone:

1. Deuteronomy emphasizes centralization of worship (12:5); Josiah's reformation was directed against idolatry in general (2 Kings 23:4ff).

2. Several passages in Exodus might almost equally with Deuteronomy account for Josiah's reformation—20:3; 22:18, 20; 23:13,24, 32f; 34:13, 14ff.

3. There are no anachronisms in it betraying a post-Mosaic origin; no allusion to division of the kingdom; no hint of Assyrian oppression; no threats of exile either to Assyria or to Babylon, but rather to Egypt (Deut. 28:68).

4. In Deut. 18:6-8 we read: "And if a Levite come from any of I thy gates out of all Israel, where he sojourneth, and come with all the . desire of his soul unto the place which Jehovah shall choose; then he shall minister in the name of Jehovah his God, as all his brethren the Levites do, who stand there before Jehovah. They shall have like portions to eat, besides that which cometh of the sale of his patrimony"; but in 2 Kings 23:9: "Nevertheless the priests of the high places came not up to the altar of Jehovah in Jerusalem, but they did eat unleavened bread among their brethren," and yet critics make "Levites" and "priests" interchangeable terms.

They claim further that the Aaronic priesthood did not come into existence till about the time of the Babylonian exile in the time of



Ezra, at which time they think the books of Leviticus and Numbers were written authorizing the Aaronic priesthood. They are sure of a development from no priests in the book of the covenant (Ex. 20-23) to Levitical priests in Deuteronomy and finally to Aaronic priests in the time of the exile as given in Leviticus and Numbers. This is their proof of the late date of Deuteronomy, and the whole thing is disproved by the facts.

The proof against the critical theory on this point is so clear and convincing it is deemed important to give it in detail to some extent. The expression the "priests the Levites" in 2 Chron. 5:5; 23:18; 30:27 states the priests were Levites. In 2 Chron. 31:2, 4 we find "priests and Levites," making a clear distinction between the two classes. All this was according to the "law of Moses." In the same chapter (verses 12 and 17) we find separate assignments of duties of Levites and of courses of priests (verse 17). In verse 19 the priests are declared to be the "sons of Aaron." This record was under the reign of Hezekiah (cir. 727 B.C.) before the date given by critics to Deuteronomy by nearly a hundred years, and considerably longer time before the exile, when the critics are sure the Aaronic priesthood first appeared in the books of Leviticus and Numbers, which they are sure did not exist till the time of Ezra. Not only are the critics thus shown to be wrong from even their own viewpoint, but their viewpoint is wrong, for the priestly law was given by Moses in Leviticus and Numbers, which were written by Moses some 1490 B.C., according to Usher. The abundant and detailed accounts, given in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers, of Moses appointing Aaron and his sons as the priestly family, the description of their priestly garments, the record of their consecration and the completion of the tabernacle and its furniture, and the detailed record of the order of worship—all this and much more given in the middle books of the Pentateuch has to be discredited as mythical in order to save the "scientific" theory of the critics.

#### *Section II*—ALTARS OR SANCTUARIES AS EVIDENCE

**An Epoch.** Critics claim that the discovery of the Law of Moses by Hilkiah provided an epoch in the history of Israel, that before that time God had sanctioned a number of altars at as many different places, "in all places where God records his name," and that after that time only one central altar was authorized as provided in the newly discovered law found by Hilkiah, which they think was

the book of Deuteronomy. But, against this, one may point victoriously to Hezekiah's reformation recorded in 2 Kings 18:4, 22:

He removed the high places, and brake the pillars, and cut down the Asherah: and he brake in pieces the brazen serpent that Moses had made; for unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he called it Nehushtan. . . . (verse 22) But if ye say unto me, We trust in Jehovah our God; is not that he, whose high places and whose altars Hezekiah hath taken away, and hath said to Judah and to Jerusalem, Ye shall worship before this altar in Jerusalem?

**Only One Altar at a Time.** As indicating the original purpose of unity one may point particularly to Ex. 20:24-26, which is so often misinterpreted as permitting a plurality of sanctuaries, but when correctly interpreted permits only that altars may be erected in every place where *Jehovah records his name*, which is confirmed by the command in Ex. 23:14-19 that Israel shall come three times each year to the *house of Jehovah* and there present their offerings.

Again the evidence is all against this theory, but we can only point out a few of the many proofs found in the sacred records. The law given in Ex. 20:22-26 does not provide for a multitude of altars or sanctuaries to be used at the same time, but gives the instructions for building the altars, etc. In Ex. 27:1-8 is given an account of the building of an altar by Moses at Sinai of "acacia wood," "hollow with planks." This must have been a form to contain the earth or rough stones of which the altar was to be constructed. It was provided with staves and rings for carrying it from place to place during the wilderness wanderings as the children of Israel journeyed from one place to another. The critics point to the high places as evidence for numerous altars, but these high places were condemned, and the use of them by Hezekiah and all the bad kings was disapproved, and the record says they departed not "from the sins of Jeroboam the son of Nebat," who made Israel to sin. The sin of Jeroboam so often mentioned and condemned was that of establishing two altars, one at Bethel and one at Dan, and the calf worship that he ordered to be performed at these places and forbidding his subjects to worship at the central place at Jerusalem where was the one and only authorized altar. As usual in such cases, when the critics can find no other way out of their difficulty, they deny the historicity of the record in these places. As a matter of fact, the unity of the sanctuary follows as a necessary sequence of monotheism. If Moses taught monotheism, he also enjoined unity of worship.

In 1 Kings 3:2: "Only the people sacrificed in the high places, because there was no house built for the name of Jehovah until those days," the critics claim authority for worship at the high places. In the next verse it is said that "Solomon loved Jehovah, walking in the statutes of David his father: only he sacrificed and burnt incense in the high places." The word only is an important modifier of the statement and means an exception to the orderly conduct of Solomon, and the same applies to the people. When we consider the very clear condemnation of those who worshiped at the high places and the many commendations of those kings who destroyed these places as being unauthorized altars, together with the exception given here, there is no ground for the critical view of authority for these places.

**A Central Altar Only.** Again and again the children of Israel were told throughout the Pentateuch that they should worship Jehovah in the place where he would choose for them in the promised land which they were to occupy in the future. The fact that no permanent sanctuary was established before the temple of Solomon was built does not argue against the idea of a central altar in the tabernacle where God promised to record his name. Nor does this fact militate against God's manifesting his presence at any time and place. The sacrifice at Bochim (Judges 2:5), the altar of Gideon at Ophrah (Judges 6:24-27) and that of Manoah on the rock (Judges 13:19) do not make void the universal law of "sacrifice" in all places where God records his name. In each of these places the place was sanctified by the presence of God's angel. These facts do not support the claim of critics that the law of a single altar did not exist before the time of Josiah, when they claim that Deuteronomy was written and this law given for the first time.

**Professor Naville** has set forth an idea regarding- the origin of 'the book of the law" discovered by Hilkiah which has some value. After the analogy of the custom of the Egyptians' burying portions of the "Book of the Dead" within foundation walls of temples, he concludes that Solomon, when he builded the temple, probably deposited this "book of the law" in the foundations, and that when Josiah's workmen were repairing the temple, the long forgotten document, probably written in cuneiform, came to light. Thus "the book of the law" which he identifies with Deuteronomy must be pushed back, at least, <sup>as</sup> far as the age of Solomon.<sup>1</sup> Geden has a similar view as to date,

---

<sup>1</sup> Edward Naville: "The Discovery of the Book of the Law Under King Josiah, an Egyptian Interpretation of the Biblical Account," translated by M. L. McClure, with an 'Production by Professor Sayee (1911), pp vii, 2, 16, 18f, 22.

"some time during the prosperous period of David and the united monarchy."<sup>2</sup>

It is impossible that any Jew could have raised any question concerning the single sanctuary, or that he could have thought of Moses as instituting anything of less dignity.

### *Section III*—THE SETTING OF DEUTERONOMY

**An Impossible Condition.** Had Deuteronomy originated in the time of the reformation under Josiah (c. 623-621 B.C.), as claimed by critics, the many details of the setting would have betrayed the fraudulent claim of Mosaic times. After some 900 years it would have been impossible for a writer to enumerate correctly the items of geography and topography of the land along with the ethnography, history, and conduct of the inhabitants, which form the setting of the book of Deuteronomy:

All the cities of the plain, and all Gilead, and all Bashan, unto Salecah and Edrei, cities of the kingdom of Og in Bashan. (For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of the Rephaim; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbah of the children of Ammon? nine cubits was the length thereof, and four cubits the breadth of it, after the cubit of a man). . . . And the rest of Gilead, and all Bashan, the kingdom of Og, gave I unto the half-tribe of Manasseh; all the region of Argob, even all Bashan. (The same is called the land of Rephaim.) (Deut. 3:10-13.)

This reference to the Rephaim (giants) inhabiting Bashan is confirmed in Deut. 2:10, 11 where the record tells us that the Emim or Anakim dwelt in Moab "aforetime, a people great, and many, and tall, as the Anakim: these also are accounted Rephaim, as the Anakim; but the Moabites call them Emim." Here it is implied that the Rephaim had been succeeded in Moab by another people, and the history sustains the view that this race of giants was even in the time of Moses decreasing. Og, king of Bashan, was the only survivor of the race of giants who had "aforetime" inhabited the land. And not only was Moab and Bashan "aforetime" occupied by a race of giants, but probably all Palestine. In the time of Abraham, Chedorlaomer and the kings that were with him smote the Rephaim in Ashtoroth-karnaim in Bashan. When the spies returned from their tour of Canaan they reported:

And all the people that we saw in it [the land] are men of great stature. And there we saw the Nephilim, the sons of Anak, who come of the Nephilim:

---

<sup>2</sup> A. S. Geden: "Introduction to Hebrew Bible" (1909), p. 330.

and we were in our own sight as grasshoppers, and so we were in their sight (Num. 13:32f).

There were a few of these giants remaining in the time of David, as Goliath of Gath and his brother Lahmi, and Sippai, but the record seems to indicate these as rare specimens of a former race which had now become almost extinct.

*Section IV*—GIANT CITIES OF BASHAN

And we took all his cities at that time; there was not a city which we took not from them; threescore cities, all the region of Argob, the kingdom of Og in Bashan. All these were cities fortified with high walls, gates, and bars; besides the unwalled towns a great many (Deut. 3:4, 5).

**Facts Strange as Fiction.** Of all Bible history, no other account seems so incredible as this, yet it is verified in the most convincing manner by scholars who have visited the land. J. L. Porter says:

The conquest of Bashan begun under the leadership of Moses in person was completed by Jair, one of the most distinguished chiefs of the tribe of Manasseh. In narrating his achievements, the sacred historian brings out another remarkable fact connected with the kings of Bashan. In Argob, one of its little provinces, Jair took no less than *sixty great cities*, "fenced with high walls, gates, and bars; besides unwalled towns a great many" (Deut. 3:4, 5, 14). Such a statement seems all but incredible. It would not stand the arithmetic of Bishop Colenso for a moment. Often when reading the passage, I used to think that some strange statistical mystery hung over it; for how could a province measuring not more than thirty miles by twenty support such a number of fortified cities especially when the greater part of it was a wilderness of rocks? But mysterious, incredible as this seemed, on the spot, with my own eyes *I have seen* that it is literally true. The cities are there to this day. Some of them retain the ancient names recorded in the Bible.<sup>3</sup>

Some of the native tribes of Bashan, the Geshurites and the Maacathites, were not exterminated in the conquest by Israel, for Joshua says these "dwell in the midst of Israel unto this day" (13:13). These are said to have taken refuge in the rocky wilds of Argob and "amid the mountain fastnesses of Hermon." David married the daughter of Talmi, the chief of the Geshurites, and she became the mother of Absalom. It will be remembered that Absalom fled to this rocky region from the wrath of his father after he had slain his brother Amnon. It is said that this wild region is still a place of refuge for criminals of all sorts.

**Cities Not Ruined but Deserted.** Of the cities of Bashan, Porter says they are not ruined, but deserted, and that many of the

---

<sup>1</sup> J. L. Porter: "Giant Cities of Bashan and Syria's Holy Places," p. 18.

houses stand as perfect as if finished yesterday. In his travels through Bashan he says he has more than once lodged for the night in a comfortable house in the deserted cities of Bashan; that the walls are sound and the roofs, doors, and window shutters are in perfect condition. If these deserted houses were such as our modern American dwellings they would have crumbled into dust centuries ago. But they are built of stone throughout, the walls being from five to eight feet thick, and the doors and window shutters, in perfect condition, are of stone hung-on projecting pivots. Some of these cities have from two hundred to five hundred houses well preserved, but without an inhabitant. The roofs are made of slabs of stone some twelve feet long and eighteen inches wide, and all the stones are so well fitted that no cement or mortar was needed.<sup>4</sup>

*Section V—BUILT BY GIANTS*

**Most Ancient Houses in the World.** Porter describes the stone buildings of Bashan as follows:

The simplicity of their style, their low roofs, the ponderous blocks of roughly hewn stone with which they are built, the great thickness of the walls, and the heavy slabs which form the ceilings—all point to a period far earlier than the Roman age, and probably even antecedent to the conquest of the country by the Israelites. Moses makes special mention of the strong cities of Bashan, and speaks of their high walls and gates. He tells us, too, in the same connection, that Bashan was called *the land of the giants* (or Rephaim, Dent. 3; 13); leaving us to conclude that the cities were built by giants. Now the houses of Kerioth and other towns in Bashan appear to be just such dwellings as a race of giants would build. The walls, the roofs, but especially the ponderous gates, doors, and bars are in every way characteristic of a period when architecture was in its infancy, when giants were masons, and when strength and security were the grand requisites. I measured a door in Kerioth: it was nine feet high, four and a half feet wide, and ten inches thick—one solid slab of stone. I saw the folding gates of another town in the mountains still larger and heavier. Time produces little effect on such buildings as these. The heavy stone slabs of the roofs resting on massive walls make the structure as firm as if built of solid masonry; and the black basalt is almost as hard as iron."

There seems no room for doubt that these cities were built by the Rephaim, the aboriginal inhabitants of Bashan, and that here we have some of the most ancient houses in the world.

**Houses Well Preserved but Deserted.** Kerioth, Kenath, Bozrah, Salecah, Edrei, and other cities of Bashan are located, still bear-

---

<sup>4</sup>Porter: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 20, 81.

<sup>5</sup>Porter: *Op. Cit.*, p. 84.

ing their scripture names, but deserted, and hundreds of their houses are still in as good condition as when first built. It can hardly be doubted that these occupy sites of great antiquity. But the present desolation was predicted by Jeremiah (48:9): "And her cities shall become a desolation, without any to dwell therein"; "And Moab shall be destroyed from being a people" (Jer. 48:42). Many are the prophecies of old describing the utter ruin of the land of Bashan and the land of Moab with their cities deserted and without inhabitant, all of which are literally fulfilled today.

**Bedouins Descendants of Ishmael.** This mysterious land furnishes a most striking example of the literal fulfillment of an ancient prophecy. In Gen. 16:12 we have a prophecy spoken by the angel to Hagar, the handmaid of Sarai, nearly 4,000 years ago: "He [Ishmael] shall be as a wild ass among men; his hand shall be against every man, and every man's hand against him; and he shall dwell over against all his brethren." Travelers tell us that these Bedouin Arabs (Ishmaelites) make frequent raids on their neighbors as in the days of the judges, when they destroyed the increase of the earth, . . . and left no sustenance in Israel, neither sheep, nor ox, nor ass. For they came up with their cattle and their tents; they came in as locusts for multitude; both they and their camels were without number: and they came into the land to destroy it (Judges 6:4, 5).

These Bedouin Arabs are nomads who are scattered throughout an immense territory from the western boundary of Persia to the Atlantic, and from the mountains of Kurdistan to the negro countries of Sudan. We are told that the Midianites are Ishmaelites (Judges 8:24) from whom the Bedouin Arabs are thought to have descended. They are now generally Mohammedan in religion, and, true to the teachings of the Koran and the prediction of the angel regarding Ishmael, they are fierce, cruel, and treacherous, their "hand against every man," and all settled peoples among whom they rove live in mortal dread of this people who live by robbery, plunder, and murder. But for the constant menace of these marauders Bashan might be settled by civilized and industrious people and its fertile plains cultivated and made to flourish with corn, and figs, and vineyards, and with sheep and cattle as of old. But the land has only a few scattered settlements of Druses whose chief concern is protection from foe sons of Midian (the Bedouin Arabs) just as in the days of Gideon.<sup>6</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup> Porter: *Op Cit.*, p. 31.

These facts form a setting not only for Deuteronomy, but also for the books of Joshua and Judges, which no writer of centuries later could have forged.

*Section VI*—THE SILENCE ARGUMENT

**A False Claim.** Critics contend that the scriptures are silent as to the observance of the different items of the law until the time of the Babylonian exile, and that this silence regarding observance of the rites, feasts, sacrifices, etc., is proof that such laws did not exist before the exile, when they think the Priestly Code (especially Leviticus) first came into being. They make special application for this rule against the day of atonement. But this proves too much, for there is no mention of the atonement in any of the post-exilian books. Both Ezekiel, who wrote 592-570 B.C., and Deuteronomy, which the critics themselves claim was written about 621 B.C., make many references to different rites and institutions of the Mosaic law, including the Passover (Deut. 16; Iff), the Mosaic law of leprosy (Deut. 24:8); and these books are admitted by the critics to have been written long before the exile. Besides, these rites and institutions are frequently mentioned in Judges, Samuel, Kings, and Chronicles.

The argument put forth by some critics that the substance of the Levitical code is based on preexisting temple usage is a plain contradiction of the argument so much relied on that "there is no proof of the practice" and therefore the law did not exist. A natural question here is, "How is it known that there was temple usage if there is no trustworthy written history of it?"

**Nonobservance, If True, No Proof of Nonexistence.** Professor Briggs argues that circumcision was not observed nor any of the feasts during the exodus, and that the command to abolish the high places was not observed. He says: "It is an unlikely supposition that these pious princes so neglected a well-known duty."<sup>7</sup> He assumes that the legislation of the Pentateuch was not observed in the historic life of the Hebrew people, and that therefore the Pentateuch did not exist till about the time of Ezra; that during the forty years' wanderings Israel did not offer burnt offerings and peace offerings to Yahweh, and that "the neglect of these essential things (including circumcision) carries with it the nonobservance of the entire priest's

---

<sup>7</sup>Chas A. Briggs: "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 117.



code, for, according to that code, an uncircumcised man or one who did not keep the Passover was cut off from his congregation."<sup>8</sup>

If the children of Israel failed to observe the commandments of Moses such failure would not prove the nonexistence of the law. Moses even predicted that after his death they would utterly corrupt themselves (Deut. 31:29). The record tells us that circumcision was not observed at all during the wanderings, and there is only one account of the observance of the Passover during that time (Num. 9:5). But the Passover feast was given to be observed "when ye are come to the land which Jehovah will give you, according as he hath promised, that ye shall keep this service" (Ex. 12:25).

This nonobservance theory of the critics is one of the weakest they could propose. The law was never given to be observed primarily in the wilderness wanderings, though some parts of it were observed. Deut. 12:8-11 shows this very clearly:

Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes; for ye are not as yet come to the rest and to the inheritance, which Jehovah thy God giveth thee. But when ye go over the Jordan, and dwell in the land which Jehovah your God causeth you to inherit, and he giveth you rest from all your enemies round about, so that ye dwell in safety; then it shall come to pass that to the place which Jehovah your God shall choose, to cause his name to dwell there, thither shall ye bring all that I command you: your burnt-offerings, and your sacrifices, your tithes, and the heave-offering of your hand, and all your choice vows which ye vow unto Jehovah.

In the thirteenth and fourteenth verses the same exhortation is given. It will hardly be argued that the Feast of First Fruits, or the wave offering, was to be observed before the children of Israel were settled in the land of promise, for it is definitely written "when ye are come into the land which I give unto you, and shall reap the harvest thereof" (Lev. 23:10).

**A Scripture Perversion.** Again Professor Briggs cites Neh. 8:17 to prove that the Feast of Tabernacles was something new.<sup>9</sup> This passage seems clear and says: "Made booths, and dwelt in the booths: for since the days of Jeshua the son of Nun unto that day had not the children of Israel done so." There is not a word in Neh. \* to suggest that the law introduced by Ezra was a new one. It was received without demur by a deeply divided community, and its genuineness was doubted by no one. For how could this be some-

---

<sup>8</sup> Briggs; *Op. Cit.*, p. 119.

<sup>9</sup> Briggs: *Of. Cit.*, p. 120

thing new when Solomon had established the temple worship, including the Feast of Tabernacles, and other items of the law nearly 500 years before the exile? (See 2 Chron. 8; 13). The passage in Nehemiah does not say a word about the Feast of Tabernacles not] having been observed since the days of Joshua (and if it had it would establish its existence rather than its nonexistence), but they had not observed "so," that is, making booths and dwelling in them. The language will bear no other construction, and the critics grossly pervert the passage in the attempt to prove the nonobservance and consequently the nonexistence of the law of this feast.

Critics claim silence where there is no silence. They make the bold claim that there is no evidence of the observance of the law of the Priestly Code until the time of the exile. But in 1 Sam. 1:3 it is said: "And this man [Elkana] went up out of his city from year to year to worship and to sacrifice unto Jehovah of hosts in Shiloh." In 2 Kings 23:21 Josiah ordered the keeping of the Passover "as it is written in this book of the covenant." The critic usually disposes of such accounts by saying they are not historical or that the passage is an interpolation and that without the slightest proof except that it interferes with his "scientific" theory.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VII

### *Section I*—PRIESTHOOD AS EVIDENCE

Book of the law found by Hilkiah. What book?

Critics' claim as to priests.

Objections to the view that the book found was only Deuteronomy:

1. Centralization of worship. Josiah's reformation.

2. Passages in Exodus.

3. Quotations showing "Levites" and "priests" not interchangeable. Claim that Aaronic priesthood originated in time of exile.

Of development from—

No priests in book of covenant (Ex. 20-23), to Levitical priests in Deuteronomy, and finally, to Aaronic priests in time of exile.

Proof against above theory clear and convincing. Detailed.

Records in Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers regarded as mythical in order to save the so-called scientific theory of the critics.

### *Section II*—ALTARS OR SANCTUARIES AS EVIDENCE

An epoch in history of Israel (?).

Central altar at Jerusalem shown in quotation in time of Hezekiah.

Perversion of Ex 20:24-26.

Form built by Moses for construction of an altar at each place of encampment. One altar at a time or a multiplicity of them?

High places as evidence of plurality. Universally condemned.

Sin of Jeroboam. Unity of worship and monotheism.

People and Solomon worshiped at high places—mentioned as an exception to their orderly conduct. Destroyed by good kings.

Central altar only. Other places sanctified by presence of angel, and this fact does not nullify the general law of a single altar.

Professor Naville's theory of the finding of the law.

### *Section III*—THE SETTING OF DEUTERONOMY

An impossible condition. Detail.

Scripture quotation.

The Rephaim, Anakim, Emim. Og king of Bashan.

Abraham smote Rephaim Nephilim reported by the spies.

### *Section IV*—GIANT CITIES OF BASHAN

Scripture quotation.

Facts strange as fiction. Testimony of travelers—J. L. Porter.

Geshurites of Bashan not exterminated.

Solomon grandson of their chief.

Cities not ruined, but deserted. Many houses well preserved.

### *Section V*—BUILT BY GIANTS

Most ancient houses in the world.

Porter's description. Moses makes special mention of the strong cities of Bashan and their high walls and gates. Calls Bashan the land of the giants (Deut. 3:13).

Cities still identified, well preserved to this day, bearing their ancient scripture names—Kerioth, Kenath, Bozra, Salecah, Edrei.

Present desolation foretold by prophets. Quoted.

Bedouin Arabs, as descendants of Ishmael. Prophecy of angel to Hagar. Retain same characteristics to this day. Habitations and manner of life.

Setting for Deuteronomy, Joshua, and Judges Could all this have been so minutely forged a thousand years later?

### *Section VI*—THE SILENCE ARGUMENT

A false claim of silence in the scriptures regarding observance of rites, feasts, sacrifices, etc., as proof that such laws did not exist before the exile.

Testimony of Deuteronomy and Ezekiel. Also mentioned in other books.

Position of Professor Briggs. Law not given primarily to be observed in the wilderness wanderings. Scripture quotation.

A scripture perversion. Neh. 8:17.

Claim of silence when there is no silence. Elkana, Josiah.

## CHAPTER VIII

### CRITICAL ARGUMENTS REFUTED

#### *Section I*—MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

**Evidence All Affirmative.** The evidence for the Mosaic authorship is everywhere indicated in the text of the Pentateuch except in the book of Genesis, and evidence for his writing this book is found elsewhere. In regard to Deuteronomy it is declared in the beginning, at the end, and throughout this book that Moses received the messages contained therein from God and that he "wrote this law, and delivered it unto the priests the sons of Levi" (Deut. 31:9). See page 63f.

The book of Deuteronomy contains three discourses delivered by Moses in the land of Moab. Moses provided for the preservation of this book of the law, placing it by the side of the ark. He is declared to have composed the song recorded near the end of the book.

That Moses wrote the Pentateuch has always been a universal tradition among the Jews, and wherever history deals with the Jew this tradition is apparent. That such tradition has always accompanied the Jew and connected with his history *at every point* will scarcely be denied by even the most rabid critic.

The claims made by the book itself should have great weight in determining its authorship, especially when it is so often declared. In Mal. 4:4 it is said: "Remember ye the law of Moses my servant, which I commanded unto him in Horeb for all Israel, even statutes and ordinances." The book of the covenant, Ex. 20-23, is declared to have been written by Moses (Ex. 24:4). The so-called Priestly Code (Leviticus) and specific portions of Exodus and Numbers are declared to have been given by Jehovah to Moses, some of it on Mt. Sinai, some in the camp at the foot of the mountain, some in the wilderness. Deuteronomy is specifically declared to have been written by Moses (Deut. 31:9).

**Detailed Narratives of Wilderness Wanderings.** The Priestly Code of Leviticus gives specific instructions in regard to the camp of Israel in the wilderness; sin offerings were to be burned without the camp; ashes from the altar were to be carried outside the camp; lepers were to live outside the camp. The tabernacle with holy and most holy places and its furnishings was made with detailed instructions for its transportation, the boards and other parts being so built that

it could be readily taken down and carried from place to place. The location of the tribes in the camp and the trumpet to call together and for the journey were all given in detail. All this and much more is declared to have been enacted during the sojourn in the wilderness. The consecration of Aaron and his sons is given in Lev. 8. In the ninth chapter specific instructions to Aaron are given and a record that Aaron made the sin offering, the burnt offering, and the peace offerings as directed by Moses (verses 21ff): "And the breasts and the right thigh Aaron waved for a wave-offering before Jehovah; as Moses commanded. And Aaron lifted up his hands toward the people, and blessed them; and he came down from offering the sin-offering, and the burnt-offering, and the peace-offerings." (Verse 24): "And there came forth fire from before Jehovah, and consumed upon the altar the burnt-offering and the fat: and when all the people saw it, they shouted, and fell on their faces."

To deny the existence of these laws for a thousand years is gratuitous, and to say that no sacrifices or ceremonial laws of Moses were kept till the time of Ezra is to deny plain facts of history, for the record says plainly that Aaron did these things.

**Late Date Theory Absurd.** In Deut. 20:17 we find the order to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Canaanite, the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite. The Amorites and Moabites were forbidden to enter into the assembly of Jehovah even to the tenth generation. These orders are given only in the book of Deuteronomy, which, according to critics, did not come into existence until all these tribes had long since been destroyed. It cannot be said that these tribes did not exist and that the record is unhistorical. Then how can we account for the history if Moses did not write it? Can we believe that an imaginary D wrote such history in the time of Josiah and ordered the destruction of enemies that had not existed for some 500 years? It is unreasonable to suppose that any sane writer would have attempted such fraud.

**Proof from Other Books.** The other books of the Old Testament show that their authors were acquainted with the Pentateuch in many and varied items. Joshua, Judges, and Samuel indicate a familiarity with the law of Moses. This is true of the author of Kings and of the prophets Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea. The law of Moses or the law God gave to Moses is mentioned in Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel, 2 Kings and 2 Chronicles. Joshua the son of Nun as "Moses" minister" carried out Moses' instructions in entering and

subduing the land of Canaan. Again Joshua built the altar in Mt. Ebal as Moses the servant of God commanded (Josh. 8:30-35; Deut. 11:29). Joshua refers to the cities of refuge and the Levitical cities as "Jehovah commanded by the hand of Moses" (Num. 35: Iff). Judges refers to the Nazarite vow given in Num. 6. Samuel mentions the tabernacle under the headings of house of Jehovah, temple of Jehovah, tent of meeting. He also refers to the lamp of God, the cherubim, mercy seat, holy bread, or showbread, and the linen ephod. Some thirteen chapters of Exodus are given to the construction of the tabernacle and its furniture. Where did Samuel get this information if not from Moses? In 1 Kings and 2 Kings mention is made frequently of the tabernacle, the ark, the holy vessels and the brazen altar. In 2 Kings 18:22 reference is made to Hezekiah taking away the high places and altars and "hath said, . . . Ye shall worship before this altar in Jerusalem." This proves beyond doubt an established ritual including *a* central altar before the time of Josiah when critics affirm the central altar idea originated. The critical theory cannot stand under the weight of such direct and positive evidence.

Isaiah (8:19, 20) condemns the seeking unto them that have "familiar spirits and unto the wizards, that chirp and that mutter." The law against these is found in Lev. 19:31 and in Deut. 18: 10ff. Isaiah wrote his prophecy before the time of finding the law by Hilkiah during the reign of Josiah. According to the critical view, he performed the impossible by condemning a thing a century before it was prohibited by law.

Jeremiah (2:2ff) refers to the deliverance from Egyptian bondage, the journey through the wilderness, and the final entry into the promised land. If this was not obtained from Moses in Exodus then how can it be accounted for? Again he refers in Jer. 7:12 to Shiloh as the place where Jehovah caused his name to dwell at the first. This corroborates the history given in Judges 18:31 which critics deny as unhistorical.

In Neh. 9:26 it is said that the children of Israel "rebelled against thee, and cast thy law behind their back." Again in verse 34, "neither have our kings, our princes, our priests, nor our fathers, kept thy law." The critics point out these as evidence that they had no law, as it had not been written up to that time, and the confession of neglect proves they did not have it. This is indeed strange logic, for they could not have cast Jehovah's "law behind their back" if it did not exist, or if they did not have it.

*Section II*—NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

**The Testimony of Jesus**<sup>1</sup> and the apostles is clear and unanimous. Paul speaks of the book of Moses; "Moses is read" (2 Cor. 3:15); James, Moses is preached (Acts 15:21); Jesus, "And beginning from Moses and from all the prophets" (Luke 24:27). See also John 5:45-47; "Moses wrote unto us" (Mark 12:19); "Moses commanded us" (John 8:5).

In Mark 12:26, "Have ye not read in the book of Moses?" It was the universal belief among the Jews that Moses wrote the Pentateuch. "Did not Moses give you the law, and yet none of you doeth the law?" (John 7:19). "For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me; for he wrote of me. But if ye believe not his writings, how shall ye believe my words?" (John 5:46). In Acts 3:22ff we find this: "Moses indeed said, A prophet shall the Lord God raise up unto you from among your brethren, like unto me"; etc. See Deut. 18:15. "For the law was given through Moses" (John 1:17). Luke (24:44) reports Jesus as saying:

These are my words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must needs be fulfilled, which are written in the law of Moses, and the prophets, and the psalms, concerning me.

Most critics deny the Davidic authorship of nearly all the psalms, and some leaders, as Wellhausen, refuse to credit David with any of them. But in doing this they have to repudiate Jesus who quotes Psalm 110 as the language of David (Matt. 22:41-45; Mark 12:35ff; Luke 20:41ff). Also Peter, guided by the Holy Spirit, declared that David prophesied concerning Judas (Acts 1:16), and referred to Psalms 16 and 110 as being written by David (Acts 2:25-34).

Further New Testament evidence would be superfluous, for if these passages are not sufficient proof, we do not see how further proof could be demanded.

**SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VIII***Section I*—MOSAIC AUTHORSHIP OF THE PENTATEUCH

Evidence all affirmative. In all the books of the Pentateuch except Genesis, and evidence for Mosaic authorship here is found elsewhere (Deut. 31:9).

Three discourses of Moses in land of Moab. Jewish tradition.

Testimony of Deuteronomy often repeated. Unmistakable evidence of other books.

Detailed narrative in wilderness.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chas. H. Roberson: "What Jesus Taught," pp. 397-407.

To deny the detailed record of Mosaic laws is to defy plain statements of history and implies a wholesale charge of fraud and deception.

Late date theory absurd. Order to destroy the inhabitants of Canaan, the Hittite, the Amorite, the Canaanite, the Perizzite, the Hivite, and the Jebusite. These historical tribes or nations had been extinct for 500 years in the time of Josiah.

Proof from other books. Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, Hosea, Ezra, Nehemiah, Daniel—all testify to Mosaic authorship. Derails given.

*Section II*—NEW TESTAMENT EVIDENCE

Testimony of Jesus and the apostles.

"Moses is read" (2 Cor. 3: IS).

"Beginning from Moses and from all the prophets" (Luke 24:27).

Moses is preached (Acts 15:21).

"Moses wrote unto us" (Mark 12:19).

"Moses commanded us" (John 8:5).

"Have ye not read in the book of Moses?" (Mark 12:26).

"Did not Moses give you the law?" (John 7:19).

"For if ye believed Moses, ye would believe me" (John 5:46).

And many other passages.



## CHAPTER IX

### OBJECTIONS ANSWERED

#### *Section I—FIRST OBJECTIONS*

**Modernism Over 300 Years Old.** Among the first objections to the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch were those promulgated in the seventeenth century by Peyrerijs, a Roman Catholic priest, and Spinoza, an apostate Jew. These objections number eighteen and Professor Briggs gives them in numerical order.<sup>1</sup> For the sake of brevity and convenience we shall give them in groups, indicating the number in parentheses with our comments following:

#### **Group A**

(2) Gen. 14:14. "And pursued as far as Dan." But Dan did not receive this name until long after the death of Moses; for Judges 18:29 tells us that the Danites in the times of the Judges "called the name of the city Dan, after the name of Dan their father, who was born unto Israel: howbeit the name of the city was Laish at the first."

(4) Ex. 16:35. "And the children of Israel did eat the manna forty years, until they came to a land inhabited; they did eat the manna, until they came unto the borders of the land of Canaan." This passage implies the entrance into the land of Canaan after the death of Moses and the author's knowledge of the event described in Josh. 5:12.

(6) Deut. 2:12. The children of Esau destroyed the Horites and dwelt in their stead "as Israel did unto the land of his possession, which Yahweh gave unto them." This implies the conquest of Canaan.

(8) Deut. 3:14. "And called them, even Bashan, after his own name, Havvoth-jair, unto this day." This implies a day long after this naming which was made in the last days of Moses.

(9) Deut. 34:10. "And there hath not arisen a prophet since in Israel like unto Moses." This implies a time long subsequent to Moses.

(10) Gen. 22:14. Mt. Moriah is called the mount of God, which could not be so called until the erection of the temple. Professor Briggs remarks that this objection rests upon a mistake,

---

<sup>1</sup> Chas. A. Briggs: "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," pp. 36-45.

that it is not called the Mount of Yahweh, but the place is called "Yahweh sees" "as it is said to this day, in the mount where Yahweh appears." He then adds "this proverbial expression, however, implies a long sojourn in the Holy Land, and, therefore, a period long subsequent to Moses."

It is believed that the above group of objections may be answered briefly by the same facts and these facts are that the Pentateuch constitutes an ideal prophetic code, given before the conquest of the Promised Land, contemplating permanent settlement and a long sojourn of the Israelites in Palestine. As an inspired writer, Moses anticipated many things before they transpired.

Professor Chas. A. Briggs, who is an ardent supporter of these objections, remarks in his "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," page 83:

If we could present good and sufficient reasons for the opinion that the Deuteronomic code is a prophetic ideal code, given before the conquest in view of a long sojourn of the nation in Palestine, these facts might be explained. But the difficulty is to find such reasons. Who can prove it?

Again the same author says, on page 161, that "the law of Moses was as truly prophetic as legal. Moses was even more a prophet than a lawgiver."

This last statement is quite sufficient to explain the so-called contradictions and inconsistencies of this group of objections. But this is not all, for this eminent modernist flatly contradicts his own statement quoted above, published in the same book. Besides the prophetic feature of Moses' writings which brought before his view the future history of Israel when settled in the Promised Land, there is another possible explanation of some of the difficulties pointed out, to which the critic should not object since he makes free use of it in every time of need, that is, that the statements referred to as indicating a later date than Moses' time may have been added by a later copyist. That such additions or changes in the text may have been made by scribes in copying is admitted by many scholars friendly to the Bible who do not apply such an admission to such changes as destroy the claims of the inspired record or impair its trustworthiness.

### **Group B**

- (1) Gen. 12:6. "The Canaanite was then in the land" implies a time when this was not the case, that is, centuries after the conquest by Joshua.

- (3) Gen. 36 gives a list of kings reigning in Edom: "Before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (verse 31). This implies an author living after the establishment of kings in Israel not earlier than the Hebrew monarchy.

Again these passages clearly imply the prophetic character of Moses' writing. He speaks of the conquest of Canaan, of the central altar, the place of judgment, and of the king as future, e. g., "the place which Jehovah thy God shall choose" and "when thou art come unto the land which Jehovah thy God giveth thee, . . . and shalt say, I will set a king over me, like all the nations that are round about me" (see Deut. 17:8-15). The entire Pentateuch is forward looking and makes full and ample provision for the settlement of the children of Israel in Canaan. Indeed its main feature is to provide a law and guide for their conduct after the conquest and settlement in the Promised Land. Moses claims many times over that he is delivering the message of God, and is, therefore, speaking by inspiration. He could see by the spirit of prophecy the future condition of Israel under the rule of kings when he referred to the kings of Edom "before there reigned any king over the children of Israel" (Gen. 36:31). By this same inspiration he could see "the Canaanite was then in the land," though he probably knew this much of the history of Palestine without the aid of inspiration. In Deut. 4:5 we read:

Behold, I have taught you statutes and ordinances, even as Jehovah my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the midst of the land whither ye go in to possess it.

In Deut. 28 Moses recites the punishments that would be visited upon the children of Israel for disobedience and says:

Jehovah will bring thee, and thy king whom thou shalt set over thee, unto a nation that thou hast not known, thou nor thy fathers; and there shalt thou serve other gods, wood and stone (Deut. 28:36).

Again

When thou shalt beget children, and children's children, and ye shall have been long in the land, and shall corrupt yourselves, and make a graven image in the form of anything, and shall do that which is evil in the sight of Jehovah thy God, to provoke him to anger; I call heaven and earth to witness against you this day, that ye shall soon utterly perish from off the land whereunto ye go over the Jordan to possess it (Deut. 4:25-31).

Shall stand before Jehovah, before the priests and the judges that shall be in those days (Deut. 19:17).

These passages and others that might be cited show most conclusively that the future conditions of Israel when settled in the Promised Land were before Moses as a prophetic vision.

**Group C**

- (5) Deut. 1:1. "These are the words which Moses spake unto all Israel beyond the Jordan" implies an author who was in Palestine, for only such an one could write "beyond the Jordan."

Critics try to support their claim of a later date for Deuteronomy from this passage which they claim was not written till after the children of Israel had entered the land of Canaan. They claim the same for the language found in Deut. 1:5 and 4:41, 46. But the connection does not support this contention, as the statement is explicit in locating the writer by saying he was "in the wilderness," "in the Arabah," and in verse 5 Moses repeats that it was "beyond the Jordan, in the land of Moab, began Moses to declare this law," etc. In Deut. 11:30 referring to Mt. Gerizim and Mt. Ebal the record says: "Are they not beyond the Jordan, behind the way of the going down of the sun . . .?" Again, Hebrew scholars tell us that the same Hebrew preposition is used in Num. 32:19, which, if translated *beyond as* in other places, would read: "We will not inherit with them beyond Jordan forward; because our inheritance is fallen to us beyond Jordan eastward" (A. V.), the same word referring to both sides of the river. In a number of other passages the phrase is used to indicate the same side of the river on which the writer is known to be located (Cf. A. R. V.).

**Group D**

- (7) Deut. 3:11. "For only Og king of Bashan remained of the remnant of the Rephaim; behold, his bedstead was a bedstead of iron; is it not in Rabbah of the children of Ammon?" This implies a writer looking back upon the story of the conquest of Bashan from a date much later than Moses.

There is nothing in this passage to sustain the contention of a later date than Moses. It is not spoken of as a relic of a former age, but the iron bedstead is a memorial of the victory just recorded.

**Group E**

- (11) Deut. 2:5. "Not so much as for the sole of the foot to tread on," when compared with 1 Chron. 18, where David conquers Edom, shows an inconsistency, and doubtless implies a time when Israel was friendly with Edom, but does not in itself imply a later date than Moses.

The fact that Israel was not to take any of the territory of Edom at this time has no connection with what David did 500 years later.

**Group F**

(12) Num. 21:14. The citation of the book of the wars of Yahweh implies another author than Moses.

Why could not Moses cite another authority as corroborating his account? This is done by practically all writers without criticism from any source.

**Group G**

(13) Deut. 27:2 seq. (compare Josh. 8:30 seq., where the law was written on an altar) implies a law much less extensive than the Pentateuch. It is now generally agreed that the reference is to the Deuteronomic code.

The reference seems to be to Deut. 27:15-26—the law of curses which was to be inscribed in Mt. Ebal—a synopsis of Lev. 20. That a special law was to be written on the plastered stones in Mt. Ebal is clear from Deut. 29:1 where it is said:

These are the words of the covenant which Jehovah commanded Moses to make with the children of Israel in the land of Moab, besides the covenant which he made with them in Horeb.

Verse 21 refers to the "curses of the covenant that is written in this book of the law." Again Josh. 8:32 says Joshua wrote there upon the stones "a copy of the law of Moses, which he wrote, in the presence of the children of Israel." Then follows an account of the carrying out of this program by Joshua on Mt. Ebal and Mt. Gerizim as directed by Moses, and afterwards the reading of "all the words of the law, the blessing and the curse, according to all that is written in the book of the law."

**Group H**

(14) Deut. 10:7f, which narrates the separation of the Levites at Jotbathah, is inconsistent with their separation before the death of Aaron as reported in Leviticus and Numbers.

The expression "at that time" probably refers back to the making of the ark in verse 3. The parenthetical statement (verses 6-9) covers more than one item which had been given before, not necessarily in chronological order.

**Group I**

(15) Ex. 4:20, which represents that Moses took his family with him to Egypt, is inconsistent with Ex. 18:2 seq., which states that they remained with his father-in-law in Midian. Modern

critics claim these variations as due to different stories of the same thing recorded in different documents.

Ex. 4:20 reads, "And Moses took his wife and his sons, and set them upon an ass, and *he returned to the land of Egypt.*" Clark says that it is possible that Zipporah, being alarmed by this circumstance (verses 24, 25) and fearing worse evils, took the resolution to return to her father's house with her two sons (Clark's "Commentary," Vol. I, Royal Octavo Stenotype Ed., p. 299). Ex. 18:2, 5 says: "And Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, took Zipporah, Moses' wife, after he had sent her away, and her two sons; . . . and Jethro, Moses' father-in-law, came with his sons and his wife unto Moses into the wilderness where he was encamped, at the mount of God." Instead of a contradiction here there is the most perfect harmony and agreement throughout. The fact is plainly stated that Moses set his wife and sons on an ass and *he* returned to Egypt, and Ex. 18:2 seq. confirms the fact that Moses sent his wife away. Upon the arrival of Moses at the mount of God some time later, Jethro brought Zipporah, Moses' wife, and his two sons to meet Moses. Why should not the Bible be thus allowed to explain itself?

### **Group J**

(16) Ex. 33:11. "Yahweh spake unto Moses face to face."

(17) Num. 12:3. "Now the man Moses was very meek, above all the men which were upon the face of the earth."

(18) Deut. 31: 9. "And Moses wrote this law." Several other passages—Num. 1:1; 2:2; 5:1; 31:14; Deut. 31:1—where Moses is spoken of in the third person and sometimes in flattering terms.

The above three objections seem to have no basis in fact upon which to stand. God could have spoken to Moses face to face without Moses seeing him. Moses could speak of himself in the third person in either complimentary or derogatory terms, and it is decidedly better taste for him to do so rather than in the first person.

### *Section II*—FALSE CHARGES AND INTERPRETATIONS

**Passover Feast Abridged.** Critics claim that the book of the law found by Hilkiah was Deuteronomy. In this book, chapter 16, we find a brief statement of the Passover law, but it is very much abridged, because it had already been given in detail by Moses in the other books of the Pentateuch. If the other books of the Pentateuch had not been written before the time of the exodus as claimed by

critics, we would ask them how Josiah celebrated the Feast of the Passover in accordance with the "book of the law" when Deuteronomy does not give more than half the items of this feast. It does not specify a lamb to be roasted whole and to be eaten with bitter herbs and unleavened bread, nor that "no bone of the victim should be broken. It says nothing about the burnt offerings which were to be offered every day of the Passover week" (McGarvey).<sup>2</sup> It does not even give the day of the month on which the feast was to begin. These items are omitted in the abridged record of Deuteronomy. If these items were not written in other books of the Pentateuch till the exile, where did Josiah get his data for observing this feast? This fact gives a deathblow to the claim that the "book of the law" found by Hilkiah was Deuteronomy only.

Another false claim of critics is that Ex. 21:13 makes Jehovah's altar an asylum for the manslayer. But the critic seems to care nothing for the next verse which forbids the use of the altar as an asylum. Adonijah and Joab were both taken from the altar and slain.

Professor McGarvey mentions that

Professor Smith falls into the common error of supposing that the Israelites were forbidden to intermarry with foreigners. . . . This prohibition had reference only to the tribes of Canaan (Ex. 34:11-16; Deut. 7:1-3); consequently the people were left as free to intermarry with other nations as they had been before the law was given. Indeed the book of Deuteronomy contains an express provision for the marriage of Hebrews to foreign women taken captive in war, which were usually reduced to slavery (Deut. 21:10-14). David, therefore, did not violate the Levitical law in marrying, though Solomon did. ("Authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy," page 164).

**Careless Reading or Ignorance.** E. Sellin, a noted critic, who has written a number of religious books and occupied a chair of theology in a German university, points to the record in Gen. 6:19 calling for one pair of beasts and birds, while Gen. 7:2 calls for seven pairs of clean beasts and birds as a contradiction. Surely the professor is able to distinguish between clean and unclean beasts and birds. He also refers to Gen. 7:4 giving the duration of the flood as forty days, while in 7:24 it is given as 150 days. Again he should be able to discriminate between the two passages, for in the first case the rain was to continue forty days, while in the latter the waters continued to rise or "prevailed" upon the earth 150 days. Other contradictions are pointed out by this critic as follows:

---

<sup>2</sup>J. W. McGarvey: "Authorship of Deuteronomy" (1902), p. 12.

At one time the inhabitants of Palestine are called Amorites, at another Canaanites; the mountain where the law was given is sometimes called Horeb, sometimes Sinai; the third of the patriarchs sometimes Jacob, sometimes Israel . . . and best known of all, there is the periodically changing designation of God as Yahweh and Elohim.<sup>3</sup>

The above manifests such carelessness and such a bias in support of an hypothesis that it seems unnecessary to point out all of his errors.

Another of Professor Sellin's glaring mistakes is his charge that the "book of the law" found by Hilkiah as recorded in the twenty-second chapter of 2 Kings was the book of Deuteronomy only, and he offers as proof of this that the book was read three times in one day which he says would not be possible of the entire Pentateuch.<sup>4</sup> But not one word is said in the record about the length of time required for Hilkiah and Shaphan and the king to read the book. Such gross misrepresentation of facts would appear inexcusable in one who occupies the position occupied by Professor Sellin.

**Image Worship Charged.** Some critics claim the ephod made by Gideon, of which it is said "it became a snare unto Gideon, and to his house" (Judges 8:27), was an image of Jehovah. Other critics say it was the image of a bull. Micah (Judges 17:3-6) made a graven image and a molten image, a sanctuary and an ephod. Jeroboam made two calves of gold, setting one up at Dan and the other at Bethel, and said, "Behold thy gods, O Israel, which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt" (1 Kings 12:28). Critics cite all these cases as examples of image worship authorized by the Bible and charge the religion of Israel with idolatry. Nothing could be farther from the truth, for all of these cases and all other cases of idolatry are specifically condemned in the Bible, and the sin of Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, is referred to more frequently and condemned more severely than any other sin mentioned in the Bible. "Jeroboam the son of Nebat who did sin and who made Israel to sin," is the expression on which he has been gibbeted forever. They even charge ancestor worship, tree worship, stone worship, and image worship against early Israel.<sup>5</sup> To establish this last they would have to deny the Decalogue to Moses, for the Ten Commandments forbid image worship. The practice of any such rites of ritualism by the Israelites is nowhere

<sup>3</sup>E. Sellin: "Introduction to the Old Testament," p. 27.

<sup>4</sup>Sellin: *Op. Cit.*, p. 74.

<sup>5</sup>James Orr: "Problem of the Old Testament" (1917), p. 39; Professor Briggs charges "ancestral worship by Elijah on Mt. Carmel and worship on high places" as approved by the Bible record ("Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch," p. 116).



mentioned with approval, but always condemned in the Bible and the critics ought to know this much.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IX

### *Section I—FIRST OBJECTIONS*

Modernism over 300 years old. Peyrerius. Spinoza.

Objections itemized from Professor Briggs' "Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch."

#### **GROUP A**

Group A consisting of six objections outlined and answered. Quotation from Briggs denying that the Deuteronomic code is a prophetic ideal code, but in another place in same book he affirms that the law of Moses was as truly prophetic as legal.

#### **GROUP B**

Group B consisting of two objections answered. Many items given as future. The entire Pentateuch is a forward-looking book.

Moses could see by the spirit of prophecy the future condition of Israel under the reign of kings. Quotation (Deut. 28:36). (Deut. 4:25-31.)

#### **GROUP C**

Group C consisting of one objection answered.

"Beyond Jordan" does not imply that the writer was in Palestine when the text plainly says he was in the wilderness, in the Arabah, in the land of Moab. Other examples given, sometimes indicating one side and others the other side.

#### **GROUP D**

Group D consisting of one objection answered. Contains nothing to sustain the charge of a later date than the time of Moses.

#### **GROUP E**

Group E consisting of one objection answered. Has no point.

#### **GROUP F**

Group F consisting of one objection answered. A practice universal.

#### **GROUP G**

Group G consisting of one objection answered. A special law was to be inscribed in the plastered stones. See Deut. 27:15-26. A synopsis of Lev. 20.

#### **GROUP H**

Group H consisting of one objection answered. No reason why the separation could not have been repeated, or the language probably refers back to the time of making the ark in verse 3. The statement covers more than one item which had been given before, not necessarily in chronological order.

#### **GROUP I**

Group I consisting of one objection answered.

**GROUP J**

Group J consisting of three objections answered.

*Section II*—FALSE CHARGES AND INTERPRETATIONS

The Passover Feast abridged.

How could Josiah have celebrated the feast in accordance with the "book of the law," if that expression includes only the book of Deuteronomy, when Deuteronomy does not give more than half the items of the feast? Omitted features given.

Jehovah's altar not an asylum for the manslayer (Ex. 21:13) as claimed by critics. See following verse.

Quotation from McGarvey. Note important item on intermarrying.

Careless reading or ignorance. E. Sellin, a noted critic, fails to distinguish between clean and unclean beasts and birds. Also fails to grasp the difference between the time covered by the rain of the deluge and the time the waters remained on the earth.

Quotation showing other gross errors which he charges against the Bible.

Sellin's charge that the record in 2 Kings 22 indicates the book of the law found by Hilkiah was read three times in one day, and therefore could not be the whole Pentateuch. No time is mentioned for the three readings.

Image worship charged. Ephod made by Gideon. Micah made a graven image and a molten image, a sanctuary and an ephod. Jeroboam made two golden calves. "Behold thy gods, O Israel."

Critics charge ancestor worship, tree worship, stone worship, and image worship against early Israel. All such are condemned in the sacred writings.

## CHAPTER X SCIENCE VS. CRITICAL CLAIMS

### *Section I—SCIENCE OF THE BIBLE*

**Modernists** are constantly affirming that the Bible abounds with erroneous teaching in references of a geological or astronomical character. Under the heading of Religious Values of the Books of the Pentateuch, the "Anglican Commentary" says (p. 39):

The writers are inspired to reveal the religious truth necessary for man's eternal salvation. Scientific and historical accuracy is not necessary for salvation, and does not call for a divine revelation. Since it is within the scope of ordinary human knowledge ... it would be unreasonable to expect the writers of Genesis to be in advance of their age in the sphere of scientific knowledge. The essential inspiration of the book of Genesis is in no way impaired by the fact that the writer has used the beliefs of his time on the origin of the world and mankind as the medium by which to convey the religious truth which he was inspired to teach.

The chief merit of this quotation consists in the number of false assumptions crowded into so few words: (1) It assumes that Genesis contains scientific and historic errors; (2) that to be accurate in these would necessarily mean a knowledge in advance of their age which it is assumed is not true; (3) that the writer has used the beliefs of his time on the origin of the world and of mankind. Not only are these assumptions baseless, but a fair and honest use and application of Genesis show the reverse to be true. No mistakes of Moses have been proved, his writings show a decided advance of the idolatrous peoples of his age, and it cannot be shown that Moses used the beliefs of his time on the origin of the world and of mankind.

**Bible and True Science Not in Conflict.** By no process of research or reason could man find out for himself the facts of the first chapter of Genesis. Science is limited, in its investigations, to the realm of things as they are and to their relations. It cannot go back to the beginning and determine how matter and energy came to exist nor how or when they may cease to exist. It cannot reason about the first cause, nor about duration or space. It is axiomatic that the finite cannot comprehend the infinite. "In the wisdom of God the world through its wisdom knew not God" (1 Cor. 1:21). All we know about such subjects comes from divine revelation.

"In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth." Science has only to do with the universe as a great machine in "going order." Science has no means of knowing apart from revelation that the creation was effected in six periods called days in the Bible. It was no part of the divine purpose to define these periods according to astronomical law. Indeed the record tells us that the great ruler of the day was not created till the fourth day, or division or unit of time. The Bible reveals to us that the heaven and the earth were not self-existent from all eternity, but that God created them. Against this fact science can offer no proof. Whether the six days of creation were literal days of twenty-four hours each (no sun measured the first three) or ages matters not, for "in the beginning" may have covered millions of years, according to our manner of thinking or conceiving of time.

The record in Genesis is in most remarkable harmony with the established facts of science. In each there was a genesis, a chaos that was succeeded by order, a creation that proceeded by progressive development from the lower to the higher. Is the first chapter of Genesis a mere record of a vague guesswork? A moment's thought convinces one that no tradition can go beyond the time of man's appearance upon the earth, and that the record in the first chapter in Genesis must be a supernatural revelation.

The Bible was not given us for the purpose of teaching astronomy, geology or other branches of physical science. Reference to what may be called scientific phenomena is only incidental in proclaiming the greatest and most important science, the SCIENCE OF HUMAN HAPPINESS AND LIFE ETERNAL, which is not physical but spiritual.

**Ptolemaic Astronomy.** Infidelity assumes that the Hebrews of the Old Testament held the Ptolemaic system of astronomy, that the earth is the center of the universe, and that the earth is surrounded by crystalline shells in which the heavenly bodies are fixed. On account of the spherical and convex form of the "vault of heaven" the deduction is made that there could be no "waters above the firmament without a second shell to hold them."

This assumption is a slander against the intelligence of the inspired writers of the Old Testament. The word firmament in the scriptures does not represent a solid, but the atmosphere and ether, or, as given in the margin of the American Revised Version at Gen. 1:6f, "expanse," which "divided the waters which were under the

firmament" or expanse (oceans, seas, rivers, etc.), "from the waters which were above the firmament" or expanse (the clouds which are made up of water vapor). "Let birds fly above the earth in the open firmament of heaven" (Gen. 1:20) (margin American Revised Version, "on the face of the expanse of the heavens"). No language of Moses' time was capable of expressing more accurately the truth now universally accepted on this subject. Had Moses "used the beliefs of his time on the origin of the world" he would never have used this language which is nowhere else found in ancient literature, though Moses was acquainted with the science and learning of the Egyptians. Numerous are the passages supporting this view, while not one can be shown indicating that the firmament was a solid crystalline shell of the ancient Greeks.

For he draweth up the drops of water,  
Which distil in rain from his vapor,  
Which the skies pour down  
And drop upon man abundantly (Job 36:27, 28).

Who causeth the vapors to ascend from the ends of the earth;  
Who maketh lightnings for the rain;  
Who bringeth forth the wind out of his treasures (Psalm 135:7).

All the rivers run into the sea, yet the sea is not full; unto the place whither the rivers go, thither they go again (Eccles. 1:7).

He that calleth for the waters of the sea, and poureth them out upon the face of the earth (Amos 9:6).

These quotations are not all that bear on this subject, but they are sufficient to show most conclusively the Hebrew conception of the clouds as the only reservoir in the heavens and that they are formed by evaporation. It is grievous perversion to assume that the metaphorical expression "windows of heaven" of Isaiah and Malachi conveys the idea of actual spillways of a solid celestial reservoir.

**The Solar System.** A number of scriptures indicate the Hebrew conception of the earth's shape:

It is he (God) that sitteth above the circle of the earth, and the inhabitants thereof are as grasshoppers; that stretcheth out the heavens as a curtain, and spreadeth them out as a tent to dwell in (Isa. 40:22). He stretcheth out the north over empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing (Job 26:7). His (the sun's) going forth is from the end of the heavens, and his circuit unto the ends of it; and there is nothing hid from the heat thereof (Psalm 19:6).

In these passages we have the "*circle of the earth*"; that it was "*hung upon nothing*"; that the sun has a "*circuit*" and could rise and

set as we express the idea today, or apparently make a complete circuit around the earth "from the end of the heaven" . . . "unto the ends of it." Here we have the earth's sphericity, its suspension in space, and its rotation upon its axis.

Critics make much ado about the expressions of the rising and setting of the sun, as though the writers thought the sun actually makes a daily circuit around the earth. Why this should be so of them and not of us when we all use this accommodated expression is not clear.

**Form of the Earth.** It is freely admitted that the Bible speaks of the "four winds of the earth" and the "four corners of the earth." But it nowhere intimates that the earth is either flat or square. With a modernist it is good form and good English to speak of the "rising" and "setting" of the sun and of the "four corners of the earth," but for a writer of the Hebrew scriptures to use the same expression is unpardonable ignorance of what is now known to be true, and the modernist brands the inspired writer as not only ignorant, but as teaching that which is false.

**Astronomical Terms.** The Hebrew names for Arcturus, Orion, Pleiades, and some other astronomical terms are peculiar to the Hebrews, and have never been found in Babylonian or Assyrian literature as referring to constellations. But these terms were used by Job, Isaiah, and Amos long before the Babylonian exile, and were, therefore, not borrowed from Babylon (see Maunder).<sup>1</sup>

The Jewish calendar with its day of twenty-four hours and its sacred year of thirteen lunar months and secular year of twelve months, the former being counted in seven years of every nineteen years, was well established among the Hebrews, while the Babylonian calendar was quite different. The system adopted by the Hebrews is called the Metonic cycle, and it brings the average year to a level of practical accuracy. We have no writings of the ancient Hebrews other than the books of the Old Testament,<sup>2</sup> and in them there is no setting forth of any mechanical explanation of the movements of the heavenly bodies. Nor should one expect such, in view of the fact that the purpose of the Holy Scriptures was not to work out the

<sup>1</sup> E. W. Maunder: "Astronomy of the Bible" (fourth edition), pp. 233, 242.

<sup>2</sup> Recent press reports give account of the discovery at Ras Shamra in Phoenicia on the Mediterranean coast of clay tablets inscribed with cuneiform alphabetical characters, representing Hebrew of about the time of Joshua, one of which is said to contain a record of conflict between the king of Zidon and the tribes of Zebulun and Ashur. But it does not appear that these records are from Israelitish sources. This discovery, however, may prove to be of great value, when it shall have been fully deciphered, not only in ancient Hebrew history, but also in studying the ancient Hebrew language.

relation of thing to thing—the field of scientific research—but to reveal God to man. The lesson of value, therefore, which should be drawn from observations of natural phenomena is that Jehovah is faithful to his promises for mankind. Said he:

If my covenant of day and night stand not, if I have not appointed the ordinances of heaven and earth; then will I also cast away the seed of Jacob, and of David my servant (Jer. 33:25f).

Eclipses, meteors, and comets must have been known to the ancient Hebrews, but, like other astronomical phenomena, were not mentioned in the Bible. This was no part of the divine purpose, but when the Bible does make a statement in the field of science, you may rely upon it as accurate and in agreement with true science. Two of Jupiter's nine moons have a retrograde motion—that is, opposite to that of the others, but the Bible says nothing about this, and it is a puzzle to science.

Infidelity has often made the proud boast that scholars of reputation reject the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch, or that men of science do not believe the Bible to be the inspired word of God. The following quotations are from the "Conflict of the Ages," by Arno Clemens Gaebelein:<sup>3</sup>

Louis Agassiz, the great scientist, started out as an atheist. After progressing in his scientific research, he became deeply convinced that his atheism was a miserable, a lying invention. The study of nature led him to nature's God and he became a believer and an earnest worshiper.

Copernicus, the founder of the great system which made his name immortal, was a godly man. He requested to have put on his tombstone the words: "That which thou hast granted the dying thief is all I ask."

Sir Isaac Newton, whose discoveries still are unsurpassed, in spite of the claims of a certain infidel, was a diligent student of the Bible and a firm believer in its infallible truths.

William Herschel, another great astronomer, said: "The wider the field of science extends, the more numerous and indisputable become the proofs of the eternal existence of a creative and almighty wisdom."

To these we may add the names of Kepler, Linneaus, Leibnitz, Kiebig, Maedler, Professor R. A. Millikan, and many others. In fact, the most outstanding men of letters and science in the world are to be found in this class, while those opposed to the Bible are guilty of the most glaring errors and of relying on hypotheses and conjectural Philosophy.

---

<sup>3</sup> Gaebelein: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 7, 14.

*Section II—ASTROLOGY*

**Not Science—Not Recognized in the Bible.** Astrology is not the foundation of the Bible as some presumptuous persons assert. It is not the foundation of astronomy: it is not science. Astrology is a system of pretended fortune telling by means of certain aspects of the stars. It is based on fraud, superstition, and ignorance.

It is inevitably linked with heathenism, and both shut up spirit and mind against the knowledge of God himself, which is religion; and against his works, which is science. And though a man may be religious without being scientific, or scientific without being religious, religion and science alike both rest on one and the same basis—the belief in one God, maker of heaven and earth (Maunder).<sup>4</sup>

Nowhere does the Bible recognize or give credit to astrology, but it is specifically challenged and condemned along with all forms of superstition.

There shall not be found with thee . . . one that useth divination, one that practiseth augury, or an enchanter, or a sorcerer, or a charmer, or a con-suiter with a familiar spirit, or a wizard, or a necromancer (Deut. 18:10).

In denouncing Babylon for her wickedness and cruelty, the prophet Isaiah (47:13) says: "Let now the astrologers, the star-gazers, the monthly prognosticators, stand up, and save thee from the things that shall come upon thee." "Learn not the way of the nations, and be not dismayed at the signs of heaven; for the nations are dismayed at them" (Jer. 10:2). The penalty for violation of this law was death.

We often boast of our advanced civilization and learning, yet in this scientific age and enlightened community astrology has a strong hold upon many, as is evidenced by the distribution of thousands of astrological almanacs and treatises on astrology. Radio programs are freely given by astrologists, and multitudes of listeners eagerly seek to learn if they were born under a "lucky star."

**Ancient Superstition.** Astrology is one of the most ancient forms of superstition, and was prevalent among the Egyptians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, Hindus, and Chinese.<sup>5</sup> The Jews are said to have been much addicted to astrology after the captivity, but they had been favored with ample opportunity to know how the astrologers had failed to meet the demands upon them under both Nebuchadrezzar and Belshazzar, and how Daniel had interpreted the dreams of these monarchs after the failure of the astrologers, the Chaldeans, and soothsayers. In Dan. 5:15 it is specifically stated that the astrologers

---

<sup>4</sup> Maunder: *Op. Cit.*, p. 146.

<sup>5</sup> E. A. Wallace Budge: "Babylonian Life and History," pp. 186, 212.



could not make known unto Belshazzar the interpretation of his dream. These references show that the astrologers were classed along with other magicians and soothsayers, and, like them, they had no such power as they feigned to possess.

While astrology was not the basis of astronomy, it was, to an extent, responsible for the development of that science, for the practice in ancient times of gazing at the stars to determine some mysterious meaning from them resulted in an acquaintance with the heavenly bodies. Astronomy rendered a valuable service under such pioneers as Copernicus and Galileo, who taught the truth about the solar system and the relation of the heavenly bodies to the earth, giving a substantial foundation instead of the superstitions of astrology. This result only confirmed the attitude of the inspired scriptures which condemned the practice of astrology on all occasions.

### *Section III—MIRACLES*

**Modernists Deny the Supernatural.** "All the acknowledged leaders of the movement [destructive criticism] have, without exception, scouted the reality of miracles and prophecy and immediate divine revelation in their genuine and evangelical sense" (quoted by Professor J. W. McGarvey in "Authorship of Deuteronomy" from W. H. Green). While this is true, there are those who are not acknowledged leaders who formally deny this charge. Yet even in the writings of this class there is usually betrayal of a lack of faith in the supernatural. Modernists reject miracles upon the allegation that they are impossible and that they cannot believe the impossible. Yet they ask the world to believe that they have the discerning and perceptive power to resolve the alleged composite scriptures into their supposed original elements and apply their analysis to books, sections, paragraphs, sentences, clauses, and phrases with the assurance that the results are scientifically correct. It is obvious that no recorded miracle of the Bible involves more of the supernatural than does this bold assumption of the critics. The damaging fallacy of the higher critical schools is that they proceed on the hypothesis that in the record of a supernatural revelation nothing supernatural can happen. Such an assumption in itself devitalizes the very foundation of higher criticism.

Higher criticism claims to supply the antidote for all miracles of the Bible. Miracles are discarded by the claim that the account of them was not written till centuries after the supposed events, when

legends had supplanted actual history, or else the account is an interpolation; prophecy is claimed to have been written after its fulfillment, or possibly the prophecy was a good guess that came to pass by accident. When the scriptures are thus robbed of all that is worth while their destruction is complete.

**The Greatest Miracle.** According to modernists, one of the most wonderful miracles of all ages was performed by the redactor, who is represented as patching together myths, legends, and stories of folklore included in the sources in such manner as to produce a wonderful degree of harmony and unity. If the redactor did all this he must have been divine, or divinely inspired, for nothing short of divinity could have produced such wonderful results in:

1. Historical facts fully confirmed by external evidence;
2. Giving a uniform moral code infinitely superior to any other;
3. Presenting a fixed purpose—the greatest good and eternal salvation to all who will accept the blessings offered—which purpose is manifest at every stage of revelation;
4. Maintaining a uniform worship of the one true God while surrounded on all sides and at all times by polytheistic idolatry;
5. Giving a law which runs counter to human nature and imposes restraints and self-control for man's good, but which would never have been enacted by men not supernaturally endowed;
6. The marvelous fulfillment of many prophecies concerning the promised Messiah and of the nature and purpose of his mission in the world;
7. Prophecies couched in language not understood by the prophets themselves which have been fulfilled in the most minute details and completely understood after fulfillment (see Isa. 53; 2 Pet. 1:20f).

Even the most radical critic must recognize that such work as the foregoing would constitute a miracle equal to any recorded in the Bible.

**Purpose of Miracles.** The miracles of the Bible were not given to display power, or cunning, or sleight of hand. They were given for a definite and specific purpose, an important purpose, indeed a necessary one. That purpose is expressed by the apostle John (20:30f): "Many other signs therefore did Jesus in the presence of the disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God; and that believing ye may have life in his name." In Heb. 2:4 we find "God

also bearing witness with them, both by signs and wonders, and by manifold powers, and by gifts of the Holy Spirit."

**Universal Experience and Knowledge.** Modernism claims that no statement of a supposed event can be accepted if it contradicts universal experience, that it is more probable that the statement is false or the witnesses mistaken. To pronounce an event incredible because it appears to contradict the laws of nature is to assume knowledge of all laws of nature, which is absurd; to do so because it seems to contradict the testimony of all men is to assume a knowledge of all testimony, which is impossible; and to do so because it is contrary to one's own experience and observation is to assume such experience and observation is supreme and to discount the experience and observation of others at all times and in all places, and this is extreme folly. If we believe the testimony of another because his experience and our own exactly tally, can we conclude from this that our own experience is the standard of all truth? No one can believe that. For one to base objection to a miracle on the ground that it is contrary to all experience is to assume universal experience—by all men, at all times, and in all places.

**Based on Supernatural Facts.** The working of miracles by the Master cannot be questioned apart from attributing a wholesale untrustworthiness, resting either upon a wilful or a superstitious misrepresentation, to the evangelists. Such a supposition will find no support among unbiased judges. The presupposition that miraculous occurrences are incompatible with established laws of nature, and could not possibly have occurred, and must, therefore, of necessity be attributed to illusion and fraud, is a prejudice which has been the cause, either avowedly or tacitly, of a great mass of negative criticism on the subject.

**A Sure Test.** But there is a sure test of the claims of miracles which we find in the Bible alone. God's word has been so fortified and corroborated with evidence, internal and external, that there is no room for doubting its truthfulness. The Bible records many miracles by which God has sealed his truth and his messages with signs and wonders and by manifold powers and gifts of the Holy Spirit, all of which attest the fact that true religion is based on supernatural facts.

**SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER X***Section I—SCIENCE OF THE BIBLE*

Charge that the Bible abounds with erroneous teaching on geology and astronomy.

Quotation from Anglican commentary—abounds with errors. Specified.

Bible and true science not in conflict. The field of science. Its limitations cited.

Genesis is in most remarkable harmony with the established facts of science. Some of these specified.

The purpose of Revelation. The science of human happiness.

Ptolemaic astronomy, not the teaching of the Bible as charged.

Firmament explained. Quotations from Job, Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Amos.

The solar system and the earth's shape. Quotations from Isaiah, Job, Psalms.

The four winds of the earth and the four corners of the earth.

Astronomical terms, not Babylonian or Assyrian, therefore not borrowed. Arcturus, Orion, Pleiades used by Job, Isaiah, and Amos long before the Babylonian exile.

The Jewish calendar. Sacred year of thirteen lunar months, and secular year of twelve months, the former counted in seven years of every nineteen years. Practical accuracy.

The purpose of inspired revelation was not the field of scientific research, but a higher and nobler purpose of benefiting man.

*Section II—ASTROLOGY*

Not science—not recognized in the Bible. Not the foundation of astronomy. But is magic, a system of pretended fortune telling by means of the aspect of the stars. Based on fraud, superstition, and ignorance.

Quotation from Maunder.

Astrology is always condemned along with other forms of superstition. Scripture quotations showing this.

Astrology has strong hold upon many even now.

An ancient superstition among Egyptians, Chaldeans, Babylonians, etc.

*Section III—MIRACLES*

Modernists deny the supernatural.

Usual ground for objecting to miracles is that they are impossible.

Their claims for the Documentary Hypothesis in resolving the alleged composite scriptures into their supposed original elements involves more of the supernatural than does any recorded miracle of the Bible. It is not only impossible, but absurd.

Miracles are discarded by the critics on the claim that the account of them was not written till centuries afterwards when legends had supplanted history; prophecy is claimed to have been written after its fulfillment, or a good guess that came to pass by accident. In this way they rob the scriptures of all that is worth while.

The greatest miracle claimed in all ages is to be found in the activities of the redactor, if their claims for him are true. The patching together of myths,

legends, folklore of the so-called sources in such manner as to produce a wonderful degree of harmony and unity throughout the Bible would require nothing short of divinity or divine inspiration. The results enumerated under seven classifications.

Purpose of miracles.

Universal experience and knowledge.

Based on supernatural facts.

A sure test. What is it?

## CHAPTER XI

### FRUITS OF MODERNISM

#### *Section I—FALSE PHILOSOPHY AND IMMORALITY*

**Kantianism.** "By general consent, the main philosophic basis of modernism is the Kantian doctrine of immanence or the relativity of human knowledge."<sup>1</sup> Modernists have, to a large extent, accepted the philosophy of Immanuel Kant, a noted philosopher of the eighteenth century, who taught that the human mind cannot know things-in-themselves; that it is not capable of knowing anything about nature and God and moral law. He explains that we can only know "subjectively" and not "objectively," i. e., that the human mind can only "know its own thoughts and subjective categories of thinking."<sup>2</sup> According to Kant, objective knowledge is impossible. Subjective knowledge is the knowledge of one's own thoughts, his own desires, ambitions, and purposes. To illustrate, "I know that I exist, that I think and have certain ambitions," etc., but I cannot know that others think, or know, or have ambitions. Kant admits that we may know that objects exist, but teaches that *we cannot know anything more about them*. It would rather seem impossible to know even the mere existence of a thing without knowing something about it. If Kant's claims are true that human knowledge, at its best, is phenomenal, symbolic, provisional, and mutable,<sup>3</sup> that it is relative and not absolute as claimed by Kantianism, it naturally follows that Christianity has no firm foundation on which to stand.

**Denial of Human Knowledge.** This philosophy has gone to the extreme of assuming and asserting that "we do not know anything" absolutely. But in this assertion there is a contradiction, for the assertion "we do not know" implies the affirmation that we do know what we are saying. Again if we assert that we do not know anything, we may be asked, "How do you know that?" The logical answer would be, "*I do not know even that I do not know anything.*" It may be said in reply, "You said you did." Or, accepting the answer, we ask again, "How do you know that you do not know that you know you do not know?" and so on *ad infinitum et ad absurdum*. There seems to be only one thing that this class of scientists can be positive about and assert that they do know and that one thing is,

---

<sup>1</sup> Chas. Harris: "Creeds or No Creeds" (1927), p. xiii.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 61, 62.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

"We do not know anything." Yet this is science according to modernism.<sup>4</sup>

**Evil Results of the Doctrine.** The modernist theory of knowledge, or rather, the lack of it, destroys any dependable system of morality. If all human knowledge is relative, symbolic, provisional, mutable, this idea extends also to the moral law, the result being that there is no certainty even in ethics. The theory, whether intentional or not, is antagonistic to morality, religion, and all things worth while. The doctrine repudiates knowledge and reason by a process of reason (?). If reason cannot be depended upon as the advocates of the theory claim, we fail to see how reason can be employed to detect its own weakness and point out its faults.<sup>5</sup> No conclusion is safe when it is reached through unreliable sources, or supported only by untrustworthy evidence.

### *Section II—APOTHEOSIS*

**Adoption or Election.** Modernism is manifested in many forms and different degrees. One form deals with the nature and character of Jesus and his divinity. One authority is quoted as referring to the "divinity of man" and another as saying, "The error (of orthodoxy) does not spring from maintaining the divinity of Jesus, but from denying the divinity of man."<sup>6</sup> One view holds that man is at present only potentially divine, not actually. "Human nature, though very nearly, is not yet quite God. It is, however, capable of becoming so in the future"<sup>7</sup> and that in this world. The theory is that, when human nature shall have developed in harmony with its possibilities and probabilities, man will pass through the state of "superman" and on into divinity, and that in the same sense and to the same degree that Jesus is divine.

This doctrine is called by its advocates "Adoption" or "Election," but in reality it is the ancient pagan doctrine of apotheosis, or deification, declaring one as god. The ancient Egyptians and Romans professed to have conferred deity upon their kings and emperors. The honors paid to the Chinese philosopher Confucius afford an example of pure apotheosis. All over the world sorcerers, chiefs, kings, and conquerors have applied to themselves this logical consequence of animism. It is the instrument of monarchy and the foundation of

---

<sup>4</sup> Harris: *Op. Cit.*, p. 62.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>6</sup> Harris: *Op. Cit.*, p. 334,

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 335.

the notion of the divine right of kings. When Herod the king made an oration on one occasion "the people shouted, saying, The voice of a god, and not of a man" (Acts 12:21, 22). Thus it will be seen that modernists are not very modern after all, for some of them do not hesitate to choose this heathen doctrine instead of God's word.

It is not charged that all modernists hold the doctrine of apotheosis, but that some do will be clearly seen from the following quotations from Dr. Chas. Harris, in "Creeds or No Creeds." On page 319 he refers to the Girton conference or the Cambridge conference, held at Cambridge, England, and reported in "Modern Churchman" for September, 1921. At this conference several papers were read by modernists setting forth adoption (apotheosis), from which Dr. Harris quotes on page 318 as follows:

Professor Bethune-Baker said quite openly at the Cambridge conference: "We must absolutely jettison the traditional doctrine that his (Christ's) personality was not human, but divine. To our modern categories of thought such a statement is a denial of the doctrine of the incarnation. ... I can make no use of the traditional beliefs in either his miraculous birth or his personal preexistence. ... I do not for a moment suppose that Jesus ever thought of himself as God. Jesus was *anthropos teleios*, the actualized ideal of man, man at the end of his evolution."

On page 326 Dr. Harris refers to a paper read at the conference by Canon Barnes and says:

Before we can venture to claim Canon Barnes as even in principle a supporter of the orthodox theory of a Divine Incarnation as distinct from and opposed to the heterodox theories of immanence, pantheistic identity, and apotheosis, which dominated the conference, we have first to assure ourselves of two points.

One of these involved Barnes' view that Jesus was identical with the Holy Spirit.

On page 361 he quotes Dr. Lake (from "Landmarks of Early Christianity," p. 131):

Adoptionism (i. e., apotheosis) seems to me to have no part or lot in any intelligent modern theology, though it is unfortunately often promulgated, especially in the pulpits which are regarded as liberal. We cannot believe that at any time a human being, in consequence of his virtue, became God, which he was not before, or that any human being will ever do so. No doctrine of Christology, and no doctrine of salvation which is adoptionist in essence, can come to terms with modern thought.<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>8</sup> Dr. Foakes-Jackson and Dr. Lake [the latter of Harvard Theological School], who until recently were prominent in the modernist movement, have now abandoned it and have passed upon it strictures similar to my own but much more severe.—Chas. Harris, in "Creeds or No Creeds," p. 359.



Another paper read at this conference was by Canon Glazebrook. Dr. Harris on page 320 says:

Glazebrook "is quite clear that the original Christology of the church was 'adoptionist,' and that its source was (in no inconsiderable measure) the heathen doctrine of apotheosis. 'The ancient Greeks and Romans,' he declares, 'paid homage to many heroes or demigods, who, by their virtues or their services to humanity, had obtained seats among the gods of Olympus. . . . Can we be surprised if the early Christians, although they were Jews by race and education, were disposed ... to follow the line which was suggested by Greek story?'"

But we do not have to go to England or Germany to find a revival of this ancient doctrine, for it is seen in a quotation from a noted American leader in religious thought who says:

We are wrong when we make belief in the divinity of Jesus a technical, philosophical affair. The men of the New Testament were not primarily philosophers, metaphysicians, theologians. They were primarily men of profound religious life endeavoring to get their vital experiences conveyed to others in such terms as were at hand. I believe that they would have agreed with George Eliot's Adam Bede: "I look at it as if the doctrine was like finding names for your feelings." The doctrine of the divinity of Jesus was thus the expression in current terms of the central experience of the Christian life— finding God in Christ. The divinity of Jesus is not something first of all to be treated as a formula; it is something first of all to be vitally discovered, experienced, and lived upon. . . .

In many minds this experimental approach to the divinity of the Master is impeded and embarrassed by the complicated theological developments which have taken place between the New Testament and our own day. . . . That chasm between deity and man the idea of the Logos had once bridged. But still the chasm was there and in many Christian minds had its disastrous effect upon the interpretation of Jesus. So far off was God from man that it was easier to think that Jesus was some superior angel, some demigod from heaven, than to suppose that in him men could find the very being and equality of God himself; or, on the other side, if he were the influx of God himself, then he could not have been real man, but only a phantom in appearance like a man. . . . When, therefore, Athanasius against Arius struggled for the Nicene theology, with "very God of very God" incarnate in Christ, he was endeavoring to bridge a chasm that to many seemed unbridgeable. With us, however, the most prevalent and characteristic way of thinking we have had since the middle of the nineteenth century involves the immanence of God and his immediate presence in our lives and in his world. ... In our theology no longer are the divine and human like oil and water that cannot mix; rather all the best in us is God in us (Harry Emerson Fosdick, "Modern Use of the Bible," PP. 261ff).

This seems to be in harmony with the general purpose of modernism to debase and destroy our standards of religious authority and

the superior personality of Jesus Christ, bringing him down to the lowly status of a mere man, and at the same time exalting man to the same nature and character of Jesus.

*Section III—FREUDISM*

**Results of Unbelief in the Bible.** When men repudiate faith, as all schools of infidelity do; when they are persuaded that there is no truth, no proof, no absolute knowledge, as most modernists claim; when they reject the Bible with its code of morality as the inspired word of God, they have nothing left to guide and direct them aright; they are at sea without chart or compass. They are then ready to throw off all restraints and give free reign to all the selfish passions to which human beings are heir. Having no hell to fear nor heaven to gain, there is left only the deterrent forces furnished by the laws of the land, and these are so imperfectly administered that the criminal is tempted to take a chance of escaping the penalties of the law. The prevailing unbelief in the Bible and the Christian religion is the direct cause of the crime wave which has swept over the world in modern times. Especially is this true in America where modernism flourishes to an alarming extent.

Modernism is based on psychology, i. e., upon subjective feeling. Psychological theology deals not with God, but with man's religious feelings and sentiments. So also psychological ethics deal not with an objective morality, but with man's own feelings and sentiments. This is fundamental with modernism.

**A Most Revolting Doctrine.** Kantianism is not the only false philosophy adopted by modernists. Many of them, not all to be sure, have espoused the doctrine of Professor Sigmund Freud, an Austrian Jew and a physician, who mixed bad medicine with bad philosophy and worse psychology and produced the most perverse *compound of unwisdom* ever discovered by any of their leaders. While other systems of psychology have made mistakes, yet their conclusions are based on normal adult minds. Not so with Freud, for he "draws sweeping conclusions" from pathological cases of sexual abnormality and even perversion and applies these without discrimination to the normal subject. With Freud sex feeling is the dominant factor in human activity even in its most repulsive forms. He claims this is true even in the youngest infants and that practically all human activity is derived from sex feeling and may be traced to it.<sup>9</sup> His desig-

---

<sup>9</sup>Harris: *Op. Cit.*, p. 351.

nation for this item of his doctrine is the "Oedipus complex," which in plain terms is sexual love between mother and son, father and daughter, which he claims is the birthright of every infant, though he claims this inheritance is dropped with advancing age, just as a snake sheds its skin in spring. The name he has chosen for his new discovery is "psychoanalysis" which disgraces the name Freud into a gigantic *fraud*.

Freudism is directly opposed to chastity and virtue and is hostile to the Bible doctrine of temperance and self-control, especially as regards sexual passions, which it is claimed should be given free reins and unrestricted license. He even teaches, contrary to practically all other medical authorities, that the suppression of sexual passion results in nervousness and abnormal mental disorder and insanity. This comes very near to being the absurd doctrine of *-venereal therapeutics* for the prevention and cure of mental disorders. Its more ardent adherents regard the most debasing and unnatural abuses of the sexual passion with approval instead of censure. "They prefer to teach young men how to commit fornication with impunity" instead of keeping themselves pure.<sup>10</sup>

The pathological cases in the armies of the world war put his theories to empirical tests, and brought his disciples to the recognition that sex was not the controlling factor. Since 1914, he has relied chiefly on direct intuitions afforded by psychological situations. The absurdity and fallacy of this doctrine is quite apparent if we apply the same principle to other human passions, as hatred, vengeance, greed, jealousy, or pride and vanity. We should be masters of our passions rather than slaves to them. Overindulgence continues to enslave its victims with ever-increasing power and tenacity.

Free Love and Disregard for the Marriage Relation follow in the wake of modernism in its worst form. When the Bible is rejected with its high standard of morality and Freudism is adopted in its stead, we have a product that knows no limit to indulgence of the wildest passions and has no scruples against committing the foulest crimes—a condition, which, if not checked by moral teaching of the Bible and by ordered society in the form of law, would be a disgrace to even respectable heathenism. Such are the works of the flesh and of modernism, the result of discrediting the Bible and destroying its influence. The result of such effort (if it could ever succeed in its purpose) would be to destroy not only true religion,

---

<sup>10</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 352.

but civilization as well, and to reduce the status of man to that of the beast whose only ambition is to gratify the physical passions and appetites.

While Freud was a physician and a psychologist and wrote on these subjects, his theory of "psychoanalysis" has not been adopted to any extent among medical men or among authorities on psychology. But Freudism has been accepted in some circles of modernism, according to good authority, and it has been said of him that he is "the most influential thinker of our time, next to Einstein." "Philosophers— of a sort—have appropriated Freudian ideas, but Freud himself is no philosopher. Nevertheless he is the vogue, and hence he has influence. Novelists and dramatists, with even greater impetuosity than philosophers or moralists, have seized upon Freudism and have made it popular"<sup>11</sup> ("Catholic World," November, 1930).

#### *Section IV—A NEMESIS OF HIGHER CRITICISM*

**A Merited Retribution.** In all the affairs of men which have for their purpose the breaking down and destroying of those things which are held dear, and vital, and necessary, there comes, sooner or later, a retributive justice. Sincere believers that the Bible is the revealed will of God to men have waited patiently for the time when the fallacies of those who analyze, dissect, reject, and reconstruct the Bible should be exposed, and that, simply by applying the critical methods to other writings. Such has come to pass.

Miss Florence Deeks worked three years to write "The Web," which is the story of woman's contribution to world achievement. Her manuscript was submitted to a publishing house in Toronto who kept it for about eight months. During the time the publishing house had possession of Miss Deeks' manuscript, Mr. H. G. Wells was writing "The Outline of History" which was published by the same company.

When Miss Deeks read "The Outline," she became convinced that Mr. Wells had appropriated many parts of her work, and included them in his book. On the advice of eminent counsel, she brought suit for damage against Mr. Wells and his publisher. The defendants denied the charge of plagiarism, and declared that "The Web" or any portion of it had never been in the possession of Mr. Wells, nor had it been out of the custody of the Canadian house to whom it was

---

<sup>11</sup> Sigmund Freud visited America in 1909 and received the honorary degree of LL.D. from Clark University.

submitted, nor had Mr. Wells been in Canada during the six or eight months the publishing house had possession of Miss Decks' manuscript. Miss Decks could not muster any evidence to offset the denial. So, how was she to prove that her unpublished manuscript had been plagiarized? Then, some one advised her to seek the aid of a scholar who applied historico-literary methods to the analysis of the Bible. Accordingly she consulted the Rev. W. A. Irwin, M.A., B.D., Ph.D., professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature at the University of Chicago. A quotation from Professor Irwin's signed statement filed as a part of plaintiff's case follows:

Miss Decks called upon me, and told me the story of her manuscript and her belief that Mr. H. G. Wells had used it in writing his "Outline of History," and asked me to undertake a study of the two works for evidence bearing upon the contention. I consented, in considerable measure because this is the sort of task with which my study of ancient literature repeatedly confronts me, and I was interested to test out in modern works the methods commonly applied to those of the ancient world.

**Modern Methods Applied.** Professor Irwin applied to the two writings the historico-literary methods by which the critics have reached certain "assured results." He read, selected, compiled, weighed carefully, so that when the time should come for the plaintiff to establish before the court by satisfactory evidence the charge of plagiarism, all things should be ready.

The time for pleading before the court came, and Professor Irwin, Ph.D., swore that by his analysis and comparisons, and by the application of the rules of Biblical criticism, it is established beyond a doubt that: ". . . the author of 'The Outline' had access to the manuscript of 'The Web'; it was at hand as he wrote; was constantly available, and referred to repeatedly; and was palpably a disguised copying of it." The professor was permitted to file with the court a sixty-page tabulation of the results of his research, and the reasons therefor. The court dismissed the case and the following is reported in the Ontario Law Reports, 1931, page 828, as the words of the trial judge:

But the extracts I have quoted and the other scores of pages of Professor Irwin's memorandum, are *just solemn nonsense*. His comparisons are *without significance*, and his argument and conclusions are *alike puerile*. Like Gratiano, Professor Irwin spoke "*an infinite deal of nothing*." His reasons are *not even "two grains of wheat hidden in two bushels of chaff"*! They are not reasons at all (italics by authors).

The plaintiff appealed to the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Ontario whose four judges all agreed in dismissing the appeal. One of them wrote a fourteen-page judgment, in which is recorded at page 840, Law Reports, "I have no hesitation in agreeing with the trial judge in the *utter worthlessness of this kind of evidence—it is almost an insult to common sense.*" Also, "I am wholly in accord with the view of the trial judge *as to the weight to be given to this evidence in this case*" (italics by authors).

**The Test a Complete Failure.** Then Miss Decks appealed to the Lords of the Privy Council, the court of last resort in the British Empire. The appeal was dismissed by the unanimous judgment of the court.

The plaintiff's case rested entirely upon the value of the testimony given by Professor Irwin. Miss Decks had not one iota of evidence that Mr. Wells had even had the possibility of access to the manuscript of "The Web." In concluding the written judgment, the trial judge said:

"The defendants were not, I think, called upon to offer any evidence to rebut Professor Irwin's *fantastic hypotheses*" (italics by authors). This means that the "assured results" of Professor Irwin's comparisons and investigations of the two works, made in the approved historico-literary method, was no proof at all, and could not be the basis upon which the court could find a judgment.

This finding stands approved by the Appellate Division of the Supreme Court of Ontario, and affirmed unanimously by the court of last resort in the British Empire. The evidence arrived at by the methods of the historico-literary critic was insufficient to warrant the awarding of any damage to the plaintiff or to impose the cost of the proceedings upon the defendants.

Then, does it even have the semblance of fairness and Tightness that any person whatsoever who has the ability of a tyro to evaluate evidence should accept evidence, identical in quality and method, as sufficient upon which to base a rejection, or even a doubt as to the trustworthiness and integrity of any portion of the divine word— the Bible? What becomes of the "assured results" of this modern historico-literary hypothesis? It has fallen down all along the lines of its investigation, and now has been adjudged by learned and distinguished jurists as "hard to understand how any one, party or witness, could imagine that any court could accept or be influenced by it."

[Adapted from an article by H. E. Irwin, K. C., published in "The Sunday School Times," January 21, 1933.]

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER XI

#### *Section I—FALSE PHILOSOPHY AND IMMORALITY*

Kantianism. Doctrine of immanence or the relativity of human knowledge.

Can know things subjectively, not objectively; that is, that the human mind can only know its own thoughts and subjective categories of thinking.

That we do not know anything absolutely.

Evil results of the doctrine.

Repudiates knowledge and reason by a process of reason. If reason cannot be depended upon, no conclusion is safe when obtained through unreliable sources.

#### *Section II—APOTHEOSIS*

Adoption or election. The "divinity of man." "Superman." The doctrine, while called "adoption" or "election," is in reality the ancient

pagan doctrine of apotheosis or deification, declaring one to be God.

Ancient Egyptians and Romans professed to have conferred deity upon their kings and emperors. Confucius. Divine right of kings. Herod.

The Girton conference. Quotation from Dr. Chas. Harris. On Bethune-Baker. Another on Canon Barnes. One on Dr. Lake and still another on Canon Glazebrook.

Quotation from Harry Emerson Fosdick.

#### *Section III—FREUDISM*

Results of unbelief in the Bible.

Throw off all restraints. A leading cause of crime.

Modernism based on psychology, i. e., upon subjective feelings.

Psychological theology deals not with God, but with man's religious feelings and sentiments.

A most revolting doctrine. That of Professor Sigmund Freud, an Austrian Jew and physician. His compound. Sex feeling dominant factor in human activity according to Freud.

His "Oedipus complex."

Doctrine directly opposed to chastity and virtue.

Ardent adherents regard the most debasing and unnatural abuses of sexual passion with approval.

Absurdity and fallacy of the doctrine.

Free love and disregard for the marriage relation.

The works of the flesh and modernism, the result of discrediting the Bible and destroying its influence. Effect on society.

#### *Section IV—A NEMESIS OF HIGHER CRITICISM*

Miss Florence Deeks wrote the manuscript for "The Web." Left it with a Canadian publisher whose company in England had the publishing of "The Outline of History," by H. G. Wells.

When the "Outline" appeared Miss Deeks thought Wells had used some of the material in her manuscript and entered suit for plagiarism.

In the absence of any other evidence Miss Deeks sought the help of a modernist, Rev. W. A. Irwin, professor of Old Testament Languages and Literature at the University of Chicago, who applied the historico-literary method used by critics against the Bible.

Verdict of the trial judge, dismissing the case.

Miss Deeks appealed to the next higher court and lost.

Finally the case went to the Lords of the Privy Council, the court of last resort in the British Empire, where the decision affirmed that of the two lower courts. The attempt was declared by the court as "just solemn nonsense."

The critical literary analysis of the Bible merits the same judgment as that given Miss Deeks.



PART II  
EXTERNAL EVIDENCE

## CHAPTER I

### SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

#### *Section I*—ARCHAEOLOGY

**Science of Antiquities.** Our knowledge of the past is obtained chiefly from written history; ethnology, or the science of races of people; comparative philology, or the science of languages; and the science or study of antiquities as derived from exploring the remains of the arts of ancient civilizations. *Archaeology* is from the Greek *archaios*, ancient, and *logos*, word or discourse, hence, means the science or study of antiquities.

Time has been divided into historic and prehistoric, based on known written history. Until recent years there was no recognized authentic history as such prior to that of Herodotus, a Greek historian, who wrote about 400 B.C. Herodotus is called the *Father of History* (but perhaps more properly, father of Greek history), and from his time forward there is no lack of written history. He collated some traditions and used the lists of kings with some fragments of history that reached back some two or three hundred years, but prior to his time the Bible furnished practically all the ancient history in our possession.

Archaeological records are found inscribed on stone monuments and slabs; on walls of buildings and tombs; on clay cylinders, tablets, and bricks; on metal plates, coffins, vases, and various articles of pottery, etc. Records on papyrus were common, but have been preserved only in the dry climate of Egypt.

**Inscriptions Deciphered.** These records are chiefly in cuneiform and various forms of hieroglyphic characters, both of which have been deciphered in recent years. It is announced that scholars have at last deciphered the Hittite inscriptions, which are said to be quite abundant, but so far these have not been translated and published to a great extent.<sup>1</sup>

**Buried Cities.** In ancient times the monarch sought to perpetuate the memory of his name and the principal achievements of his reign by having his name inscribed on bricks used in palaces and other public buildings, and a record of his annals inscribed on mate-

---

<sup>1</sup> The inscriptions of the ancient Incas and other American aborigines have not yet been deciphered, neither have the inscriptions of the Etruscans who inhabited Italy prior to the Romans, though their abundant inscriptions are written in Roman characters. In recent years a vast amount of inscriptions have been found in the islands of the Aegean Sea, none of which have been deciphered.

rials of the most durable character. When a city was destroyed the ancients did not clear off the debris as we do, but built upon it, and it is said that their garbage and waste were thrown into the streets and alleys till they were so elevated the houses would sometimes have to be built higher or the doors cut higher to admit of passage. Thus the history of successive rulers and peoples has been preserved and recent research has brought to light much of the history of prehistoric times.

**Achievements.** Results of archaeological research are immeasurable. Contributions to the historical setting of the children of Israel in the different periods of their history; a new and definite location of events previously assigned to oblivion; more definite knowledge of contemporary peoples and their religions—these have given added interest and vividness to the narrative. The translation of the cuneiform writing has given larger meaning to words of the Old Testament and assures a better understanding and a more expressive and sympathetic meaning of the words penned by the writers of the Old Testament. Immense are the credits, historical, geographical, chronological, ethnographic, and linguistic, for which archaeology comes in for no small share of permanent good. The records of ancient peoples chiseled in stone, stamped in almost imperishable burnt clay, painted in the darkness of tombs or cut on mountain side, bring impartial, unimpeachable, and conclusive proof of the truthfulness of the Old Testament.<sup>2</sup>

The activities of the explorer and the excavator, the pick and the spade, have opened volumes of ancient history which have altered, modified, and refuted many of the alleged results of higher criticism. What has been achieved already, and the promise of greater things in the future, should eliminate the possibility of any one, critic or not, to dogmatize concerning what could or could not have been in any given period of the past.<sup>3</sup>

#### *Section II—ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY*

**First Activities and Pioneers.** Previous to the nineteenth century feeble attempts were made through societies for the study and investigation of antiquities, and a few individuals directed their efforts to travel rather than to the use of the spade, but effective archaeological research had its beginning early in the nineteenth century. Since the

---

<sup>2</sup> Cf. I. M. Price: "The Monuments and the Old Testament" (sixth edition), Chap. xxv.

<sup>3</sup> Ira M. Price: "The Monuments and the Old Testament" (New Rewritten Edition) (1925), p. 21.

epoch-making discovery of the Rosetta Stone in 1799, and especially that of Ashurbanipal's library at Nineveh in 1844, rapid progress has been made in the science of archaeology, and many men have devoted their lives to unearthing the buried and forgotten records of the past, and in deciphering and causing those records to yield their secrets to the world.

Among the pioneers in the field of archaeology, we may mention A. H. Layard, Hormuzd Rassam, and George Smith at Nineveh; M. Botta and Victor Place at Khorsabad; M. Botta and A. H. Layard at Nimrud and other places in Assyria. In Babylonia and Persia, Claudius James Rich, Ker Porter, Wm. K. Loftus, Sir Henry Rawlinson, and later Dr. Robert Koldewey excavated at Babylon and other sites in Babylonia, while the Frenchman, DeSarzec, explored Tello, and extensive excavations were carried on at Nippur (the Biblical Calneh) by J. H. Haynes, Dr. Peters, and H. V. Hilprecht. Later, Dr. E. J. Banks at the lost city of Adab and G. Leonard Wooley at Ur of the Chaldees made many important discoveries.

Some of the leading explorers of Egypt are Augustus Mariette, E. Gardner, F. L. Griffith, Ed Naville, and W. M. Flinders Petrie. Brugsch, Maspero, and many others also have a large part in Egyptian archaeology.

Palestine has likewise been explored by a number of eminent archaeologists, including the pioneers Robinson, Tobler, Wilson, Warren, Kitchener, Palmer, Bliss, and Petrie. In recent years R. A. Stewart Macalister has explored extensively in Palestine.

All of these and many others have contributed much to the resurrection of the civilization of ancient peoples whose countries had been conquered, their cities destroyed, and, to a large extent, their history forgot. Records on stone monuments and slabs; on the walls of buildings and tombs; on clay bricks, tablets, and cylinders; on metal plates, coffins, and on many articles of pottery give a graphic account of the language, literature, learning, institutions, and religion of peoples long forgot except *as* they are incidentally mentioned in the Bible.

**Discoveries Numerous and Varied.** The thought, customs, and life of ancient peoples have been revealed, in large measure, by their architecture, their tools and implements, and their art and sculpture. Vases, dishes, knives, daggers, hatchets, hammers, mirrors, fetters, and various other instruments and utensils, all of copper, were among the discoveries in Babylonia and other places, belonging to the third

pre-Christian millennium. Monoliths, and bas-reliefs of crouching lions, and other wild beasts, including winged bulls and lions with human heads, and gigantic human figures with eagle heads, were found in abundance at Nimrud (Biblical Calah), Khorsabad, and Nineveh. Thirteen pairs of such bulls and lions were found at Nimrud alone by Layard. The palaces of Sargon, Ashurbanipal, and other ancient Assyrian kings at Nineveh were adorned with wall slabs of alabaster, on which were represented in well-executed bas-reliefs scenes of the king in a lion hunt, or the siege of an enemy city, or a fierce battle in which is portrayed the impaling of an enemy or the flaying of some alive, and other forms of torture. Many such scenes were accompanied by a cuneiform record describing the victories thus portrayed.

The museums of the world contain vast quantities of these antiquities taken from the ruins of Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, and other places. The Ottoman government demanded the deposit of many important relics and inscriptions in their museum at Constantinople, where thousands of such records and other antiquities have remained till this day without having been translated or studied. Many records were found in such fragmentary condition they could not be read, and some of the most interesting could only be partially read on account of being so badly broken.

**Valuable Relics Lost.** Many objects discovered by Victor Place at Khorsabad, together with some sixty-eight cases of choice bas-reliefs taken from the palace of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh, including all of the antiquities found by Fresnel at Babylon, intended for the Louvre at Paris, were lost by the sinking of two rafts in the Tigris River, on the way from Baghdad to Basra, near the Persian Gulf.

Notwithstanding these losses of valuable relics and inscriptions and the further fact that archaeologists tell us they have only "scratched the surface" in their work of exploring the ruins of antiquity, yet they have discovered much and have thrown much light on Bible subjects and places whose locations had been lost. Modern research has located scores of places in Palestine otherwise lost sight of, and has identified many places in Egypt mentioned in the Old Testament and otherwise unknown. At Abu-Habba, Mr. Rassam discovered two barrel cylinders of terra cotta inscribed and containing a record of Nabonidus, the last king of Babylon, and a stone symbol "inscribed with archaic characters." These inscriptions not only record the his-

tory of the place, but "establish the identity of the ruin with Sippara of the sun-god and Sepharvaim of the Bible" ("Asshur and the Land of Nimrod," p. 402).

**Ancient Sites Identified.** In Gen. 10:10 Nimrod's kingdom included "Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh in the land of Shinar." Archaeology has definitely identified Babel as Babylon, Erech as the modern Warka, the site of Accad, and Calneh as the modern Nippur, all in the land of Shinar (Sumer), the later Babylonia. The fact that Nimrod went forth into Assyria and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah (the modern Nimrud), and Resin, all fully identified (except possibly Rehoboth-Ir) is fully confirmed by the latest reports of discoveries at Ashur in Assyria telling of the discovery of objects connecting the building of the city with immigrants from Lagash, a city of southern Babylonia. This fact completely upsets the claims of some modern scholars that Assyria is the older and that Babylonia was settled by immigrants from Assyria. Thus it is found in this case, as in all other cases of contact with a Bible subject or place, archaeology confirms the Bible.

### *Section III—THE ROSETTA STONE*

The Key to Egyptian Hieroglyphic Writing. During the war between the French and English in Egypt, in 1799, a French officer named Boussard, while repairing an earthwork in Rosetta, not far from Alexandria, Egypt, discovered a rock, one face of which had been polished and inscribed in three different kinds of writing, Hieroglyphic, Demotic, and Greek. The French perceived at once the value of this trilingual inscription, and, after taking impressions from its face, they packed the stone and placed it on a French vessel to be transported to France. But three days later, and before the ship could sail, the English were victorious, and in the capitulation that ensued it was stipulated that all curiosities should be surrendered to the English. The French tried to avoid the surrender of the stone on the grounds that it was private property, but the English finally secured the stone by sending a devil cart to the ship where the stone was stored, and though the ship was plague-stricken, Mr. Wm. Hamilton, secretary to Lord Elgin, boarded the ship and carried the stone to an English vessel on which it was transported to London and stored in the British museum. The stone is three feet nine inches high, two feet four and one-half inches wide, and eleven inches thick.<sup>4</sup> "It

---

<sup>4</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 15.

is thought to have been at least twelve inches higher, and to have had a rounded top."<sup>5</sup>

The upper portion is inscribed in hieroglyphic characters and fills fourteen lines. The middle inscription is in Demotic, an Egyptian script, which occupies thirty-two lines. The lower portion is in Greek and has fifty-four lines, twenty-eight of them complete, in Greek uncial letters. It is said that the hieroglyphic writing was used by kings and priests, while the Demotic script was used by the common people.

**Trilingual Record.** All three of these inscriptions contain the same subject matter, a statute of the Egyptian priests, decreeing an apotheosis to Ptolemy Epiphanes. It commends his policy and expresses gratitude for the favors granted by the monarch with some other items of current events. Of course, scholars could read the Greek inscription, but the Egyptian hieroglyphic and Demotic writing had been lost for over two thousand years. The deciphering of this inscription was a marvelous feat of scholarship which was accomplished by Francois Champollion, a French scholar, who obtained his clue to the phonetic value of the characters from the name Ptolemy, and other names which could be read in the Greek. This stone is recognized as one of the very greatest archaeological finds in the world, as it has made it possible to decipher the hieroglyphic writing, and thus to unlock the vast storehouse of ancient Egyptian literature which for centuries runs parallel to that of the people of the Old Testament.

The translation and publication of ancient Egyptian inscriptions found on monuments and slabs, on stone walls and buildings, on metal plates and tombs, and on a vast amount of papyrus, have brought to light much of the history of Egypt. As should be expected, this history confirms and corroborates the Bible account at every point of contact, and in no case has it been discredited by scientific investigation.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER I

### *Section I—ARCHAEOLOGY*

Our knowledge of the past. Archaeology defined.  
 Historic and prehistoric time. Herodotus.  
 Archaeological records.  
 Inscriptions deciphered. Hieroglyphic, cuneiform, etc.  
 Hittite inscriptions.

---

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* (sixth edition), p. 39.

Buried cities.  
Achievements.  
Results.

*Section II*—ORIGIN AND DEVELOPMENT OF ARCHAEOLOGY

First activities and pioneers. Some pioneers mentioned.  
Discoveries numerous and varied.  
Museums of the world contain vast quantities of antiquities from Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, etc.  
Valuable relics lost by sinking of rafts on the Tigris River.  
Archaeologists say they have only scratched the surface.  
Ancient sites identified.  
Claims of modernists completely upset.

*Section III*—THE ROSETTA STONE

Key to Egyptian hieroglyphic writing.  
Discovered by Boussard at Rosetta near Alexandria in 1799.  
Trilingual. Three kinds of writing named.  
Contents. Statute of Egyptian priests decreeing an apotheosis upon Ptolemy Epiphanes, commending his policy and favors to them.  
When the English armies were victorious the stone was surrendered by the French to the victorious English and carried to the British museum.  
Deciphered by Francois Champollion, a French scholar.  
Clue to the phonetic value of the characters.  
Served as a key to unlock the mysteries of the hieroglyphic writing which had been lost for some 2,000 years.  
Effect on history of Egypt. Effect on Bible history.



## CHAPTER II

### LIGHT FROM EGYPT

#### *Section I—EGYPT*

**Fulfillment of Prophecy.** The prophecy of Ezekiel (chapter 30) has been literally fulfilled, and all that was the glory of ancient Egypt is gone forever as predicted by the prophet. Their nationality perished when Nebuchadrezzar conquered the land as foretold in this prophecy, the confirmation of which is recorded in the cuneiform annals of this Babylonian king, found in recent years at Babylon. Their civilization, their laws, and institutions, even their language and alphabet, as well as their religion and the people as a race, have perished from the earth. Their idols were destroyed and their images have ceased to be used in their religion, and the people were scattered among the nations as predicted by the prophet, the land now being inhabited by Mohammedan Arabs. The prediction, "*there shall be no more a prince of the land of Egypt,*" has been literally fulfilled, their present ruler being only a vassal of a foreign power, England, who speaks and the ruler of Egypt obeys. Old Egypt is gone forever, and could not now have a prince of any kind.

#### *Section II—THE OLDEST BOOK*

**Written Records Older Than the Time of Moses.** It is said by some that the Bible is the oldest book in the world, and by others that the writings of Moses or Job constitute the oldest writing known. Neither of these claims is correct. When Moses lived and wrote he lived among civilized people who had a well-developed language, an adequate system of writing, and an extensive literature. Much of this literature has been discovered in recent years, including some written at the very time of the exodus and much of an earlier date. It is now claimed by some scholars that the oldest book discovered thus far is "*The Precepts of Ptah Hotep,*" the son of the seventh king of the fifth dynasty, to whom scholars give the date of about 3850 B.C., though there is no general agreement among them, and their opinions differ widely on all dates prior to the time of Moses. But evidently this book dates before the time of Moses, as also do many other Egyptian writings. The author claims to be 110 years old. The book is somewhat like the proverbs of Solomon and "inculcates obedience, diligence, patience, and other virtues." Among other very

ancient books are the "Book of the Dead," "Tales of the Magicians," etc. Some of the greatest archaeologists and scholars tell us that the farther back we go the more perfect the art of the ancient Egyptians, and the same is true of Babylonia and Chaldea. In this connection we quote from one of the greatest of archaeologists, Flinders Petrie, who spent some seventy years exploring in Egypt and other lands ("Seventy Years in Archaeology," p. 271):

At last it was necessary to give some name to this oldest civilization, and I called it Badarian, after the name of the district Badari, in which it was found. The Badarian civilization was the oldest then known in Egypt; it has finer pottery than that of any later age, also hard stone work and glazing. The skulls proved to be closely kin to the earliest Indian, and the later periods of Egypt all show increasing changes toward the Mediterranean types. It is certain that the Badarians were immigrants from a higher Asiatic culture, as their work steadily deteriorated in Egypt.

These facts administer a severe blow to the claims of critics who only a few years ago were affirming that if Moses ever lived he could not write, since he was not far enough removed from the monkey stage of man's development.

### *Section III—WHAT OF THE FLOOD?*

**Chronology Uncertain.** But, says one, "What of the flood and the unbroken line of kings of Egypt running back many centuries beyond the great deluge which Bishop Usher places at about 2348 B.C.?" In reply to this the following is taken from the "National Geographic Magazine" of 1913: "Egyptology is hopelessly divided against itself over the question of all dates prior to 1580 B.C." In 1870, George Smith discovered cuneiform tablets in Babylonia dating from 3000 B.C., according to his opinion. They give the most important tradition of the deluge, other than the Bible account. Other scholars point out the great divergence of the opinions of scholars, not only in Egypt, but also in Babylonia.

An inscription of Nabonidus, who reigned as king of Babylon, 555-538 B.C., has been found in which he claims to have found an inscription of Naram-Sin, who lived 3,200 years before his time, or about 3750 B.C.<sup>1</sup> This inscription of Nabonidus was found by Hormuzd Rassam at Abu Habba. Many scholars have based the whole system of dates of Babylonian antiquity on this statement of Nabonidus, thus carrying their discoveries back to a great antiquity.

---

<sup>1</sup> E. J. Banks: "Bismya, or the Lost City of Udab" (1912), pp. 203-205.

But it would seem very doubtful that Nabonidus had any reliable source of information on this point. On this subject Dr. Geo. A. Barton says:

These dates will be found in many of the older books, but they are incredible. They would, if true, leave long gaps in the history that we have no information to fill. Since it has been clearly proved that the dynasties overlapped, it seems that Nabona'id reached his date by adding together totals of dynasties, some of which were contemporary. It now seems probable that he placed Naram-Sin about 1,100 years too early ("Archaeology and the Bible," pp. 58f).<sup>2</sup>

The Babylonians were the successors of the more ancient Sumerians, but they knew little of the lengths of the reigns of the earliest Sumerian kings. Several lists of the antediluvian kings have been found, and, according to one list, ten kings reigned before the flood, covering a period of 456,000 years.<sup>3</sup> Of course, this is a gross exaggeration, but there may be some traditional connection between these ten kings and the ten patriarchs from Adam to Noah.<sup>4</sup> In fact, some scholars have made up tables of these antediluvian kings of Babylonia and what may be their equivalents among the antediluvian patriarchs. There is indeed a very striking similarity between several of them. The Babylonians divided their history into two great divisions, one before, the other after, the flood, thus confirming the tradition of a universal flood which was generally accepted among the Babylonians at a very early age. From the lists of the Babylonian kings and the lengths of their reigns, some scholars have been led to add them together and thus obtain a very great antiquity running back beyond the time of the flood. But recent discoveries have proved that some of these lists represent kings of different cities, as Babylon, Ur, or Larsa, and were concurrent or parallel. At any rate, many of the best authorities on archaeology, including Dr. E. J. Banks,<sup>5</sup> Dr. Geo. A. Barton,<sup>6</sup> and others do not accept the statement of Nabonidus and think that Naram-Sin may have lived a thousand years later. Thus, it is seen that the claims of great antiquity for the kings of ancient Babylonia rest upon weak evidence, for the dates of both antediluvian and postdiluvian kings are very uncertain.

---

<sup>2</sup> Professor Ira M. Price, in New Rewritten Edition (1925) of "The Monuments and the Old Testament," says, "This date is frankly rejected by all Assyriologists as at least from 1,000 to 1,100 years too long" (p. 51).

<sup>3</sup> E. A. Wallace Budge: "Babylonian Life and History," p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> Barton: "Archaeology and the Bible" (fourth edition), pp. 289-298. (By permission of American Sunday School Union.)

<sup>5</sup> Banks: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 203-4.

<sup>6</sup> Barton: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 57-60.

*Section IV—THE PYRAMIDS*

**Purpose of.** By whom and for what purpose were the pyramids built? This question is partially answered by the pyramids themselves, as many of them have interior chambers whose walls are inscribed with a record of the annals of the kings who built them. Thus it is that we find that the greatest one, Gizeh, was built by King Choofoo (Kufu), who used 300,000 men in its construction, in relays of 100,000 each—100,000 working while 200,000 provided food. In the interior chamber there is found not only the annals of the king inscribed on the walls in hieroglyphic characters, but the mummy and treasures with it are found there unless the tomb has been robbed as is often the case.

**The Pyramid Texts Are All Religious.** They contain prayers and hymns, incantations, and magical formulae by which they thought to secure life eternal. The Egyptians believed in a future life after death, and they thought one needed to eat and drink in the next world the same as in this. Food was provided for the long journey by various formulae. One epitaph at an Egyptian tomb is quoted:

"Receive thy bread which does not dry up, and thy beer which does not sour, for the corn is cut and the barley is harvested for thee."

**Mummies.** The Egyptians mummified all their dead both rich and poor. The body of Jacob was embalmed or mummified by Joseph, the process requiring forty days (Gen. 50:1-3). No doubt Joseph himself was mummified, since his bones were carried by the Israelites when they left Egypt and were buried in Shechem (Josh. 24:32). Gen. 50:26 says "they embalmed him." Egyptians held sacred many animals and birds which they mummified in great numbers, including cats, dogs, monkeys, hawks, etc. More than seventy cats were found mummified in a large vase at Abydos, their holy city. The mummy of Ramses II, supposed to be the Pharaoh of the oppression, and that of Merneptah, supposed to be the Pharaoh of the exodus, have been found and both are now in the museum at Cairo, Egypt.

In 1881, the mummies of some ten or more kings of Egypt were discovered in a subterranean chamber, reached through a well thirty or forty feet deep, and a tunnel extending some twenty-five feet in one direction, and then turning at a right angle, extending about 200 feet, terminating in a large chamber. These mummies were identified by labels and were hidden here from thieves who had been plundering the tombs for treasures buried with the kings. These mummies

are now in the museum at Cairo, among them being Rameses II, whose body had been removed from its original resting place to that of another king, and then again to that of a second king before it was finally placed in the tunnel just described. This information is said to be given in the inscriptions and is confirmed as above.

Many rich treasures have been discovered in the tombs of the ancient kings of Egypt, including articles of furniture decorated with gold, chariots, beds, grain and other articles of food, including honey still liquid and possessing its characteristic scent after 3,000 years or more.

**Chronology.** Our knowledge of Egyptian chronology is obtained chiefly from Manetho, an Egyptian priest of about 250 B.C. His system gives thirty-one dynasties of Egyptian kings, bringing the chronology down to the conquest of Alexander the Great (332 B.C.). We have the view expressed upon high authority that many Egyptologists use materials uncritically, and thereby civilization is pictured as much older than it really is. Quotations from Manetho vary in many respects so that the conclusions drawn from them differ greatly. The most reliable scholarship on the chronology of Egypt says that all dates prior to about 1780 B.C. are highly speculative and not dependable. Some of the ripest scholars believe the earlier lists of Egyptian kings are only fictitious records, or records of fictitious kings.

#### *Section V—ELEPHANTINE RECORDS*

**Jewish Temple at Elephantine.** Papyrus records in Aramaic language found at Elephantine, an island at the first cataract of the Nile, tell of a Jewish colony there and a temple to Jehovah. One record says this temple was already there when Cambyses, king of Babylon, conquered Egypt (525 B.C.). These papyri are dated from 494 to 400 B.C., during the time of Nehemiah. These Jewish colonists first wrote to Jehohanan, high priest at Jerusalem, but failing to receive any reply, they wrote to the sons of Sanballat, governor of Samaria, and at the same time to Bagohi, the Persian governor of Judah, with the result that permission was granted to rebuild the temple on the island of Elephantine, which had been destroyed by the enemies of the Jews there. These papyrus records found since 1895 give this information, and the facts indicate that the orthodox Jews did not approve of a temple to Jehovah except at Jerusalem, hence this appeal to the enemy of Nehemiah and his people confirm-

ing the Bible record of the schism between the Jews and Samaritans. Reference is also made to the Passover and to Hananiah (Neh. 7:2). For this Sanballat see Neh. 2:10. These records most conclusively corroborate the Bible history connected with these characters and the Jewish Passover and other customs of the Jews.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER II

### *Section I—EGYPT*

Fulfillment of prophecy. Ezek. 30.

The Egyptian nation, civilization, laws and institutions, language and alphabet, religion and people as a race have all disappeared.

No more a prince of the land of Egypt.

Their idols destroyed and their images ceased as foretold by the prophet.

### *Section II—OLDEST BOOK*

Written records older than the time of Moses.

Bible not the oldest book.

Moses lived among civilized people who had a well-developed language, an adequate system of writing, and an extensive literature.

Much of their literature written about the time of Moses and much more at an earlier date.

The oldest book so far discovered supposed to be "Precepts of Ptah Hotep."

Other very ancient books are the "Book of the Dead," "Tales of the Magicians," etc.

Art of the ancient Egyptians. Quotation from Flinders Petrie.

### *Section III—WHAT OF THE FLOOD?*

Chronology uncertain. Quotation from "National Geographic Magazine."

Inscription of Nabonidus, last king of Babylon, stating that Naram-Sin lived 3,200 years before his time, or 3750 B.C. Many writers base their chronology on this record of Nabonidus.

Many of the leading archaeologists now place the date of Naram-Sin much later, some as much as 1,000 years or more. Quotation from Dr. Geo. A. Barton.

Ten kings reigned before the flood.

The Babylonians divided their history into two great divisions, one before and the other after the flood.

Lists of Babylonian kings and the length of their reigns. Some were concurrent, as king of Babylon, king of Ur, or Larsa.

### *Section IV—THE PYRAMIDS*

Purpose of. Interior chambers. Tombs of kings.

Pyramid of Gizeh built by King Chofoo (Kufu). Interior.

Pyramid texts all religious.

Interior inscribed with prayers, hymns, incantations, and magical formulae. Egyptians believed in a life after death. Food for the dead.

Egyptians mummified all their dead both rich and poor. Mummified many sacred animals and birds. The body of Jacob, Joseph. Mummies of Ramses II, Merneptah.

Mummies of ten or more Egyptian kings found in 1881.

Rich treasures in tombs of Egyptian kings.

Egyptian chronology. Manetho. He gives thirty-one dynasties.

Many Egyptologists use material uncritically, especially as to dates and chronology. All dates prior to 1780 B.C. highly speculative.

*Section V—ELEPHANTINE RECORDS*

Jewish temple at Elephantine. Papyrus records found there.

Correspondence. Sanballat Hananiah (Neh. 7:2). The Passover.

These records corroborate the Bible history.

## CHAPTER III

### ANCIENT EGYPT CONFIRMS THE BIBLE

#### *Section I*—SCRIPTURE CONFIRMATIONS—EGYPTIAN

**Personal Names and Places Identified.** While no direct reference to the sojourn of Israel in Egypt is found among the inscriptions so far, the setting of the Bible history is fully corroborated. In the delta of the Nile, the land of Goshen is found, and Tanis as the Biblical Zoan, Memphis as Noph, and Thebes as No or No-Ammon are all fully identified. At Zoan a trilingual inscription has been found which confirms the decipherment of the Rosetta Stone and is much valued by archaeologists.

The inscriptions give a number of Biblical personal names, among them Asenath, Joseph's wife; Potiphar, Joseph's master; Potiphara, his father-in-law.

**Assouan Dam.** The inscriptions tell us of famines in Egypt when the Nile failed to overflow. One such inscription published in 1891 tells of a seven-year famine when the Nile failed to overflow, and another tells of a famine dated about 1500 B.C. lasting for many years, during which time distribution of corn was made each year. In modern times, under the direction of the British government, the Assouan Dam has been built on the upper Nile near the first cataract by means of which the annual overflow of the Nile is now regulated.

**King Shishak.** In 1 Kings 14:25ff. (written after 927 B.C.) we read:

And it came to pass in the fifth year of king Rehoboam, that Shiskak king of Egypt came up against Jerusalem; and he took away the treasures of the house of Jehovah, and the treasures of the king's house; he even took away all: and he took away all the shields of gold which Solomon had made. And king Rehoboam made in their stead shields of brass.

Sheshonk I is said to be the Biblical Shishak. His invasion of Israel with 12,000 chariots and 60,000 cavalry and the capture of Jerusalem are a part of the inscription of this king at the temple of Karnak in Thebes. His invasion of Judah occurred 927 B.C.

**Goshen.** Not many years ago skeptical scholars denied the existence of such a place as the land of Goshen, where the Bible tells us Israel dwelt, and they scoffed at the idea of Israel's oppression in making brick with straw. Not only has the name Goshen been found in the inscriptions, but the ruins of the granaries in Pythom and



Raamses reveal the fact that in the lower courses the brick were made with straw, while in the upper portions they were made without straw. A recent discovery confirms Ex. 1:11 in an inscription of Ramses II, which says he built the city of Raamses with Semitic labor.

### *Section II—THE HITTITES*

**Oldest Diplomatic Document.** Only a few years ago skeptics denied the existence of such a tribe or nation as the ancient Hittites so often mentioned in the Bible, but modern research has proved the Bible record correct here as well as at all other points of contact with archaeology. As given in Section V, the Hittites were mentioned in Merneptah's inscription at his tomb; they are mentioned by Shalmanezar II, by Tiglath-Pileser III, and Sargon II, king of Assyria, says in his annals of 717 B.C. that he captured Karkemish, their capital city, and thus ended the Hittite power. Many sculptures of Hittite kings, priests, deities, warriors, etc., have been found. But perhaps the most striking reference to them is found in the inscription at the temple of Karnak, Thebes, which records the wars of Ramses II with the Hittites, including a treaty of peace and an alliance with them, which is said to be the oldest diplomatic document in the world. A copy of this treaty between Ramses II of Egypt and the Hittite king, Hattusil, inscribed in the Babylonian language, has been found in Asia Minor, confirming the record of the same document in hieroglyphic characters at Thebes. The Tel-El-Amarna tablets contain more than thirty references to these people.

**Hittite Inscriptions.** While many Hittite inscriptions have been found, the writing has only recently been deciphered. Since 1920 a number of European scholars have been editing and studying the Hittite inscriptions. Professor Hroznij has shown that the locked secrets of the official Hittite language would yield to an Indo-European key. (See article, Hittites, John Garstang, "International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," Revised, Vol. 3, p. 1398).

As yet only a small portion of their records has been published, but when more complete details are published we may expect the Bible history connected with them to be confirmed further. Thus infidelity has been dealt another blow and the Bible record fully confirmed.

### *Section III—BIBLE ONLY SOURCE OF MONOTHEISM*

**Monotheism of Akhnaton IV Rejected by Tutankhamen.** Critics assume that the Hebrew religion began with polytheism and

that monotheism was not developed among them until some time after Solomon.<sup>1</sup> No evidence is produced to support this view, while the Bible abounds with evidence to the contrary.<sup>2</sup> The only monotheism apart from the Bible, so far as known to us, is that attempted by Amenophis IV (Akhnaton IV) of Egypt, who reigned about 1480-1460 B.C., or just preceding the time of Israel's coming into Palestine (cir. 1450 or 1400 B.C.). The wife of Amenophis III (Akhnaton III) was a sister of the Babylonian king. Their son, Amenophis IV (Akhnaton IV) married an Asiatic princess, and became so infatuated with the Semitic religion of his mother and his wife that he transplanted it to Egypt, and set up altars and shrines at various places. But his son-in-law, Tutankhamen, whose tomb was explored in recent years, succeeded him, and soon abandoned the new religion and returned to his old system of polytheism of his fathers.

**Influence of Israel in Egypt.** Queen Tiy, the mother of Amenophis IV (Akhnaton IV), is said to have had great influence in the reign of her son and may have had a part in the reformation attempted by Amenophis IV (Akhnaton IV). She was the daughter of Yuua and Tuou, whose mummies were discovered a few years ago with a number of well-preserved articles in the tomb, among them being a bed, a chariot, and chairs with cushions that might have been used, together with a jar of honey some 3,000 years old. Some scholars think Yuua and Tuou were Semitic rather than Egyptian. Also one may think this reformation to have been the result of Israel's influence in Egypt, and might be connected with the experiences of Moses with a Pharaoh who preceded Amenophis IV. At any rate, it is remarkable that the Israelites retained a pure monotheism among a people so thoroughly polytheistic, and still more remarkable that the Egyptian monarch attempted to adopt a monotheism about the time of the exodus or near that unless he was influenced by Israel's God through contact with the Jews.

#### *Section IV—TEL-EL-AMARNA TABLETS*

**Letters in Cuneiform.** One of the most important discoveries ever made in the field of archaeology was made in 1887, when over three hundred letters in cuneiform were found on the Upper Nile, Written almost entirely in the Assyrian language of the time of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Ismar J. Peritz: "Old Testament History," p. 87.

<sup>2</sup> "I may fail to carry conviction in concluding that both in Sumerian and Semitic religions monotheism preceded polytheism and belief in good and evil spirits"—S. H. Langdon, in *Mythology of Races*," Vol. V, p. xviii.

exodus. These letters were on clay tablets, inscribed while the clay was soft, and then burnt and placed in a clay envelope which was also burnt after the address had been inscribed thereon. They are from petty vassal kings of Palestine and Phoenicia to Amenophis III and Amenophis IV of Egypt, dating from about 1400-1350 B.C., according to Price in "The Monuments and the Old Testament," New Rewritten Edition (1925), p. 160, or about 1400 B.C., according to Hilprecht in "Explorations in Bible Lands," p. 620. The date agrees most perfectly with the accepted date of the Bible account of Israel's invasion of Palestine under the leadership of Joshua.<sup>3</sup>

**Israel in Egypt Before Time of Moses.** The burden of these letters is an appeal to the king of Egypt to come to the rescue of the inhabitants in opposing the encroachments of the Hittites on the north and of the Habiri on the south. The name Habiri is generally admitted to refer to the Hebrews, though some critics attempt to show that they were not the Hebrews which the Bible records as invading Palestine at about this time. These letters are said to contain more than 100 glosses or explanations in Hebrew of the Assyrian or Babylonian words used, which shows that Hebrew was understood at the courts of Amenophis III and IV. This proves the Biblical account of the residence of Israel in Egypt before the time of Moses, and the existence of the Hebrew language before the earliest Biblical documents were written.

It is now well known that the cuneiform writing was common in Palestine at that date, but that the Hebrew characters had not been in common use. The fact that Hebrew writing did appear soon afterwards is strong evidence in support of the Bible account of Israel's invasion of Palestine.

**Bible Setting in Palestine Confirmed.** The Tel-El-Amarna letters and other archaeological evidence confirm the Bible history of the Canaanitish worship in high places, of sacred animals, of human sacrifices, etc. That the first born were sacred and should be sacrificed to deity was a deep-seated belief of ancient peoples. It was practiced by the Phoenicians and other worshipers of the goddess Ashtoreth. In the time of Manasseh the children of Israel went into idolatry and adopted the worship of Ashtoreth or Astarte, and "he

---

<sup>3</sup> "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, . . . that he began to build the house of the Lord" (1 Kings 6:1). Adding to this Usher's date of Solomon's laying the foundation of the temple, 1015 B.C., we have 1495 B.C.—a variation of only four years from the date of the exodus.

made his son to pass through the fire" (2 Kings 21:6; Jer. 7:31). This goddess was also worshiped in the high places with the most immoral rites and debasing services, along with human sacrifices, leading items of Canaanite worship, both of which are severely condemned in the Bible. Archaeology has brought to light remains of these altars of murder and of the infant victims sacrificed thereon. Many Ashtoreth plaques of the goddess in nude form used in connection with the corrupt worship of high places have been found.

*Section V—MERNEPTAH*

**Pharaoh of the Exodus.** For a long time the mummy of Merneptah, supposed to be the Pharaoh of the exodus, had not been found, and it was supposed that he had been lost in the Red Sea with his army and chariots in pursuit of the children of Israel. But this is not the case, as there is no evidence that the king went into the sea in person, and his mummy was found in 1898 in Thebes fully identified by the label.

It is said that Merneptah's oldest son was also named Merneptah, and Dr. Banks says he may have been a victim of the tenth plague when the death angel destroyed all the first born of Egypt, and that it "appears that he did die early, for he entirely disappears from history, and his younger brother, Seti II, became the next king."<sup>4</sup>

**Name of Israel Found.** In 1896, Professor Petrie made a wonderful discovery in the form of a large polished slab of rock some ten feet high and five feet wide. This stone had been inscribed and placed at the tomb of Amenophis III, but it was afterwards appropriated by Merneptah, the supposed Pharaoh of the exodus, who turned the inscribed side to the wall and inscribed his annals on the other side. Merneptah's long list of victories and conquests on this stone closes as follows:

Lybia is wasted,  
The land of the Hittites is brought low,  
Canaan with all its tribes is captured,  
Askelon is led forth,  
Geser is taken,  
Israel is devastated and its seed destroyed.<sup>5</sup>

This is taken from Dr. E. J. Banks, and the same is given by Barton and others who obtained their information from the discoverer, Professor Flinders Petrie. Many archaeologists express doubt as to

---

<sup>4</sup>E. J. Banks: "The Bible and the Spade," p. 73. <sup>5</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 73f.

what is meant by the statement regarding Israel, some skeptical scholars declaring that it indicates that Israel must have been already an independent settled nation in their own land. But the evidence is strongly against this view, for it is admitted by scholars that there is a character, a determinative, in front of each of the names in the list representing a settled nation in their own land, but this character is omitted before the name Israel. The Bible pictures Israel as a nation of slaves not settled in their own land and under their own government. It seems natural for a boastful and oppressive king like Merneptah to glory over Israel as devastated and its seed destroyed when they had escaped into the wilderness where, no doubt, he thought they would die of starvation and want. Thus, we find the name of Israel mentioned by the Pharaoh who is supposed by scholars generally to be the very one who had refused to let Israel go, but, finally, under the lash of the tenth plague, did grant them permission to go and take with them all of their possessions.

#### *Section VI—THE PHARAOHS DEALING WITH MOSES*

**Names of Pharaohs.** There has been much discussion about the Pharaohs of Moses' time, and scholars have speculated as to why the Pentateuch does not mention their names. But this omission need not surprise us; the inspired writer was not interested in the biography of the Egyptian rulers, but rather with God's purposes in dealing with his people, Israel. Foreigners may refer to the acts and conduct of the Sultan of Turkey, the Czar of Russia, or the Khedive of Egypt without being interested at all in the personal name of the ruler.

For many years certain scholars have believed Ramses II to have been the Pharaoh of the Oppression and Merneptah the Pharaoh of the Exodus, but certain other scholars have thought that Thothmes III and Amenhetep II, respectively, represent these Pharaohs, claiming the former, according to dates assigned them, are too late by some 200 or more years to fit the time of the Exodus. It may be well to examine the claims on which the two views are based.

**New King Knew Not Joseph.** It is thought that Joseph lived under the reign of one of the Hyksos kings, and in Ex. 1:8 we read: "Now there arose a new king over Egypt, who knew not Joseph." Under this king we are told that the children of Israel were made to "serve with rigor" and the Egyptians "made their lives bitter with hard service, in mortar and in brick, and in all manner of service in the field, all their service, wherein they made them serve with rigor"

(Ex. 1:13ff). "And it came to pass in the course of those many days, that the king of Egypt died" (Ex. 2:23), and another king arose under whose reign the Exodus occurred as related in the book of Exodus.

**Who Were These Pharaohs?** The Bible does not give their names, but from the record in Exodus and what we have learned from archaeology we may be able to answer this question satisfactorily. In Ex. 1:11 we read: "Therefore they did set over them taskmasters to afflict them with their burdens. And they built for Pharaoh store-cities, Pithom and Raamses." It is claimed that an inscription of Ramses II has been found in which this king says he built these cities with Semitic labor. And in further corroboration of this Scripture, Naville identified the site of Pithom in 1883 and found there much evidence of the activities of Ramses II and large statues of this king, thus connecting Pithom with the work of Ramses II. It is also said that Naville found no evidence of a former city occupying the site of Pithom built by Ramses II. M. G. Kyle, a noted scholar and archaeologist, in "International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," revised edition, 1929, Vol. II, pp. 1056f, says:

A visit to the ruins and a careful examination of Naville's work in 1908 found every part of his much disputed report exactly confirmed. On the gateway was an inscription in which Ramses II states categorically, "I built Pithom."

**Ramses Bequeathed His Name.** As to Raamses, Petrie found in 1905-6 what he believes to be the ruins of this store city, about eight miles from Pithom, where he found "statues of Ramses II and Ramses III" and other evidence of the work of these kings in the buildings which they erected. Ramses I could not have been the builder of these cities, for his reign was too short, being less than two years in length. If Thothmes III was the oppressor and built these store cities as claimed by some writers, we have the absurd conclusion that Ramses II, whom modernists date 200 years later than Thothmes III, destroyed every vestige of proof of Thothmes' work and substituted his own name as the builder and that he and Ramses III erected their colossal statues there! Who can believe it? Besides, Ramses II evidently bequeathed his name to one of the cities which he built, which fact Moses could not have recorded had Ramses lived at the time modern scholarship assigns him. With reference to the stele of Ramses II, now in the museum of the University of Pennsylvania, Dr. Barton says: "It is not stated that he made these captives build the city for him, though in the statement that Ramses gave it his own name it

is implied that it was either a new city or one that he was rebuilding."<sup>6</sup> In addition to the charge of Ramses' practice of erasing the names of his predecessors and substituting his own on buildings which he did not build, proponents of this charge will have to prove that he tampered with the records of Moses and changed them to give added glory to his achievements. Even a modernist would hardly attempt this task. It is thus clear that the two cities built by the oppressed children of Israel in Egypt for Pharaoh as shown by the name Raamses and by the inscriptions and statues were founded by Ramses II, who reigned sixty-seven years and is regarded as the great builder among the Pharaohs of Egypt.

**Manetho's Chronology.** Some scholars declare that Ramses II could not have been the oppressor for the reason that the date set for him by many critics does not fit that of the time of Moses, being, as they claim, some 200 years too late. This late dating is based chiefly on the chronology of Manetho, an Egyptian priest, who wrote about 250 B.C. He is said to have gathered the lists of Egyptian kings and grouped them into thirty-one dynasties, beginning with the first king of the first dynasty, Menes, and including all succeeding kings to the time of the conquest of Alexander the Great in 332 B.C. But Manetho's work has been lost and is now known only from quotations in the "Chronographiai" of Julius Africanus of about A.D. 221, and from quotations found in the "Chronicon" of Eusebius of Caesarea of about the third century A.D. These quotations differ widely and serious scholars do not regard this chronology as reliable. Baikie says:

Of these, Manetho, as reported by his epitomisers, alone attempts to clothe his skeleton of facts, if such they were, with a little flesh and blood; but his praiseworthy efforts rather impaired his credit as an historian than otherwise. It did not conduce to faith in the old writer's trustworthiness to be told that in the reign of King Neferkheres "the Nile flowed with honey eleven days," or that King Sesokris "was five cubits in height, and his breadth three cubits."<sup>7</sup>

**Sothic Cycle.** Another aid for fixing dates is claimed in what is called the Sothic Cycle (see Barton: "Archaeology and the Bible," fifth edition, 1927, p. 22f, or a modern encyclopedia) by which accumulated errors in counting the year as 365 days are corrected. But the calculations are based on two assumptions, neither of which has been proved: (1) That this system was adopted 4240 B.C. and was in general use by the Egyptians throughout the entire period of the

---

<sup>6</sup> G. A. Barton: "Archaeology and the Bible," fifth edition, 1927, App. II, IX, p. 551; p. 134 of sixth edition, 1933. (By permission American Sunday School Union.)

<sup>7</sup> James Baikie: "The Life of the Ancient East" (1923), p. 33.

thirty-one dynasties, and (2) that the information given in the lists of the kings is reliable. Both of these assumptions are rejected by high authorities.

This method of determining dates cannot be satisfactory for the reason that it must be assumed that the observations of the Egyptians were as accurate as those made by a modern astronomer with a telescope, whereas, when using the naked eye, the Egyptian observer may well have been a day wrong, which would make a difference of 120 years or more in the periods of the cycle.<sup>8</sup>

**Pharaohs.** There is no mention of any Pharaoh by name in the Old Testament until the time of Rehoboam. Because of this fact extreme caution must be had in venturing to assign definite names to the rulers in Egypt during the times of Joseph, the Oppression, and the Exodus. The absence of any personal designation in the title Pharaoh precludes the possibility of absolute identification in most cases.<sup>9</sup> But this should not bar careful investigation of available information in sources external to the Bible, yet one must not be overruled by the testimony which may be brought to light, but rather strive to give it a just evaluation.

**Of Joseph.** The uncertainty of giving dates to early events of the history of the Jews arises from the difficulty of determining the early Egyptian chronology and the lack of being able to synchronize the events of Biblical history with those of Egyptian history. With reference to Joseph, there are two views which are held by different scholars: (1) The Pharaoh of Joseph was one of the Hyksos or Amu kings. There is no general agreement as to the length of their domination in Egypt. On the authority of George the Syncellus, about A.D. 800, "some scholars identify this Pharaoh with Apepa II, the last important Hyksos king."<sup>10</sup> Other scholars identify the Apepa whose records are preserved by Byzantine writers with Apepa I, a Hyksos king of the fifteenth dynasty.<sup>11</sup> (2) Amenophis IV, who was Semitic in his religious sympathies, was the Pharaoh of Joseph.

The title that was given Joseph, *'abhrek* (Gen. 41:43), which is the high Babylonian title, *Abaraku*, points definitely to the time of the Hyksos kings.

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. C. R. Conder: "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia" (1915), Vol II, p. 1054.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. C. R. Gillet: "The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia" (1909), Vol. IV.

<sup>10</sup> Harlan Creelman: "An Introduction to the Old Testament" (1917), p. 33.

<sup>11</sup> Cf. Ball: "Light from the Ancient East" (1899), p. 80.



**Of the Oppression.** The same general uncertainty maintains with reference to the date of the Oppression. However, scholars generally identify Ramses II of the nineteenth dynasty with the Pharaoh of the Oppression. This identification is based largely on the discovery by Naville in 1883 of the site of Pithom (Ex. 1:11) at Tel-el-Maskhuta. The inscriptions found there are declared to show that it was founded by Ramses II. This king reigned sixty-seven years and the time varies according to various authorities—Petrie, 1295-1229 B.C.; Breasted, 1292-1225; Sayce, 1348-1281. Accordingly scholars date the Oppression about 1300 B.C. However, it must be noted that McCurdy gives date about 1580 B.C. for the beginning of the Oppression.<sup>12</sup> It is not unlikely that the whole interval between the twelfth and the seventeenth dynasties may have been occupied by struggles of rival houses, each of which claimed supremacy, but not one strong enough to uphold its claim with any degree of permanency. There is a complete dearth of trustworthy contemporary documents for this period. The Turin papyrus<sup>13</sup> and the Manethonian<sup>14</sup> fragments constitute the sole basis for any determination. In Manetho's arrangement two obscure dynasties are followed by two others of which less is known. Hence, it is not unlikely that scholars who wish to set the Bible at naught may have erred in giving the date of the Oppression at about 1300 B.C. Skeptical scholarship here must be challenged just as in any other phase of their efforts to discredit the Bible. The only chronology that can be recognized is that which is found in the Bible. Put Ramses back about two or two and a half centuries and there is revealed the true reckoning and harmony is reached with the accredited facts of the monuments. It cannot be right to attempt to adjust the facts of history to make them conform to an assumed chronology.

**Of the Exodus.** Here also as in the date of Joseph and that of the Oppression, there is uncertainty. The Exodus is frequently assigned by notable scholars to Merneptah, the son and successor of Ramses II. There is no unanimity as to the date he is supposed to have ruled. Petrie sets his time as 1229-1210 B.C.; Breasted, about

---

<sup>12</sup> McCurdy: "History, Prophecy, and the Monuments," iii, p. 433.

<sup>13</sup> The Turin papyrus of the Ramseside period is the only known native list which gave the years of the reign of each king. It was irreparably damaged during its journey to Europe. Its present condition is so fragmentary that it is incapable of rendering any definite aid in determining Egyptian chronology.

<sup>14</sup> Manetho was a native priest and wrote in Greek. His records are known only in excerpts preserved by Josephus, Africanus, and Eusebius, or by the medium of still later chronologists. The sources upon which his *Aiguptiaka* is based are unknown. He is discredited by scholars because of the fact that his divisions do not always coincide with those given in the Turin papyrus, and no one is able to tell how far he manipulated his authorities to suit his own views.

1225-1215 B.C. Many scholars set the Exodus in the fifth year of his rule or about 1220 B.C. McCurdy in work cited, I, pp. 203f; III, p. 32, dates at about 1200 B.C.; Sayce at about 1277 B.C.; Hommel in 1897, 1272 B.C., but in 1899 he declared in favor of a date during the regime of the eighteenth dynasty. To set the date at 1220 B.C. and as in the time of Merneptah involves the Bible chronology in serious difficulties. The time of the judges must be cut down to unduly small proportions; the 480 years of 1 Kings 6:1 would have to be reduced to about 300 years;<sup>15</sup> and the time of the sojourn in Egypt, 400-430 years, would have to be reduced by more than half.

Put Merneptah back in the fifteenth century and again the facts of the monuments are made to synchronize with the Bible records. Too, it makes assuredly correct the interpretation of the victory-stele of Merneptah which contains "no seed is left" in reference to Israel, that the land is desolate because of its evacuation by the children of Israel. Modernism has tried to adjust the facts of history to fit their false chronology, and many who claim to accept the Bible have fallen a victim to this system. We are urging that the facts of history synchronize with the Bible regardless of whatever the system of chronology may be.

**Chronology.** The obscurity and uncertainty of the Egyptian chronology make it very difficult to determine the extent of any period with any definiteness. About all one can say about the length of the reign of the Hyksos kings is that it lasted several centuries. Modern historians conveniently partition Manetho's series of thirty-one dynasties into several groups, but between these supposed groups lie obscure, disturbed periods which are not assignable to the more distinctly, defined groups. (See page 140; also notes 13, 14.)

Dates approximating exactness cannot be assigned back of the termination of the Hyksos reign. A notable feature is a tendency to reduce the length of the history as a whole. Many a *priori* systems and their corresponding systems of chronology have been propounded, but, even so, the best results can be little more than mere approximations. Brugsch based his system on the average length of a human generation; Meyer, on reign-lengths shown by records; and astronomical calculations are based on eclipses as related to the Sothic periods of 1,460 years and the variable year of 365 days. These are all faulty.

---

<sup>15</sup>E. L. Curtis: "Dictionary of the Bible," edited by Jas. Hastings (1898), says in Vol. I, p. 399, "The interval from the Exodus to the founding of the temple is probably nearer 300 years than 500."

Data are not available for any application of "dead reckoning," which is the one method that can yield definite results.

As to the account of the Exodus given by Manetho, it was confessedly a mere popular story, for he admitted that it was not a part of the Egyptian record, but a tale of uncertain authorship.<sup>16</sup> Scholars who have made critical examination of his record as is preserved in excerpts as noted above aver that it cannot be a veritable tradition of the Exodus, and, if indeed, it is based on any such tradition, it is so distorted as to make it without value, and impossible to be sure that it relates to the king to whose reign it is assigned. It is hazardous to attempt to adjust Hebrew records with Egyptian history at this period. Rather the converse is more rational; Egyptian accounts may better be made to conform to the Hebrew accounts.

**Ramses II.** Regarding the ruins at Tell el-Maskhuta, Hilprecht informs us that it was at first thought to be the site of Raamses because a group of statues representing "Ramses II between the gods Atum and Re," and a large number of sandstone and granite blocks inscribed with hieroglyphs and bearing "the name of Ramses II." Although these evidences favor the claims that Ramses built the ancient city occupying the site it was later decided that

There is good reason for believing that here was situated the Biblical Pithom. . . . The temple was surrounded by a wall, inside of which was the little sanctuary built by Ramses II to the god of the city, Atom. Not far from the temple, granaries were discovered, which took the shape of deep rectangular compartments without doors, in which the grain was poured from the top. To judge from the bricks of which they are built, they belong to the time of Ramses II, and it is therefore possible that they may be the store cities built by the Israelites at the command of Pharaoh. Naville's excavations have further proved that Tell el-Maskhuta contains the remains of the ancient Ero or Heroopolis, at which, according to the Greek translation of the Scriptures, the meeting took place between Joseph and his father, and which in a Coptic translation is regarded as identical with Pithom.<sup>17</sup>

In the Jewish Encyclopedia, Vol. X (1904), p. 313, under Ramses, W. Max Muller declared it to be (1) an Egyptian city; one of the "treasure cities," built by the Israelites in their servitude. He further declares that the name "land of Ramses" "seems to be derived from the famous King Ramses II. ... The city of Raamses betrays its builder and the date of its foundation by its name. He also gives (2) "Egyptian king; the founder of the city of Raamses and of Pithom

---

<sup>16</sup> See Josephus C. Apion, I, 16.

<sup>17</sup> Herman V. Hilprecht: "Explorations in Bible Lands During the Nineteenth Century" (1903), pp. 649f. (By permission of A. J. Holman Co.)

(comp. Ex. 1:11), who would consequently, seem to be the Pharaoh of the Exodus."

**Unwarranted Assumption—Location.** From the same authority, Vol. VIII, p. 500, regarding Merneptah, we quote:

He was the son and successor of the famous Ramses II (Sesostris) who is known to have built the cities enumerated in Ex. 1:11. Consequently no conclusion seemed more certain than this: Ramses II was the Pharaoh of the Oppression; Merneptah, that of the Exodus, which thus would date from the middle or end of the thirteenth century B.C. The discovery of the famous Israel inscription by Petrie ("Six Temples," plate 13, 14) has now made this conclusion very doubtful.<sup>18</sup> . . . These words (Israel is devastated and its seed destroyed) dating from the fifth year of Merneptah seem to point most naturally to Israel as settled in Palestine; though they have been construed as an allusion to the twelve tribes still wandering in the desert or still being held under bondage in Goshen.

This Merneptah inscription has been given in a number of books in practically the same words and in the same order, and we quote from Dr. E. J. Banks: "The Bible and the Spade" (1913), pp. 73f:

Lybia is wasted.

The land of the Hittites is brought low.

Canaan with all its tribes is captured.

Askelon is led forth.

Geser is taken.

Jenoam is made as nothing.

Israel is devastated and its seed destroyed.

Palestine has become a widow for Egypt. (Last line is from Barton.)<sup>19</sup>

Many writers have declared this reference to Israel an enigma and have refused to give any explanation as to its application. Others have speculated about it, as W. Max Muller has done in the above quotation when he says these words "seem to point most naturally to Israel as settled in Palestine." With no other information given, the reader can judge as to whether this is the natural conclusion. But fortunately we have very important information given by scholars of high rank. The Egyptians used a certain character to designate names of settled people in their own land, as an independent nation under their own government. This character appears with each of the names except Israel, no doubt the reason being that Israel was a people not occupying their own country, under their own laws and government as a settled people. So the very thing that W. Max Muller

---

<sup>18</sup>It is worth while to note that Dr. Muller recognizes that the Merneptah stele renders the conclusion of dating the Exodus in the thirteenth century as very doubtful. <sup>19</sup>Cf. Barton: "Archaeology and the Bible," fifth edition (1927), p. 338.

thinks most natural is the thing the record indicates most improbable if not plainly contradicted.

This point is emphasized further in the following quotation from M. G. Kyle, revising editor, "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," 1929, Vol. II, p. 1056A:

The Israel tablet found by Petrie at the Rameseum in 1906 has been the subject of much controversy and is by some interpreted to mean that Israel was already in Palestine, thus bolstering up the early date of the Exodus. If some think it may be so, there are others who, on certainly equally good ground, believe it, when correctly interpreted, to be in support of the late date of the Exodus. The name "Israel" occurs between Askelon and Khar in the inscription. Now Khar is the name for Canaan by the way of the Dead Sea. And Israel named between Askelon and Khar seems to put it between them, i. e., in the region of Kadesh Barnea. Every name in the list has the determinatives for a "people" and an "own land," except Israel. Then Khar which follows Israel has again both determinatives. This is exactly in accord with the condition of Israel wandering in the wilderness a "people" without an "own country." It is also said in the inscription "their seed is not." . . . The word (seed) . . . may well mean children and the inscription become a jeering boast that the children of Israel had not entered the promised land because they were characteristically a nation of women, despoiled of their "seed" by the destruction of the boy babies. And then last of all, the poet adds "Khar has become like the widows of Egypt," meaning that Palestine was mourning for the Israelites that did not come as a widow mourning for her husband.

Perhaps Kyle draws too much on his imagination, especially in the concluding part of this quotation, but there does seem to be good reason for believing that Israel was in the wilderness, where it was natural for those who did not understand the nature of God's protecting care over them to think they were utterly destroyed.

**Israel Not Settled in Palestine.** Others have considered that the reference to Israel in Merneptah's inscription implies a location near Tyre because of the fact that most of these countries conquered by him were in Palestine and Phoenicia and the one next to the Israel item is thus located near Tyre.<sup>20</sup> Now the reader should be able to see the weakness of this claim. In the first place we have given only a few of the long list of this king's conquests, only the last strophe of the inscription, and even in this brief extract the name of Lybia is mentioned as wasted and the land of the Hittites is brought low, neither of which is located in Palestine or Phoenicia nor near Tyre. The former lay to the west of the Egyptian delta and the latter to the north and east of Palestine. The claim that Israel was near Tyre at

---

<sup>20</sup> See "The Exodus," I, 8, C. R. Conder: "The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia," 1915, p. 1054.

the time mentioned in Merneptah's inscription seems to have no foundation in fact.

When making application of an historical reference to a Bible character, unless the context forbids it, it is natural and logical to adopt an explanation in harmony with the Bible. We know that some Pharaoh had contact with Moses and the Israelites, and the only time such contact is mentioned is by Merneptah in his inscription referred to above. There is no historical evidence of any conflict between Israel and Merneptah, unless it be at the Red Sea when Israel escaped into the wilderness, where, no doubt, the Pharaoh thought the Israelites would die of hunger and thirst, a most natural conclusion from his standpoint. During their forty years' wanderings this Pharaoh probably wrote his annals including this inscription which is the only one found so far in Egypt mentioning Israel. This view meets every requirement of the Scriptures. Had Merneptah gained such a smashing victory over Israel in Palestine, as contended by some,<sup>21</sup> it is strange indeed that no mention is made of it in the Judges, while mention is made of conflicts, many and serious, but with local tribes, including Moabites, Philistines, Canaanites, Midianites, Amorites. If Merneptah subdued Israel during the time of the judges some 200 years after they settled in Palestine, as claimed by some, it would appear as a very strange and unnatural omission from the record in the Judges.

**Historical Setting.** Professor Sayce, writing as an archaeologist, not as a theologian, says:

When the Exodus can have happened has at last been settled by Egyptological research. There is only one period in Egyptian history when it could have taken place, and the history of the period which has been recovered from the native monuments is in striking harmony with the requirements of the scriptural narrative.<sup>22</sup>

Again from the same authority we quote:

Among the papyri preserved in the British Museum is a letter to the king from a scribe written in the eighth year of Merneptah II, the son and successor of Ramses II, and consequently the Pharaoh of the Exodus.<sup>23</sup>

But even more convincing evidence is found in the language of Professor Sayce as follows:

---

<sup>21</sup> See Garstang: "The Foundations of Bible History" (1931), pp. 281f, 291. Cf. Peet: "Egypt and the Old Testament," p. 108.

<sup>22</sup> A. H. Sayce: "The Higher Criticism and the Verdict of the Monuments," third edition, revised, p. 237.

<sup>23</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 240.

The Tel-el-Amarna tablets have made it clear that we must find the "new king which knew not Joseph" in the Pharaohs of the nineteenth dynasty. They have further made it clear that Canaan could not have been invaded by the Israelites until after the fall of the eighteenth dynasty. When Khu-n-Aten died, it was still an Egyptian province, garrisoned by Egyptian troops, and administered by Egyptian governors. Among the tablets are letters from Lachish which, we are told in the book of Joshua, was one of the first of the Hebrew conquests in Palestine, while the whole of the hill country of what was afterwards Judah, as well as that of which Shechem became the capital, was subject to Egyptian authority.

The fragmentary annals of Ramses II make it equally clear that Canaan in his time also was not yet Israelite. Time after time his armies marched through it to oppose the Hittites, and the Pharaoh erected monuments of himself at the mouth of the Dog River near Beyrout in the second and the seventh years of his reign. In the eighth year of his reign the interior of the country was overrun. Not only was Askelon taken on the seacoast, but also Shalam or Jerusalem, Merom and Tabor in the inland parts of Palestine. There is still no sign that the Israelite is as yet in the land.<sup>24</sup>

While Sayce presents with much force the fact that Ramses II was the "new king which knew not Joseph" and makes him the Pharaoh of the Oppression, we think he is in error in placing both Ramses II and the Oppression in the thirteenth century B.C. Evidently he accepted Manethonian chronology and the date fixed by critics for Ramses II *ignoratio elenchi*.

**Conclusion.** The only archaeological evidence we have, that of Naville at Pithom, says that Ramses II built Pithom, and from Moses in Ex. 1:11 we learn that Israel built for the Pharaoh both Raamses and Pithom. The sandstone and granite blocks and bricks found at Pithom bear the inscription of "Ramses II"; the granaries near the site of Pithom were built of brick bearing the name of "Ramses II,"<sup>25</sup> those in the lower courses being made with straw, while those farther up were made with stubble and those at the top were made without either. With no evidence that a former Rameses or a Thothmes had any part in the building of these store cities, and with the subsequent historical setting favoring the Bible account and the history of Ramses II, why should we adopt a contrary view inaugurated by modernists who do not believe the Bible to be an inspired record, and whose theory is based on a false system of chronology which has been generally discredited by scholars of the highest rank? But it may be argued that the system has been adopted by nearly all scholars in the past twenty-five or thirty years and we should respect the findings

---

<sup>24</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 241f.

<sup>25</sup> Hilprecht: *Op. Cit.*, p. 650.

of modern scholarship. Throughout this discussion and elsewhere we have used quotations from scholars who are regarded as authority in archaeology and history, and in many cases we have used their negative testimony along with that which is positive in support of Bible teaching and history. We believe it is fair to represent an author faithfully, and we think in our citing his negative testimony we do not destroy the value of his positive evidence. When such scholars give negative testimony based on opinion or speculation we are not bound to accept it, but when they give testimony based on facts of archaeology or of history from what is accepted as reliable sources, we must receive it as positive evidence. The giving of evidence based on opinion or speculation does not destroy the positive findings of archaeology and history, nor does it discredit the witness. If we are bound to accept all a witness says when he indulges in opinion or speculation (which, *if* properly stated, is always apparent), we would have to surrender the fight against evolution and higher criticism, and indeed nearly all forms of modernism. Finally, we conclude that the Bible is sustained by the findings of archaeological data—evidence that cannot be impeached.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER III

#### *Section I*—SCRIPTURE CONFIRMATIONS—EGYPTIAN

Personal names and places identified.

The Assouan Dam. Famines. One famine of seven years mentioned.

King Shishak. Scripture quotation. Inscription at Karnak.

Land of Goshen. Ramses II says he built city of Raamses with Semitic labor.

Brick found to be made with straw as described in Exodus.

#### *Section II*—THE HITTITES

Critics denied that such nation or tribe ever existed.

Inscription of Ramses II at temple of Karnak, Thebes.

Oldest diplomatic document in the world. Tel-El-Amarna tablets.

Hittite inscriptions. Recently deciphered.

#### *Section III*—BIBLE ONLY SOURCE OF MONOTHEISM

Monotheism attempted by Amenophis IV (Akhnaton IV). Discarded by his son-in-law, Tutankhamen, who returned to the old system of polytheism.

Influence of Israel in Egypt.

Israelites retained a pure monotheism among a people so thoroughly polytheistic.

#### *Section IV*—TEL-EL-AMARNA TABLETS

Letters in cuneiform. Assyrian language. On clay tablets. About the time of the exodus.



Israel in Egypt before the time of Moses.

Letters appeal to Amenophis III and Amenophis IV from petty vassal kings of Palestine and Phoenicia for help against the Hittites in the north and the Habiri in the south, who were invading their territory.

Glosses and their import.

Bible setting in Palestine confirmed.

#### *Section V—MERNEPTAH*

Pharaoh of the exodus. Not drowned in Red Sea. Mummy found. Scriptures do not say he went with his army in person into the Red Sea.

Merneptah's oldest son, named Merneptah, may have been victim of tenth plague.

Name of Israel found in the inscriptions of Merneptah. Appropriated.

"Israel is devastated and its seed destroyed." Meaning.

Determinative in front of each name indicating an independent nation settled in its own land and under its own government. This character omitted before the name of Israel which fact confirms the Bible history of a people in slavery.

#### *Section VI—THE PHARAOHS*

Names of Pharaohs. Of Oppression. Of Exodus.

New king knew not Joseph.

Who were these Pharaohs?

Evidence from Ex. 1: 11 combined with Naville's discoveries at Pithom.

Quotation from Kyle.

Ramses bequeathed his name. Statues of Ramses II and Ramses III.

Theory that Thothmes III built Raamses and Pithom not tenable.

If Thothmes III built these store cities, it follows that Ramses II erased name of builder (Thothmes III) and substituted his own.

This also requires that Thothmes II tampered with the record of Moses.

Manetho's chronology. Modernists fix date of Ramses II about 200 years after Moses. System based on Manetho's chronology. Manetho's chronology preserved only in quotations.

Quotation from James Baikie.

Sothic cycle. Unreliable.

Of Joseph. Two views.

Of the Oppression. Views of various scholars on date of Oppression and the Exodus, and on date of Ramses II and Merneptah.

Reasons for rejecting Manetho's chronology. Harmony is reached by putting Ramses back 200 to 250 years.

Of the Exodus. Scholars not agreed on date of Exodus nor on date of Ramses II. Result of late dating. Facts of history will not fit a false chronology, but will synchronize with the Bible.

Egyptian chronology not dependable. Different bases. Manetho's record and chronology not reliable.

Connection of Ramses II with Pithom established by Naville.

Name of Ramses II on sandstone and granite blocks and bricks, also name of Ramses II on bricks used in building granaries near Pithom.

Quotation from Hilprecht. Quotation from W. Max Muller. His unwarranted assumption that Israel was settled in Palestine at time of Merneptah's boasted victory over this people. This assumption controverted by a determinative on Merneptah's inscription.

Quotation from M. G. Kyle.

Claim that Israel was settled near Tyre at time of Merneptah's reference based on position of said reference in the inscription.

The only recorded contact between Israel and the Pharaoh of the Exodus was at the Red Sea. Merneptah probably wrote his annals during wilderness wanderings.

Had Merneptah gained such a victory as he records after Israel had settled in Palestine, some 200 years after the Exodus, it would have fallen in the time of the judges. That such a conflict is not mentioned in book of Judges is significant.

Historical setting. Quotations from A. H. Sayce. Evidence from the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. Annals of Ramses II indicate that Canaan is not yet Israelite in his time.

Evidence of Sayce acceptable when giving the findings of archaeology and history, but his testimony based on opinion or on a false system of chronology fixed by critics cannot be accepted as authority.

Conclusion.

## CHAPTER IV

### LIGHT FROM THE ANCIENT EAST

#### *Section I*—CUNEIFORM WRITING DECIPHERED

**Pioneers in the Decipherment.** The knowledge of the cuneiform writing, like that of the Egyptian hieroglyphs, had been lost for some twenty centuries until its decipherment about 1835. In 1802, Grotefend, a German scholar, while studying Persian inscriptions brought from Persepolis by Nieber, noted that a number of them began with three words, and that one of them varied while the others remained the same. He conjectured that the varying word might be the name of a king, and fixed upon Darius as the most likely name. This gave him six letters. He then guessed another name to be that of Xerxes which proved to be correct. It was a natural surmise that the accompanying phrase might be "king of kings," which also proved to be true, and increased the number of letters for his use. These ingenious guesses brought the first light on deciphering cuneiform writing. Grotefend's work was not altogether a blind guess, for he had learned the history of Persia and knew these names as kings of that country, and he knew enough of the weakness and vainglory of ancient kings to understand their claims of superiority and greatness. Grotefend's efforts gave an alphabet which was published in 1837. But the credit for the interpretation of the language belongs to others, especially to the French scholar, Burnouf, and to Sir Henry Rawlinson, an English scholar. Burnouf studied the Avesta of Zoroaster and observed the similarity of the ancient Persian to the Sanscrit, the latter being a known language. This gave him a working basis, and his efforts contributed much to the final decipherment of the cuneiform writing.

#### *Section II*—THE BEHISTUN INSCRIPTION

**A Trilingual Inscription.** In 1835, Sir Henry Rawlinson studied the great inscription on the rock of Behistun (Persia). This was found to be trilingual (consisting of three languages), the *Zend or Persian*, the *Semitic Assyrian*, and the *Median*. The subject matter of the three inscriptions was identical, like that of the Rosetta Stone, giving an account of the conquests of Darius Hystaspes in 518 B.C. By study and comparison of one with the other of these records the secret of cuneiform was fully solved. Rawlinson's work was pub-

lished in 1847 about the time of Mr. Layard's discoveries at Nineveh, where the secrets of prehistoric times have been brought to light in greater measure than at any other place in the world.

The story of the Behistun inscription is a most fascinating one. The inscription is at an elevation of some 350 feet from the ground where it could be reached only by scaffolding. It is on the north side of the mountain which rises to a height of 1,700 feet. Mr. Rawlinson is quoted as saying: "But the real wonder of the work consists in the inscriptions. For extent, for beauty of execution, for uniformity and correctness, they are perhaps unequalled in the world." It is said that "where the stone was defective pieces were fitted in with molten lead." When the engraving was finished a coat of varnish gave a more perfect outline and affords protection from the elements.

**Annals of Darius Hystaspes.** It is said that the first paragraph of this wonderful inscription began, "I am Darius the great king," and that the other paragraphs of the first column begin with, "Says Darius the king." Rawlinson is said to have translated five columns, ranging from thirty-five to ninety-six lines each, establishing his hereditary title to the throne of Persia and his genealogy through eight generations. They give the provinces of his empire and his conquests over his enemies. The inscription includes a figure of the monarch with bow in hand and the prostrate figure of a man under his foot. The figures of nine rebels stand chained together by the neck.

**Greatest Achievement in Archaeology.** The translation of the Behistun inscription is accounted as the greatest achievement ever made in the field of language or archaeology. This Babylonian-Assyrian cuneiform language is Semitic in character, a half sister to the Hebrew of the Old Testament. It has opened up the records of the entire Mesopotamia!! valley and brings to light invaluable knowledge in the fields of history, chronology, geography, and commerce as each pertains to the life of the ancient Hebrews. This knowledge reveals the tremendous influence and power of Babylonia, and its subject, people, and particularly how the life of Israel was profoundly affected, and how color was given to many phases of her history, yet without affecting or influencing Israel's religious code.

### *Section III*—ASHURBANIPAL'S LIBRARY AT NINEVEH

**Golden Age of Assyrian Literature.** The age of Ashurbanipal (668 to 626 B.C.) was the golden age of Assyrian literature. This

king was a patron of literature, and he gathered together in his library at Nineveh the literary products of Assyria and Babylonia. The books consisted of clay tablets on which the writing was done with a square-ended instrument called a stylus while the clay was soft and pliable, and then the tablet was burnt and became practically indestructible. These clay tablets or books were arranged systematically in departments of legal documents, history, poetry, religion, magic, etc., just as we find in a modern library. There were chronological lists giving names of many kings of Assyria with the length of their reigns and the leading achievements of some of them. There were astronomical reports, mathematical calculations, tables of weights and measures. There were hundreds of psalms and hymns and prayers, incantations and mythological texts. Many diplomatic documents, letters, addresses, etc., were found. Vast numbers of tablets treat of astrology, medicine, and religion.

**Key to Assyrian and Sumerian Languages.** Among the most important records are those in the form of sign lists and syllabaries; lists of animals, plants, stones, temples, deities, cities, rivers, mountains, countries, etc. Lists of synonyms, verbal forms, and grammatical exercises for use of school children and a large number of bilingual texts furnish the chief source of making grammars and lexicons of both the Assyrian and Sumerian languages. The forms of words contained in exercises gave the declension of nouns and pronouns and the conjugation of verbs, so that ample material was placed in the hands of modern scientists for fully deciphering the language, and the bilingual texts containing Assyrian and the more ancient Sumerian writings arranged in parallel columns, recording the same matter in two languages, gave the clue to unlocking the Sumerian writing which is indeed very ancient, dating back to the time of Nimrod, the mighty hunter (Gen. 10:9, 10).

A similar library has been discovered in Nippur, which gives verbal forms and exercises and instructions for translating from Sumerian into Babylonian, etc. It is thought that only a small portion of this library has yet been excavated. Scholars generally think the books of the library at Nineveh were copied from this library at Nippur, and the fact that the books of Nineveh and other Assyrian cities appear to be copies of Babylonian and Chaldean originals points to the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf as the real cradle of this wonderful civilization.

**Chronology Fixed.** The later chronology has long been fixed by the lists or archons found in the library at Nineveh which go back to 911 B.C. The beginning of the kings' reigns is given and the principal events of some of them. Assyrian chronology is certain from about 911 B.C. to 666 B.C. An eclipse of the sun is stated to have been visible in the month Sivan, 763 B.C., and this has been calculated by astronomers to have occurred June 15th of that year.

At Nineveh there is a mound called Nebi-Yunus, Arabic for the prophet Jonah, which tradition says is the burying place of Jonah. Mr. Layard used strategy to secure the privilege of excavating this mound and agreed to dig a cellar for an Arab who proposed to build a house on the spot, and continued his digging till he found the palace of Esarhaddon, the son of Sennacherib. On account of the fanaticism of the Moslems, however, the work was stopped.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IV

##### *Section I—CUNEIFORM WRITING DECIPHERED*

Pioneers in the decipherment. Grotefend, a German scholar.

Knowledge of the cuneiform writing had been lost, like the Egyptian hieroglyphs, for some twenty centuries until deciphered about 1835.

The French scholar, Burnouf, and Sir Henry Rawlinson, an English scholar, entitled to the credit of interpreting the cuneiform writing. Similar to Sanscrit of the Avesta.

##### *Section II—THE BEHISTUN INSCRIPTION*

A trilingual inscription. Three languages named.

Deciphered by Sir Henry Rawlinson and published in 1847.

Annals of Darius Hystaspes in 518 B.C.

Fascinating story. Inscription at an elevation of about 350 feet.

The rock of the mountainside was faced and the writing inscribed thereon. Where the stone was defective pieces were fitted in with molten lead.

Rawlinson translated five columns, ranging from thirty-five to ninety-six lines each.

This translation classed as the greatest achievement in archaeology.

##### *Section III—ASHURBANIPAL'S LIBRARY AT NINEVEH*

Golden age of Assyrian literature.

The book consisted of clay tablets inscribed with a square-ended instrument called a stylus while the clay was soft and pliable, and then they were burnt like brick.

Arrangement in departments of legal, history, poetry, religion, magic, etc., similar to our modern libraries.

Chronological lists giving names of kings, length of reign, etc.

Vast numbers of tablets treat of astrology, medicine, and religion.

Most important are sign lists and syllabaries; lists of animals, plants, stones, temples, deities, etc. Lists of synonyms, verbal forms, and a large number of bilingual texts.

Key to the Assyrian and Sumerian languages.

A similar library at Nippur.

Chronology fixed by the archons found at Nineveh, giving the names of kings and the length of their reign.

Eclipse of the sun recorded in 763 B.C., which has been calculated by astronomers to have occurred on June 15 of that year.

Mr. Layard's experience at Nebi-Yunus in Nineveh, where he discovered the palace of Esarhaddon, son of Sennacherib.

## CHAPTER V

### THE CRADLE OF CIVILIZATION

#### *Section I—MESOPOTAMIA*

**The Kingdom of Nimrod.** Nearly 4,000 years ago, the country known as Babylonia, which was perhaps the most fertile portion of Mesopotamia, or land between the rivers (Tigris and Euphrates), was inhabited by two tribes or nations of people, the Akkadians in the north and the Sumerians in the south. These two peoples were the earliest inhabitants of Babylonia, so far as our knowledge goes. At an early date Nimrod, the great grandson of Noah, was a mighty king, of whom it is said, "The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar"—Sumer (Gen. 10:10). The same record (Gen. 10:11) tells us that out of that land Nimrod "went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city)."

**Mesopotamian Chronology.** When Semitic invaders came in they united with the Sumerians (inhabitants of Shinar). It is thought the Sumerians invented the cuneiform writing. Aside from the Bible account quoted above, Mesopotamian chronology begins with the name of the great king, Sargon I, whose seat of government was Akkad in the northern division of the country. The date of this king is not known with certainty, and a long period of time elapsed before our next sure date, that of the conquest of Babylonia by the Elamites. At this time Babylon was already a great city and the capital of the country. The Babylonians and Assyrians engaged in wars often until about 690 B.C. when Babylonia was captured by Sennacherib and the walls of Babylon razed to the ground. The two peoples were then united, and Babylon was restored and fortified by Nabopolassar and Nebuchadrezzar, and became the great city described in history.

**Sennacherib** (705-681 B.C.) succeeded Sargon II of Assyria. To Bible students he is the most familiar king of Assyria. His records of his own campaigns, his conquests, and his cruelties corroborate most remarkably the character attributed to him in the books of Kings and Isaiah.

The most stupendous Assyrian campaign against Judah touching the Old Testament occurred in 701 B.C. One would hardly expect to



find in Sennacherib's record of that campaign anything that would discount the valor of the Assyrian troops. On the other hand, the Biblical record describes the campaign from the viewpoint of Judah's annalist. In some respects each account supplements the other, and, while it is true that many gaps are not filled, yet they can be harmonized to present a "reasonably complete account of the expedition."

*Section II—ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA*

**Israel's Code Not Influenced by Environment.** Modernists claim the Jews borrowed their religion from their neighbors, and that the Bible is made up of myths and legends taken from Babylonia, Assyria, Chaldea, and Egypt. They lay great stress on the seventy years of Babylonian captivity, during which time they think the Jews imbibed much of the Babylonian religion and customs which they think became fixed in the form of codes at the end of their captivity under the leadership of Ezra. The proofs they offer have already been examined and found not based on facts but on fancy and speculation and because they want them to fit their theory.

It is freely admitted that the Jews were greatly influenced in their conduct by the religious customs and practices of their neighbors, and their history abounds with a sad record of disobedience and transgression of the law which they held to have come from God. But while their conduct was greatly influenced *their religious code was not corrupted or influenced by the idolatry and polytheism of the peoples surrounding them.* Often did the Israelites wander away from monolatry; lapses in their religious life were frequent. They passed through a series of declines and falls and revivals until finally, because of their unfaithfulness to Jehovah, they were carried into captivity. This experience produced an intense abhorrence of everything that savored of heathenism, and never since the return from Babylon have they been charged with worshiping false gods.

The Bible teaching maintains throughout a most noble and benign purpose, pure motives, and the highest character of morality to be found anywhere in the world. Had it been given from the experiences and opinions of men unguided by divine inspiration, who can believe it would not have included at least some of the leading doctrines and ethics of the people who influenced the practices of the Jews? It is strange that in borrowing from the Babylonians, as the critics claim, they failed to borrow their leading tenets of polytheism, of worship of images, of magic, soothsaying, sorcery, astrology, etc., but instead

of doing so their code uniformly opposes and condemns all such teaching and practice.

**Early History Transmitted by Tradition.** The fact that we find the Babylonians and Chaldeans offering animal sacrifices before the time of Moses is no proof that the Jews borrowed the rite from them. Abel offered animal sacrifices in the beginning, and no doubt the early history of the world was handed down by tradition through the patriarchs to all the people of the world. Adam lived 930 years; Methuselah lived 243 years contemporary with Adam and about 100 years with Shem, the son of Noah. Shem also lived 500 years after the flood, 150 years with Abraham, and 50 years with Isaac, his son. In this way the early history of the world could have come down to Abraham (cir. 2000 B.C.) through three persons, Adam, Methuselah, and Shem. It is a significant fact that Abraham lived in Ur of the Chaldees, where the most ancient records have been found confirming the Bible. It is not unreasonable to suppose that these ancient patriarchs imparted to their descendants and through them to the entire world the leading facts of the history of the world, as well as the religious practices of the patriarchs. Indeed it would be unreasonable to suppose they did not do so.

**Enoch**, the father of Methuselah, was a teacher of morals, as it is said he "walked with God." He taught a future judgment and the coming of the Lord with 10,000 of his saints to punish the wicked (Jude 14, 15). He was translated to heaven, body and soul and spirit, while Seth, the son of Adam, was yet living. At the time of Enoch's translation, the patriarchs from Seth to Lamech, the father of Noah, were all adults, so that all the generations from Seth to Noah had the advantage of the teaching and life and translation of Enoch. If the Greek philosophers did not get their ideas of God and of immortality from the patriarchs in this way, we could scarcely even suggest a reasonable way by which they obtained these ideas. Did they not borrow from the Phoenicians, and they in turn from the Egyptians, who got their knowledge of God and immortality from the Abrahamic family in Ur of the Chaldees? If they got their language and alphabet through this channel why not their ideas of God and morality and immortality? But for tradition Plato and Socrates would never have known anything of the immortality of the soul.<sup>1</sup> It is not subject to scientific discovery. Paul says, "The world through

---

<sup>1</sup> A. Campbell: "Popular Lectures and Addresses," p. 108.

its wisdom knew not God" (1 Cor. 1:21), and again, "Now the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him: and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged" (1 Cor. 2:14).

Finally one may ask if these things were handed down by tradition, oral or written, "Why were they not the property of other peoples than the Jews?" The task before us is to show that other peoples held to traditions which, in many features, were very similar to the accounts given in the Hebrew sacred literature, and while the facts have been greatly corrupted by their corrupted religion, they may be identified with the Bible account. It would be unreasonable to suppose that in corrupting their religion they would so thoroughly depart from the original tradition that no item could be identified. While the use and purpose of animal sacrifices were lost sight of the Babylonians retained the rite itself in a corrupted form.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER V

#### *Section I—MESOPOTAMIA*

The kingdom of Nimrod.

Built cities in Assyria.

Semitic invaders. Sumerians.

Mesopotamian chronology. Sargon I.

Babylonia conquered by the Elamites. Babylon already a great city.

Babylonia captured by Sennacherib, 690 B.C. The walls of Babylon razed to the ground. Restored under Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar.

Sennacherib succeeded Sargon II of Assyria. His character.

Assyrian campaign against Judah. Sennacherib's record in harmony with the Biblical record.

#### *Section II—ASSYRIA AND BABYLONIA*

Israel's code not influenced by environment.

Critics claim Israel's religion borrowed and that it was fixed by contact with Babylonia during the exile. No proof.

While Israel's code of religion was not influenced by contact with Babylonia, their history abounds with a sad record of disobedience and transgression of their law.

Had the Bible originated from the experiences and opinions of uninspired men as claimed by critics, it would have included at least some of the leading tenets of their neighbors—polytheism, worship of images, magic, astrology, etc.

Early history transmitted by tradition—through Adam, Methuselah, and Shem to Abraham.

Greeks got their ideas of God and immortality by the same means by which they got their language and alphabet—from the Phoenicians who got it from the Egyptians, and these in turn from the Chaldeans.

Plato and Socrates. Knowledge of immortality of the soul came by revelation—not subject to scientific discovery. See Paul. Original tradition corrupted.

## CHAPTER VI

### THE TRUTH IN CUNEIFORM

#### *Section I—SCRIPTURE CONFIRMATIONS—CUNEIFORM*

"The only ancient authority of value on Babylonian and Assyrian history is the Old Testament" (Enc. Britannica, Vol. 3, p. 101, 13th edition, 1926). But in recent years the Bible account has been corroborated and confirmed at every point of contact with archaeology, and these points of contact are many. Notwithstanding the claims of modernists to the contrary, the fact remains that in no case have the cuneiform records shown the Bible account to be incorrect.

**Discoveries at Nineveh.** In 1874, Mr. Geo. Smith, an English explorer, took from the library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh some 30,000 clay tablets containing treatises on mythology, astronomy, chronology, grammatical exercises, religion, etc. He found many hymns, prayers, and incantations. Among them was a Chaldean account of the flood,<sup>1</sup> the story of the creation (fragments only), the fall of man, and a large number of tablets to complete the annals of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal, etc.

In 1882, Hormuzd Rassam discovered many antiquities at Sippara, some thirty miles north of Babylon, in a library of the Shamash temple, including sign lists, grammatical exercises, mathematical texts, letters, hymns, prayers, etc., and a bilingual version of the story of creation.

#### *Section II—AT BABYLON*

**Desolation of Babylonia.** Like Nineveh, Babylon has always been identified by local tradition, though it was in utter ruins by the end of the first century. Isaiah's prophecy (13:19-22) that it should never be rebuilt or inhabited has been fulfilled literally to this day. In fall and winter Babylon is dry and a "desert of sand," but in spring and summer it is a marsh, a "wilderness of the sea" (Isa. 21:1). The innumerable canals which once crossed the rich alluvial plains of Babylonia, bringing life and joy and industry to every village and field, are now choked up with rubbish and earth. No longer fed by the Euphrates and Tigris, they are dried up, "a drought is upon her waters" (Jer. 50:38, 39).

---

<sup>1</sup> Geo. Smith: "Assyrian Discoveries" (1875), pp. 13, 97, 100, 184ff, 397.

Hillah is a large town near the site of ancient Babylon, where may be seen many evidences of the activities of Nebuchadrezzar. The large public square and some of the streets are paved with bricks bearing the name of Nebuchadrezzar and some of the houses are constructed of them.

The annals of Nebuchadrezzar containing 619 lines on a column of stone found by Sir Harford Jones at Babylon have been translated and reveal many scripture names and facts. Among these is an account of his conquest of Egypt which was predicted by Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel, Isaiah and Ezekiel both giving the name of Nebuchadrezzar as the future conqueror.<sup>2</sup>

**Babylon Destroyed Forever.** In Isa. 13:19-22 we are told that Babylon shall never be inhabited, nor dwelt in from generation to generation.

Neither shall the Arabian pitch tent there; neither shall shepherds make their flocks to lie down there. But wild beasts of the desert shall lie there; and their houses shall be full of doleful creatures; and ostriches shall dwell there, and wild goats shall dance there. And wolves shall cry in their castles, and jackals in the pleasant palaces.

So long as Babylon remains desolate, so long do we have incontestable proof of the genuineness of the records of the Old Testament.

**Utter Destruction of Walls of Babylon.** Jer. 51: 58 says:

Thus saith Jehovah of hosts: The broad walls of Babylon shall be utterly overthrown, and her high gates shall be burned with fire; and the peoples shall labor for vanity.

In order to show how literally this prophecy of Jeremiah has been fulfilled, we take the liberty of giving a rather lengthy quotation from "Asshur and the Land of Nimrod," p. 402:

The most wonderful of all destructions that have ever taken place in the world is the non-existence of even a small remnant of that prodigious wall of Babylon, which was said to have been sixty miles in circumference; three hundred and fifty feet in height, and seventy-five feet in width. Herodotus says that "on the top of the wall, at the edges, they built dwellings of one story fronting each other, and they left a space between these dwellings sufficient for turning a chariot with four horses" (Herodotus I, 179) . . . it is marvelous that not even a speck of it can now be traced, though there has been no lack of ardent researchers and explorers, who have strained their wits to fix a certain spot or limit to their conjectures, but failed to do so. I myself have had ample opportunity to arrive at a definite conclusion, and have met with the same disappointing result. The reality of the utter extinction of that

---

<sup>2</sup> Cuneiform syllabic signs yield Nabu-kudurri-utsur ("Nebo protect the boundary") Nebuchadrezzar.

gigantic wall seems the more astonishing when there are other Babylonian city walls still in existence, almost entire, not far from Babylon.

Consider it as we may, it is certainly most puzzling to determine where the site of ancient Babylon begins and where it ends.

Hormuzd Rassam in his splendid work quoted above quotes further from Herodotus as follows:

As they dug the moat they made bricks of the earth that was taken out, and when they had molded a sufficient number they baked them in kilns (Herodotus I, 179).

Berosus, Diodorus, and others also mention that the walls were partly built of burnt bricks cemented with asphalt ("Asshur and the Land of Nimrod," p. 362).

The same author throws further light on the subject as follows:

The complete demolition of that famous wall can only be accounted for by its construction; as we are told by Herodotus that "a moat, deep, wide, and full of water, ran entirely round the city, of which the wall was built"; and, as a matter of course, when the invaders were bent upon the destruction of what caused the Medo-Persian conquerors immense trouble in the capture of Babylon, it was no difficult matter to throw the debris back into the ditch from whence it was dug out. It has been suggested that while the walls were built of burnt bricks like those in the walls of Birs Nimroud, Abu-Habba, and other near-by cities whose walls are still standing, they were "not hard baked," and that the plowing of the soil from year to year, the digging of new canals and watercourses for irrigation purposes, and the "accumulation of alluvial deposit, for so many centuries, have covered the old ruins to such a degree as to make the land appear as if it was in its natural state, or the alleged burnt bricks were of that nature as to decompose to powder after a short space of time, when they are protected by a coating of bitumen" (*Ibid.*, 362).

Since Mr. Rassam's explorations in Babylon in 1882, others have carried on more extensive work there. Dr. R. Koldewey, a German explorer, has been digging in the ruins of Babylon for a number of years and has located some portions of the remains of the great walls of Babylon which he has shown on a plan of the city.

### *Section III*—AT THE TOWER OF BABEL

**Ruins of.** Several ruins have been identified by different explorers as the site of the ancient "tower of Babel," but the preponderance of evidence seems to point to one called Birs, a corruption of the ancient name Borsippa, a suburb of Babylon, one of whose mounds is the tallest now remaining in Babylonia, rising 156 feet above the plain. Dr. Banks gives the following description of the mound:

From its summit projects an insurmountable wall of brick masonry; at its base are scattered huge masses of fused bricks hurled down by the lightning

which plays about it during every passing thunder-shower. Though Rawlinson dug about the base of the tower, confirming Herodotus' description of its several stages, the greater part of it is yet unexplored.<sup>3</sup>

Dr. Banks tells of his attendants, the Arabs, hurling fragments of brick at an owl perched in the tower in an effort to dislodge it, but they failed, and the words of Isaiah, "Owls shall dwell there," were literally fulfilled, "and the owl, high above where no man would dare to climb, was left to its secure solitude in full possession of the tower of Babel."

We are told that Kerr Porter on his second visit to the tower observed three majestic lions taking the air on the heights of the pyramid. The identity of this mound as the Biblical tower of Babel seems likely from its great height (156 feet) and from local tradition, coupled with Nebuchadrezzar's record found in its corner by Rawlinson, giving an account of his repairing it. The record agrees with the Bible story that it was not finished by its builders. Nebuchadrezzar's record says it was built by a former king who failed to "finish its summit and that it fell to ruins in ancient times." Many of its bricks bear the name of Nebuchadrezzar.<sup>4</sup>

#### *Section IV*—INFLUENCE OF DANIEL AND THE TRUE GOD

"Now I, Nebuchadnezzar, praise and extol and honor the King of heaven; for all his works are truth, and his ways justice; and those that walk in pride he is able to abase" (Dan. 4:37). This account of the conversion of Nebuchadnezzar to the true God, for a time, seems confirmed by a prayer said to have been used or sanctioned by Nebuchadnezzar, discovered some time ago, as follows:

O eternal prince, "Lord of all being,"  
 As for the king whom thou lovest, and  
 Whose name thou hast proclaimed  
 As was pleasing to thee,  
 Do thou lead aright his life,  
 Guide him in a straight path.  
 I am the prince obedient to thee,  
 The creature of thy hand;  
 Thou hast created me, and  
 With dominion over all people  
 Thou hast intrusted me.  
 According to thy grace, O Lord,  
 Which thou dost bestow on all people,

---

<sup>3</sup> E. J. Banks: "Bismya, or the Lost City of Udab" (1912), pp. 92, 93.

<sup>4</sup> Josephus says this tower was built by Nimrod—"Jewish Antiquities," New York, American Book Exchange, 1880, Vol. I, p. 49.



Cause me to love thy supreme dominion,  
 And create in my heart  
 The worship of thy godhead,  
 And grant whatever is pleasing to thee  
 Because thou hast fashioned my life.

*Section V—UR OF THE CHALDEES AND BELSHAZZAR*

**Nabonidus' Record Mentioning Belshazzar.** Mughayyar now represents the site of ancient Ur of the Chaldees. This was fully established a few years ago when J. E. Taylor discovered fine barrel cylinders and large inscribed bricks in the ruins of the temple of the moon-god Sin. This temple is said to have been built by King Ur-Gur before the time of Abraham. The last king of Babylon, Nabonidus, repaired the temple and left a record of his work inscribed on these cylinders of clay, which he placed in the corners of the tower. Each of these cylinders closed with a prayer for the life of Belshazzar, his oldest son.

**Belshazzar and Cyrus.** Critics have disputed the Biblical claim that Belshazzar was king of Babylon at the time of its conquest by Cyrus, claiming that the inscriptions say Nabonidus was king, but the records clearly indicate that Belshazzar was crown prince and co-regent with his father, and it is, therefore, entirely correct to speak of him *as* king. According to Babylonian custom a contract was signed by the reigning king, Nabonidus, and his son, Belshazzar. This is said to be confirmed fully by a tablet now in Yale University, which also gives the interpretation of a dream of Nabonidus and his son, Belshazzar. While Daniel may have been the interpreter, his name is not mentioned. Belshazzar was defeated when Cyrus took the city of Babylon, and was murdered soon after. An inscription of Cyrus tells of his returning "to their dwellings" all the people captured from beyond the Tigris. This is in perfect accord with the Bible record regarding the conduct of Cyrus.

*Section VI—AT KHORSABAD*

**Sargon of Assyria.** The great inscription discovered by Botta, a French explorer, in the palace of Khorsabad, not far from Nineveh, in 1844, begins with this heading: "Palace of Sargon, the great king, the powerful king, king of the legions, king of Assyria, viceroy of the gods at Babylon, king of the Sumers and of the Accads, favorite

of the great gods."<sup>5</sup> He recites that he besieged and occupied the city of Samaria, took 27,280 captives and fifty chariots; that he placed his lieutenants over them, and renewed the obligation imposed on them by one of his predecessors, Tiglath-Pileser II, whom he refused to acknowledge (2 Kings 15:29).

Until 1844 skeptical scholars claimed there was no such king of Assyria as Sargon, the name being found only in Isa. 20:1 which reads as follows: "In the year that Tartan came unto Ashdod, when Sargon the king of Assyria sent him, and he fought against Ashdod and took it." Among the inscriptions of Sargon found in his palace at Khorsabad, we find not only the name of this great king, but the confirmation of this particular scripture in Sargon's own words:

Azuri, king of Ashdod, determined within himself to render no more tribute, etc. ... I marched against Ashdod with my warriors, who did not leave the trace of my feet. I besieged and took Ashdod.

This bit of history is given by the prophet Isaiah to fix the date of his prophecy against Egypt which follows the passage quoted. It is a most striking confirmation, not only of the facts contained in the passage, but at the same time fixes the date of Isaiah's prophecy.

#### *Section VII—IZDUBAR (OR GISDUBAR) AS NIMROD*

**Bible Setting of Nimrod Confirmed.** In Gen. 10 we are told that Nimrod was the son of Cush and that Cush was the son of Ham. The brief history of Nimrod reads:

And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before Jehovah: wherefore it is said, Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before Jehovah. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel, and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land he went forth into Assyria, and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city) (Gen. 10:8-12).

The land of Shinar is known to be the Sumer of the inscriptions located in southern Babylonia, and the cities named have all been identified in modern times as historical places of ancient times. This passage gives the name of a great king who flourished about 2200 B.C., and his genealogy as the great grandson of Noah, besides the extent of his kingdom and the cities he built. It states that Babel (Babylon) and the other cities were in existence before Nineveh; that Assyria

---

<sup>5</sup> This palace is probably equal in magnificence to any ever built, covering as it did some twenty-five acres. It was erected at Khorsabad, a few miles above Nineveh, in 706 B.C., and discovered in 1842 by M. Botta, French consul to Mosul.

was colonized from Babylon; and that the founder of both Babylonia and Assyria was a Cushite of the family of Ham. Until the time of the Assyrian discoveries these statements were all denied by scholars who did not accept the Bible history. The generally accepted view was that Nineveh was before Babylon, and that the Babylonians as well as the Assyrians were Semites. Modern research has shown all these statements of the Bible to be correct and the skeptical scholars wrong. And if the historical setting is established as true, we have no reason to doubt the existence of Nimrod as a great historical character.

Izdubar (Gisdubar) or Nimrod and His Epic. At Dur-Sargina (Khorsabad), where the palace of Assyrian monarchs stood about 3,000 years ago, there were two gigantic figures located between the winged bulls carved in high relief at the door of the royal palace. These figures are exactly alike and are believed to represent a single person, identified by scholars as Nimrod, the mighty hunter, of Gen. 10.<sup>6</sup> He is dressed in a royal robe and represents great strength and dignity. What is called the epic of Izdubar gives the exploits of this hero (Izdubar or Nimrod). The epic recites his conflicts with fierce monsters, half-human scorpions, bulls and winged griffins. This epic is supposed to have been written about 2000 B.C., but the copy translated from was made about 600 B.C. It was found by George Smith in 1871 in Ashurbanipal's library at Nineveh.

**Confirmation of Genesis.** The interesting feature of this epic *is* its reference to a number of important items of the scriptures, including the Garden of Eden (Eridu), the tree of life having life-giving power, the deluge, hell, heaven, hades, a resurrection, and even the translation of a righteous character to heaven (like Enoch). It refers to Ishtar (Ashtoreth of the Bible). While including many gods, it gives one supreme God who is the creator of all things and who made man from the dust of the earth.

#### *Section VIII—AT NINEVEH*

**Site of Nineveh.** While tradition has all along identified the site of ancient Nineveh which was built by Nimrod and destroyed by the Medes (606 B.C.), its location was, for a long time, a matter of doubt among scholars until confirmed by the explorations of modern times. Local tradition among the Arabs claims a certain Mohammedan mosque there contains the tomb of Jonah, and they identified the

---

<sup>6</sup>Smith: pp. 14, 165ft.

"Mound of Repentance" where it is claimed that the Ninevites put on sackcloth and sat in ashes. The walls of Nineveh still remain 125 feet high in places.

### **Specific Confirmation by Sennacherib.**

Now in the fourteenth year of king Hezekiah did Sennacherib king of Assyria come against all the fortified cities of Judah, and took them. And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria to Lachish, saying, I have offended; return from me: that which thou puttest on me will I bear. And the king of Assyria appointed unto Hezekiah king of Judah three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. And Hezekiah gave him all the silver that was found in the house of Jehovah, and in the treasures of the king's house. At that time did Hezekiah cut off the gold from the doors of the temple of Jehovah, and from the pillars which Hezekiah king of Judah had overlaid, and gave it to the king of Assyria (2 Kings 18:13-16).

The annals of Sennacherib, discovered in his palace in Nineveh in 1850 by Mr. Layard, tell of his invasion of Judea and of the submission of Hezekiah with the deportation of some of the Jews. They also specify the tribute taken from Hezekiah by Sennacherib, including three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold. A more definite confirmation could hardly be.

In one wing of the great palace of Sennacherib in Nineveh we are told that there is a series of thirteen slabs on the walls which pictures King Sennacherib seated on his throne and surrounded by his army. In the distance is a scene of deadly conflict in which spearmen and archers and slingers attack a fortified city. The picture shows a portion of the city already taken and represents the awful carnage of Assyrians impaling or flaying their victims. The scene includes a long procession of men and women and children with camels and vehicles approaching the monarch. Just above the king's head are these words: "Sennacherib, king of the universe, king of Assyria, sat upon a throne and reviewed the spoil of the city of Lachish."<sup>7</sup>

**Sennacherib Silent as to His Failure.** Of course, Sennacherib did not record his utter failure three years later in a siege against Jerusalem recorded in the eighteenth and nineteenth chapters of 2 Kings, where the Lord said through the prophet Isaiah: "I will put my hook in thy nose and my bridle in thy lips and I will return thee back by the way by which thou earnest" (19:28; Isa. 37:29). The Bible states that in one night, the last of the siege, the angel of the Lord smote 185,000 of the Assyrian army in the camp. Byron has

---

<sup>7</sup> H. V. Hilprecht: "Explorations in Bible Lands," p. 120; E. J. Banks: "Bible and the Spade," p. 138.

celebrated the event in the poem beginning, "The Assyrian came down like a wolf on the fold." Sennacherib's inscriptions make no reference to this calamity, but Herodotus does refer to it.<sup>8</sup> The next morning when the king found these corpses, he fled to Nineveh, where he was afterwards slain by two of his sons, and Esarhaddon came to the throne. Esarhaddon's annals are also found in the cuneiform inscriptions.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VI

##### *Section I—SCRIPTURE CONFIRMATIONS—CUNEIFORM*

Bible account corroborated and confirmed.

Discoveries at Nineveh. George Smith discovered 30,000 tablets in library of Ashurbanipal, dealing with various subjects.

Account of the flood, creation, fall of man, annals of Sennacherib, Esarhaddon, Ashurbanipal, etc.

Hormuzd Rassam at Sippara, in library of Shamash temple.

Sign lists, grammatical exercises, letters, hymns, etc., and a bilingual version of story of creation.

##### *Section II—AT BABYLON*

Desolation of Babylonia. In ruins by end of first century.

Isaiah's prophecy (13:19-22).

"Desert of sand." "Wilderness of the sea."

Hillah. Annals of Nebuchadrezzar—fulfillment of prophecies.

Destruction of Babylon complete and permanent (Isa. 13:19-22).

Destruction of walls of Babylon, fulfillment of Jer. 51:58.

Quotation from Hormuzd Rassam. Quotation from Herodotus.

Bricks from moat. Not hard burnt.

Dr. R. Koldewey discovered remains of the great walls.

##### *Section III—AT THE TOWER OF BABEL*

Ruins of Birs as "Tower of Babel." Suburb of Babylon. Height 156 feet.

Quotation from Dr. Banks. "Owls shall dwell there."

Kerr Porter observed three lions on the mound.

Identity as the Biblical tower of Babel seems likely from its great height, and from local tradition with Nebuchadrezzar's record found in its corner by Rawlinson.

Nebuchadrezzar's record says it was "built by a former king who failed to finish its summit and that it fell to ruins in ancient times."

##### *Section IV—INFLUENCE OF DANIEL AND THE TRUE GOD*

Prayer said to have been used or sanctioned by Nebuchadrezzar.

<sup>8</sup> Berosus, a priest of Babylon, who lived about 260 B.C., is quoted by Josephus as follows: "Now when Sennacherib was returning from his Egyptian war to Jerusalem, he found his army under Rabshakeh, his general, in danger by a plague, for God had sent a pestilential distemper upon his army; and on the very first night of the siege a hundred and eighty-five thousand, with their captains and generals, were destroyed"—"Jewish Antiquities," New York, American Book Exchange, 1880, Vol. I, p. 357.

*Section V—UR OF THE CHALDEES AND BELSHAZZAR*

Site of Ur identified by J. E. Taylor.

Temple of the moon-god Sin said to have been built by King Ur-Gur before the time of Abraham.

Temple repaired by Nabonidus, last king of Babylon, who deposited a record of his work in corners of the tower. Mentions the name of his son, Belshazzar.

Belshazzar and Cyrus.

Critics deny that Belshazzar was king.

Contract tablet at Yale University signed by Nabonidus and his son, Belshazzar.

Record of the interpretation of a dream of Nabonidus and his son, Belshazzar.

Belshazzar defeated and murdered.

Inscription of Cyrus telling of his returning to their dwellings all the people captured from beyond the Tigris.

*Section VI—AT KHORSABAD*

Sargon of Assyria. His palace at Khorsabad and his inscriptions. Isa. 20:1 confirmed in detail, when critics were saying there was no such king of Assyria. This also fixes the date of Isaiah's prophecy, which was evidently the purpose of the prophet in mentioning the incident.

*Section VII—IZDUBAR (OR GISDUBAR) AS NIMROD*

Bible setting of Nimrod confirmed. Gen. 10:8-12 quoted.

The cities named in the land of Shinar (Sumer) in southern Babylonia all identified.

Cities existed before Nineveh contrary to critical view.

The founder of Babylonia and Assyria a Cushite of the family of Ham contrary to the critical view that the Babylonians and the Assyrians were Semites.

The detailed setting being correct, there is no reason to doubt the existence of Nimrod as a great historical character.

Izdubar (Gisdubar) or Nimrod and his epic.

Believed to be represented by two gigantic figures at the door of the royal palace at Dur-Sargina (Khorsabad).

Epic gives exploits of this hero. Found by George Smith, 1871, in library of Ashurbanipal at Nineveh.

Confirmation of Genesis. Items specified.

*Section VIII—AT NINEVEH*

Built by Nimrod, destroyed (606 B.C.) by the Medes. Site of.

Walls still remain 125 feet high in places.

Specific confirmation by Sennacherib's inscription. Scripture quotation (2 Kings 18:13-16).

Annals of Sennacherib in his palace discovered by Layard, 1850, confirming scriptures.

Scene of deadly conflict on walls of palace. Inscription over the figure of the king. Sennacherib silent as to his failure three years later in siege against Jerusalem.

Biblical record of disaster to his army confirmed. Herodotus and Berosus.

## CHAPTER VII

### NINEVEH AND JONAH

**Book of Jonah Historical.** Dr. Banks, in his excellent little book, "Bible and the Spade," says:

The author of the book [Jonah] seems to have known little of Nineveh, for if Jonah lived in the time of Jeroboam II, as we may infer from 2 Kings 14:25, Nineveh had not yet become the home of a king; it was merely a fishing hamlet.

He then concludes that the excavations have perhaps taught us to understand the book as its author intended it to be understood, not as literal history, but a beautiful allegory . . .<sup>1</sup>

Dr. Banks supports this view by a quotation from Sennacherib, who reigned as king of Assyria in Nineveh about 705 B.C., as follows:

I greatly enlarged the site of Nineveh; its outer and inner walls, which before my time did not exist, I built anew, and made as high as a mountain. The surrounding country, which had gone to ruin on account of lack of water, I irrigated. The people had no water; for the pouring of the rain from heaven they directed their eyes. I gave them to drink. ... I caused eighteen canals to be dug and to flow into the river Khauser. From the city Kisiri I brought the canal to Nineveh. I caused water to flow therein. ... I greatly enlarged the dwellings of Nineveh, my royal city; I repaired the old streets and widened those which were too narrow. I made it brilliant like the sun.<sup>2</sup>

From this Dr. Banks concludes that Nineveh was not a place of importance until 706 B.C., when Sennacherib, the "first of the kings of Assyria to live there," made it a place worthy of his residence. He argues from this that at the time of Jonah (cir. 822 B.C.) more than a hundred years before Sennacherib, Nineveh, instead of being "an exceeding great city of three days' journey," was only a fishing hamlet. Many people, including modernists, and a great number of professed preachers of the gospel, have taken the same view as that of Dr. Banks in regard to the import of the book of Jonah.

**Confirmation by Archaeology.** Since this argument has the appearance of being plausible, and is the chief argument against the historicity of the book of Jonah, it seems proper to give it some special attention. Mr. George Smith, in his "Assyrian Discoveries," pp. 90-93, gives a condensed history of Nineveh as obtained from the inscriptions and other sources:

---

<sup>1</sup> E. J. Banks: "Bible and the Spade," p. 152.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 149.

Nineveh was founded by Nimrod, king of Babylonia, and during the dominion of his successors, there stood here a temple to Ishtar, daughter of the god Hea. In the nineteenth century B.C. we find Assyria constituted into a monarchy, under rulers whose capital was at the city of Assur . . . and one of these . . . restored the old temple of Ishtar at Nineveh. After this, for some centuries, we hear nothing of Nineveh, until the reign of Assur-ubalid, 1400 B.C., who restored again the temple of Ishtar. From this time the city gradually rose until 1300 B.C., when Shalmaneser, king of Assyria, repaired the temple of Ishtar, now again in ruinous condition, and built a palace at Nineveh, making the city the seat of government.<sup>3</sup>

This process of decay and rebuilding continued through several centuries, the temple of Ishtar being rebuilt or repaired some five or six times, down to the time of "Assur-nazir-pal, who reigned 885 B.C.," and "rebuilt both the temple and palace with great splendor, and his example was followed by his son, Shalmaneser II, 860 B.C. . . . In 825 B.C., Samsi-Vul IV succeeded to the crown. He also adorned the temple of Ishtar." This history is gathered by George Smith, who made so many and such wonderful discoveries at Nineveh, and who is regarded as one of the greatest archaeologists of modern times. It proves beyond doubt that Nineveh was an ancient city, and that at the time of Jonah, 862-810 B.C., it had just been rebuilt with "great splendor." The name Rehoboth-Ir (Gen. 10:11) has not yet been found in the inscriptions, but Professor Delitzsch has suggested that it may be the *rebit Ninua* of the inscriptions northeast of Nineveh. If this be the case, the Nineveh of Jonah contained within it all the places in Gen. 10:11f., and Khorsabad besides. After the death of Tiglath-Pileser II, 745 B.C.

Nineveh was neglected in favor of a new royal city, built by Sargon II, 722 B.C., at Dur-Sargina (Khorsabad); but the temples were kept in repair, and Sargon restored the sanctuary of Nebo and Merodach. In the year 705 B.C. Sennacherib came to the throne, and he at once set to work to restore the glory of the great capital of Assyria. The old palace of Nineveh, the work of so many monarchs, had again fallen into decay, and he entirely removed it.

From this fact we can understand the statement of Sennacherib regarding his work of restoration and improvement, for the city had fallen into decay since the time of Jonah, when it was indeed a great city of three days' journey, though in keeping with the self-conceit

---

<sup>3</sup> George Smith says he discovered here "brick inscriptions of Shalmaneser, 1300 B.C., and his son, Tugulti-ninip, 1271 B.C., both of whom made restorations and additions to the temple of Ishtar"—"Assyrian Discoveries," p. 103. Also on his second journey to Mosul and Nineveh Mr. Smith says, on page 140: "Near the entrance to the great palace of Sennacherib ... I discovered inscriptions of Shalmaneser I, king of Assyria, 1300 B.C., recording that he founded the palace of Nineveh," and other evidences of the activities of this king and his successors at Nineveh are found.



of Sennacherib, he was no doubt guilty of gross exaggeration in his claims of the work he did.

But in further proof of the great antiquity of the city of Nineveh, which, according to Genesis, was built by Nimrod (2218 B.C., according to Usher), Khammurabi, a Babylonian king, who flourished in the time of Abraham (cir. 2000 B.C.), left a cuneiform record in which he enumerates Nineveh and Ashur among his possessions. Scholars are agreed as to the date of Khammurabi. So the proof is complete and specific that Nineveh was a great city of antiquity and at the time of Jonah it was "an exceeding great city."

**Critics Claim Support for Documentary Hypothesis.** Hostile critics refer to the fable of the trees given by Jotham and the parables of our Lord as proof that Bible writers used fiction to impress and emphasize truth, and claim this as license for classifying much of the Old Testament, including whole books as mere fiction or allegory.

They also assume that because Joshua refers to the book of Jashar, and other Old Testament writers quote the book of the covenant, the song of Deborah and Barak, the elegy of David over Saul and Jonathan, and refer to records and other books in confirmation of their own writings, the books are made up altogether of myths and legends compiled by a later writer who gives not his own name, but forges the name of Moses or some other ancient worthy as the real author.

Such arguments are too puerile to deserve discussion and are unworthy of serious scholarship. One could as well prove atheism from the Bible because the Bible contains the expression "There is no God," but in both cases the author is the same—a fool (Psalm 14:1; 53:1).

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VII

Book of Jonah denied by critics.

Quotation from Dr. E. J. Banks. Sennacherib's inscription.

The Bible account of the size and importance of Nineveh and its great antiquity established by archaeology. Quotation from George Smith.

Sargon's work was that of repairing and restoring rather than of original structures.

Khammurabi, king of Babylon, contemporary with Abraham, lists Nineveh and Ashur among his possessions.

Critics claim support for Documentary Hypothesis. Fable of trees given by Jotham. Parables of our Lord used as license for classifying much of the Old Testament, including whole books, as mere fiction or allegory.

Reference to other books or records claimed as proof of composite character of the Bible: Book of Jashar; book of the covenant; song of Deborah and Barak; elegy of David over Saul and Jonathan; reference to records and chronicles.

Could as well prove atheism from the Bible (Psalm 14:1; S3:1).

## CHAPTER VIII

### ANCIENT HEBREW RECORDS CONFIRMED

#### *Section I*—THE CHALDEAN ACCOUNT OF THE DELUGE AND ISRAELIS RELIGION

**Epic of Izdubar (Gisdubar) or Nimrod.** While the early literature of many nations contains accounts of a universal flood, from which a favored family escaped by ship, none is more striking than that found by George Smith at Nineveh.<sup>1</sup> This is known as the Epic of Izdubar (or Gisdubar), and this Izdubar is supposed by many scholars to be the Nimrod of the Bible, the great grandson of Khassisadra, who is supposed to be the Noah of Genesis and the flood. The genealogy runs, Noah, Ham, Cush, Nimrod (Gen. 10). The relationship is the same in the epic as that of Nimrod to Noah in the Bible. In this epic Khassisadra (or Noah) relates to Gisdubar (or Nimrod), his great-grandson, his experience in the time of the great flood.

**Similar to Bible Account.** The epic contains many features so similar to the Bible account that we cannot escape the conclusion that both came from the same source, that is, from the historical facts as they transpired. In this epic we find the command to build a ship; the entering into the ship and closing the door; the great deluge of rain; the destruction of all life, so that brother no longer saw his brother, and no people were spared; the stranding of the ship on a mountain; the opening of the window; the sending forth of a dove and its return; the sending forth of a swallow and its return,<sup>2</sup> neither of which found a resting place; the sending forth of a raven which did not return; the sending forth of the animals when the waters had receded; the building of an altar and the sacrifice thereon. The Babylonian account states also that the ship was pitched within and without with bitumen; that the gods promised never to destroy the earth again with a flood and gave the rainbow as a sign of this promise. For all of these items we find parallels in the Genesis record, the chief difference being that the Babylonian record is stamped with the Chaldean polytheism throughout, while the Bible condemns this at every point.

**Claim of Borrowing—Baseless.** Referring to this subject the "New Commentary," by Anglican scholars, has this to say: "The

---

<sup>1</sup> Geo. Smith: "Assyrian Discoveries" (1875), p. 165ff.

<sup>2</sup> The swallow is not mentioned in the Bible.

very close resemblance between these two accounts leaves no room for doubt that the Hebrew story depends upon the Babylonian." The same authority refers to this and to the story of creation as "mythological legends of Babylon" adopted by Hebrew writers as the "basis of religious and moral teaching."<sup>3</sup>

The above modernistic commentary and all of the destructive higher critics ask us to believe that the Genesis account is compiled from two different originals fused together by a later writer or editor, and that one of these originals gives some of these items while the other gives the rest. But the Babylonian is one single original story and no claim is made as to its being patched together by a redactor or editor from more ancient independent records. How, then, could it be, as claimed by modernists, that the Genesis account was borrowed from the Babylonian? If the priestly writer borrowed some of the items from Babylon, why did he not borrow all of them? And if these were independent originals borrowed from the Babylonian account (which was a unit), why did they not borrow the same items instead of each borrowing different items, which taken together, make up the complete account in Genesis? It is obvious that no satisfactory answer can be given to these questions, and that either the borrowing theory or the documentary theory or both must fall to the ground, thus leaving the playhouse of the critics in ruins. It follows also that if the Genesis account of the flood is not derived from Babylonian mythology, neither is any other portion of the Holy Scriptures. "The Babylonians divided their history into two great periods: the one before, the other after, the flood."

Early races of men took with them primeval traditions, common heritages, wherever they wandered. One did not borrow these universal traditions from another, but each possessed them in their original form. In varying latitudes and climes, their habits and manner of living have carried them in their different dresses. An examination of the record in Genesis reveals the fact that it is the purest, the least colored by extravagances, and most nearly to our conception of what must have been the original form. No other event of early Bible history is so fully corroborated as the deluge.

**Like Could Not Borrow Unlike.** Who can imagine the poetry of Job, David, or Isaiah, with its pure monotheism and lofty ideals, being borrowed from such poetry as we find in the cuneiform records

---

<sup>3</sup>Chas. Gore: "New Commentary on Holy Scripture" (1928), p. 46.

of Babylon and Assyria, with its polytheism, idolatry, astrology, and other forms of magic which abound in nearly every verse of their religious poetry? Polytheism, idolatry, and astrology were fundamental and universal among the Babylonians. How can it be that the Hebrews borrowed their religion from them without retaining any of their fundamental doctrines and practices?

Critics cite us to the Legend of Sargon of Agade (or Akkad) as an older story from which the story of Moses was taken. This Babylonian king left an inscription telling us that his mother was of lowly birth, that he knew not his father, that he was brought forth in secret by his mother "who placed me in a basket of reeds, . . . and cast me upon the river, which did not overflow me," that the river carried him to Akki, the irrigator, who rescued him and brought him up as his own son. The inscription goes on to say that Akki appointed him as gardener, and "when I was a gardener the goddess Ishtar loved me." This ancient record of Sargon, who is claimed to have lived about 2700 B.C. (some think 3800 B.C.), gives great antiquity to the Biblical character Ishtar. The record is admitted to be older than the time of Moses, but it cannot be admitted as proof that the story of Moses was borrowed from it. Many mothers of illegitimate and unwelcome children have thrown their offspring into a river or left it where it could be cared for by others just as this "lowly" mother did. This often occurs now among people of low birth such as Sargon's mother was.

**Tammuz and Ashtoreth.** One of the Babylonian nature myths is the story of Tammuz, whose festival was celebrated in the fourth or sixth month, the fourth month of the Jewish calendar bearing his name. He was the husband of the goddess Ishtar, and was worshiped in ancient times throughout Babylonia, Assyria, Phoenicia, and Palestine. He was represented as dying each year and returning to life, and this annual death was the occasion of great lamentation and weeping by the women, accompanied by rites of lewdness and immorality. The only mention of Tammuz in the Bible is found in Ezek. 8:14, where the prophet mentions the "women weeping for Tammuz" as an example of idolatry into which Israel had gone.

Effort has been made to show that the Hebrews borrowed the worship of Ishtar (Ashtoreth of scripture) and her husband Tammuz from the Babylonians, and George A. Barton, A.M., Ph.D., in his "Sketch of Semitic Origins," p. 290, after an effort to show that Moses

borrowed the name Yahweh (Jehovah) and his worship from the Kenites says:

Analogy thus leads us to believe that probably the Yahweh worship of the Kenites contained an Ashtart (Ishtar). ... It must be admitted . . . that, if the Kenites associated an Ashtart with Yahweh, Moses and the Hebrews would inevitably worship her, too. Converts to a new religion are not its reformers, but its blindest devotees.

Barton's conclusion, it is clear, is based on only "probably," while the only reference in the Bible to Tammuz is expressed in severe condemnation, and the many references to Ishtar or Ashtaroth are accompanied by warnings and unmistakable repudiation. Similar conclusions have been advocated by other critics with no other basis than a "probability."

The Babylonian God was a development from devils and horrible monsters of foul form, but the God of the Hebrews was a being who existed in and from the beginning, Almighty and alone, and the devils of chaos and evil were from the beginning his servants (E. A. Wallace Budge).

### *Section II—ABRAHAM*

**Confirmation of History of 4,000 Years Ago.** In Gen. 14 we have an account of a contest between four kings of Mesopotamia and five kings of the Jordan valley. The former, consisting of Amraphel king of Shinar, Arioch king of Ellasar, Chedorlaomer king of Elam, and Tidal, king of Goiim, were victorious, and, along with the spoils, they took Lot, Abraham's nephew. The record tells how Abraham with his servants and allies pursued and smote these kings and brought back Lot and the spoils they had taken.

Modernists say this is a mythical story manufactured to add glory to an imaginary Abraham who never lived. Dr. Lyman Abbott, a modernist preacher and writer of religious books, who died a few years ago, speaks of the "Hebrew myth of Abraham, the Hebrew myth of Jacob, and the myth of Joseph." He then tells us positively that

this ancient compilation of myths and legends is valuable, not because of any scientific addition which it makes to our knowledge of early history, but because it shows us the consciousness of God, etc.<sup>4</sup>

The critics have nearly all committed themselves to this view, but in later years scholars were more enlightened when they

began to study the cuneiform texts which showed that King Arioch of Ellasar was identical with King Eri-Aku (George Smith, 1871) of Larsa (H. Raw-

---

<sup>4</sup> Lyman Abbott: "Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews" (1901), pp. 79, 80.

linson); they next pointed out that there was an Elamite goddess called Legama or Lagamal (George Smith), and that there were two ancient Elamite kings, one named Kudur-Mabug, father of the aforesaid Eri-Aku, and the other Kudur-nan-khundi (George Smith). What did the modern critics do in the face of this evidence, since to admit the presence of such an ancient tradition in the Old Testament would be virtually equivalent to cutting the ground away from beneath their own feet? They could not, of course, deny that Kudur-Lagama (Chedorlamer in Gen. 14) is a genuine Elamite name, or that the supremacy of the Elamites in Syria (including Palestine) is proved by one of Kudur-Mabug's inscriptions.<sup>5</sup>

Here Professor Hommel explains that the critics fell back on the assumption that the whole affair was a postexilic forgery, and that to secure "local color" the Jewish writer must have gone to the Babylonian priests for his antiquarian details. This is their alibi even now, for they are forced to admit the names are historical, and that they were connected with the identical countries indicated in Gen. 14, while the chronology is, according to the highest standards of scholarship, identical with the traditional date of Abraham.<sup>6</sup> The position of the critics has to stand on this assumption, and yet they tell us it is scientific! If such unsupported assumptions are permissible, one may say that he can prove the moon is made of green cheese, for the milky way seems near by.

**Evidence from Glosses of Words Long Obsolete.** Another interesting fact supporting the Biblical record is found in the explanatory glosses of words and phrases, which, at the time Moses wrote, had been forgotten. In verse 2, "king of Bela (the same is Zoar)"; verse 3, "the vale of Siddim (the same is the Salt Sea)"; verse 7, "En-mishpat (the same is Kadesh)"; verse 14, "his trained men" (i. e., born in his house); verse 17, "in the vale of Shaveh (the same is the King's Vale)." Are we to suppose that the writer added these glosses to cover up a gigantic fraud he was trying to put forth and to give the story the appearance of great antiquity?<sup>7</sup> The entire historical setting of this record in Gen. 14 is fully confirmed in the cuneiform records.

The other two kings are also identified: Amraphel, king of Shinar, as Khammurabi, king of Babylonia; and Tidal, king of Goiim, as Tudghula, king of Gutium, or of Kurdistan. These identifications are supported by the most eminent archaeologists, such as Hommel,<sup>8</sup>

---

<sup>5</sup>Fritz Hommel: "Ancient Hebrew Tradition" (1897), pp. 159-160.

<sup>6</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 160.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 162-3.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, pp. 43f, 158ff, 193, 196.

professor of Semitic languages at the University of Munich, Germany, 1897; Hilprecht,<sup>9</sup> Clark research professor of Assyriology and Semitic director of the Babylonian expedition, University of Pennsylvania, 1903; Banks,<sup>10</sup> field director of the recent Babylonian expedition of the University of Chicago, 1913.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VIII

*Section I*—CHALDEAN ACCOUNT OF THE DELUGE AND ISRAEL'S RELIGION

Epic of Izdubar (Gisdubar) or Nimrod.

Discovered by George Smith at Nineveh.

Biblical genealogy runs Noah, Ham, Cush, Nimrod.

In the epic Khassisadra is supposed to be Noah. He relates to Izdubar (Gisdubar), Nimrod, his great-grandson, his experiences in the time of the great flood.

So similar to Bible account that it appears both came from the same source— from the historical facts as they transpired.

Similarities indicated.

Baseless claim of borrowing. "Anglican Commentary" quoted.

Critics claim two sources for the Bible account, but only one record in the Chaldean account. Inconsistent.

Borrowing theory or the Documentary Hypothesis or both must fall.

Babylonians divided their history into two great periods, one before and the other after the flood.

Like could not borrow unlike.

Poetry of Job, David, or Isaiah could not have come from such literature as we find in the cuneiform records of Assyria and Babylonia, with its polytheism, idolatry, astrology, and other magic found in nearly every line of their religious poetry.

These features fundamental and universal among the Babylonians. Not much else to borrow.

Legend of Sargon of Agade (or Akkad), as an early story from which critics believe the story of Moses came. Nothing to show this as probably true. Evidence the conduct of many such mothers.

Tammuz and Ashtoreth. Always mentioned with condemnation and warning.

### *Section II*—ABRAHAM

Confirmation of history of 4,000 years ago.

Four kings of Mesopotamia and five kings of Jordan valley. The former were victorious and took Lot, Abraham's nephew. Rescued by Abraham with his servants and allies (Gen. 14).

Modernists claim this as a mythical story manufactured to add glory to an imaginary Abraham. Dr. Lyman Abbott quoted.

Quotation from Hommel.

---

<sup>9</sup> H. V. Hilprecht: "Explorations in Bible Lands" (1903), p. 739. 10 E. J. Banks: "Bible and the Spade," pp. 52ff.



Critics claim this record was a post-exilic forgery, that the Jewish writer must have borrowed his antiquarian details from the Babylonian priests.

The names are historical and connected with the countries indicated in Gen. 14, while the chronology is identical with the time of Abraham.

Evidence from glosses of words long obsolete. Detailed.

All four of the Mesopotamian kings identified by scholars of first rank. Hommel, Hilprecht, Banks, etc.

## CHAPTER IX

### EVIDENCE FROM NOMENCLATURE

Professors Fritz Hommel, A. H. Sayce, H. V. Hilprecht, and others, who stand at the highest peak of scholarship in the field of philology and archaeology, have produced a mass of evidence in favor of the genuineness of the names found in the Pentateuch and in Joshua and Judges and Job. This evidence points strongly to the vicinity of south Arabia, which, in the most ancient times, included Ur of the Chaldees, where Abraham was born, and is so well supported by the inscriptions that critics are able to make but feeble arguments in their efforts to overthrow it.

**The Divine Name Jehovah (Yahweh)**, used by the writer of the Pentateuch, which, we believe, to be Moses of about 1490 B.C., is claimed by the critics to have originated at a much later date, not earlier than the later kings, and they claim the original meaning of the name indicates a God of battle or of lightning. On this we quote Professor Hommel as follows:

Yahveh does not mean "He who strikes down," ... as the higher critics fondly imagine, but is an Arabic rather than a Hebrew (Canaanitish) form of the ancient verb hawaya=Hebrew hayah="to be, to come into existence," and belongs to the very earliest language of the Hebrews as spoken in the time of Abraham and Moses, prior to the epoch of Canaanitish influence. . . . The names of the witnesses in the ancient Babylonian contract tablets of the time of Abraham bear witness, therefore, to the correctness of the traditional Biblical explanation of the all-holy name Yahveh.<sup>1</sup>

In Ex. 3:13-15 we have the expression "I AM THAT I AM. . . . I AM hath sent me unto you." The margin at verse 14 in the American Revised Version says I AM is "from the same root as Jehovah." This fully agrees with Professor Hommel's statement. Jehovah is God's "memorial name" forever. This is stated also in Psalm 30:4; 97:12; 102:12; 135:13; Hos. 12:5. "I AM THAT I AM" means self-existence, without limitations, the eternal one.

Biblical tradition connects the history of the patriarch Abraham with Khammurabi (Gen. 14). The ripest scholarship of the world —of men who have devoted a lifetime to the study of philology— affirms that even the very earliest Hebrew nomenclature is absolutely similar to that of the Arabs of the Khammurabi dynasty and to that of the South Arabian in-

---

<sup>1</sup> Fritz Hommel: "Ancient Hebrew Tradition" (1897), p. 100.

scriptions—nay, more, that the Hebrews, before they took possession of the territory west of the Jordan under Joshua (i. e., the Hebrews of the patriarchal period), were still half Arabs, and that it was not until they had permanently settled down in the Promised Land that they adopted the Canaanitish tongue in place of their original language.<sup>2</sup>

**Critics' Claim of Late Invention of Scripture Names.** Scholarship has proved the system of name formation was already adopted and that the numerous personal names of the patriarchal and Mosaic times were in general use 2,000 years before Christ and "could not have been invented in or after the time of the kings—when a totally different system of nomenclature obtained—and thrown back into antiquity retrospectively."<sup>3</sup> Among the names of the Old Testament from the South Babylonian contract tablets are those of Abram, Jacob-el, Eliezer, Ishmael, Abida. Besides, if the names had been adopted in the Old Testament from later Babylonian or exilic or post-exilic times as the critics claim, it is confidently asserted by scholars that they would have been given in the Scriptures in a different form, i. e., in the form of those names found in the later Babylonian inscriptions. But the ancient monuments of southern Babylonia, recently discovered containing these names recorded some 4,000 years ago, are said to agree exactly in form with the Old Testament forms of the earliest times. "Some of these records were taken from Ur of the Chaldees and were written in the most ancient Sumerian language."

**Test by Two Definite Bases of Comparison.** Professor Hommel points out that the influence of Egypt on the Mosaic law is very clear and striking, and refers to the breastplate as copied from the Egyptians and to many Egyptian words and phrases, the names of gems, of units of measure, etc., and personal names, as Moses himself, and Phinehas (Putiel, Potiphar, etc.) which are known to the Egyptians. Professor Hommel further says:

Fortunately, the Arabian personal names of the Khammurabi dynasty, and the Canaanite names of the Tel-El-Amarna period, . . . furnish two definite bases of comparison by which we may test the early Hebrew personal names. They enable us to divide these latter into two main groups; one containing the still almost purely Arabic names of the Mosaic period; the other the nomenclature of the time of the judges with its strong admixture of Canaanite elements.<sup>4</sup>

Professor A. H. Sayce is quoted thus:

There were, therefore, Hebrews—or at least a Hebrew-speaking population—living in Babylonia at the period to which the Old Testament assigns the

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 118f.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 119.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 297.

lifetime of Abraham. But this is not all. As I pointed out five years ago, the name of Khammurabi himself, like those of the rest of the dynasty of which he was a member, is not Babylonian, but South Arabian. The words with which they are compounded and the divine names which they contain, do not belong to the Assyrian and Babylonian language, and there is a cuneiform tablet in which they are given with their Assyrian translation. The dynasty must have had close relations with South Arabia. This, however, is not the most interesting part of the matter. The names (Khammurabi, Ammi-zaduga etc.) are not South Arabian only, they are Hebrew as well. When Abraham, therefore, was born in Ur of the Chaldees, a dynasty was ruling there which was not of Babylonian origin, but belonged to a race which was at once Hebrew and South Arabian. The contract-tablets prove that a population with similar characteristics was living under them in the country. Could there be a more remarkable confirmation of the statements which we find in the tenth chapter of Genesis? There we read that unto Eber were born two sons; the name of the one was Peleg, the ancestor of the Hebrews, while the name of the other was Joktan, the ancestor of the tribes of South Arabia. The parallelism between the Biblical account and the latest discovery of archaeology is thus complete, and makes it impossible to believe that the Biblical narrative could have been compiled in Palestine at the late date to which our modern critics would assign it. All recollection of the facts embodied in it would have been long passed away.<sup>5</sup>

**Contemporary Environment Influenced Nomenclature, but Not the Religious Code of Israel.** The record in the book of Judges of the frequent apostasies of Israel, of forsaking Jehovah, and following after Baal and Astarte (Judges 2:11 seq.), of their adopting the religion of the Canaanites and worshiping the gods of their Canaanite wives and sons-in-law, is in perfect harmony with the conclusions to be drawn from a study of nomenclature. The personal names compounded with Baal, such as "Jerub-Baal (son of Saul), Merib-Baal (son of Jonathan), and Beel-yada (son of David), afterwards changed to Eli-yada," constitute a most convincing evidence for the Biblical account of the apostasy of Israel in yielding to the influence of their environment, and this unfaithfulness to their ancient traditions cannot be due, in any sense, to the pen of a later Deuteronomistic writer during the time of the last kings or in exilic time. And while this apostasy of Israel was often repeated and at times became practically universal in the time of the judges, it is a remarkable fact that their code of laws and religion remained pure monotheism, being entirely free from polytheism, superstition, and idolatry, all of which made a deep impress upon the conduct of the Israelites, but left no trace of influence upon their code of religion. During this con-

---

<sup>5</sup> Quoted in "The Ancient Hebrew Tradition," Hommel, p. 95f.

flict between the worship of Jehovah and that of the local gods, which left their marks in the nomenclature of the time, and while names compounded with Baal showed an evil influence,

the steady increase in the number of names compounded with Jo, Jeho (from Yahveh), and Jah, such as Joash, Jotham, Jeho-natan (Jonathan), Abi-jah, Joab, Zeruah, Shephat-iah, Adonijah, Uri-jah, Jehoshaphat, Bena-iah, Jehoiada, etc.<sup>6</sup>

indicate the final adherence to the Yahveh of the law of Moses. And while the critics have appealed to nomenclature in support of their claim of Canaanitish influence, these facts defy contradiction.

The higher critics, therefore, here play the part of Balaam, however little they may have foreseen or desired the issue. Called in to curse, they have been constrained to bless the Israelites.<sup>7</sup>

**Forgery Impossible.** The names in the book of Numbers have been pronounced forgeries invented a thousand years after the time of Moses, according to the claims of critics, but they have been shown to be genuine and the inspired document containing them trustworthy as proved by the tradition preserved in the inscriptions found in distant regions. The plea of the critics that the Biblical writers use an "archaic style" taken from Babylonian priests, which they wove into their records, must collapse irretrievably before the abundant evidence brought to light in recent years. This evidence of inscriptions sustains the Biblical record at every point, but if the names and history connected therewith were later forgeries, modern research would show the misfit setting and the records would be fully exposed as frauds. The authenticity of these inscriptions is confirmed by contemporary inscriptions from other regions, so that the evidence cannot be impeached or set aside.

It becomes clearer every day that the Hebrews of the patriarchal period, and even down to the time of Moses and Joshua, did not use the Canaanite speech—a fact which may be readily proved by a careful examination of their personal names; it was not until after the conquest of the region west of the Jordan that they adopted the language of the subjugated Canaanites. This fact is brought out still more clearly by certain characteristic divergences from the ancient Arabic and Hebrew personal names, observable in the early Canaanite nomenclature of the Tel-El-Amarna texts.<sup>8</sup>

Among the names of the kings of southern Canaan in the book of Joshua (Josh. 10:3) we also meet with a number of pure Arabic names. Another very interesting fact is that the Egyptian plenipotentiary in Palestine and Syria, who

---

<sup>6</sup>Rommel: *Op. Cit.*, p. 303.

<sup>7</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 27.

<sup>8</sup>*Ibid.*, p. 216.

must have been a kind of governor, bears the pure Arabian name of Yankhemu (Yan'am). Later on in the time of kings of Israel, a totally different state of things obtained in southwest Palestine. By that time the Canaanite element had entirely displaced the Arabian, a fact which is proved by the names of the princes of Ashdod, Gaza, and Askelon. From this we can see how accurate and trustworthy the tradition of the book of Joshua really is, and how little foundation there is for the distrust with which modern critics are pleased to regard it.<sup>9</sup>

From these facts we must conclude that the Biblical record is fully sustained and confirmed from the comparison of its names with those of external records found in modern time among the ruins of ancient peoples, and that "it is impossible to believe that Abraham could have been a Canaanite Weli or Saint, whose worship the Israelites appropriated after their conquest of Hebron."

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IX

Genuineness of names found in Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, Job.

South Arabia as the source.

The divine name Jehovah (Yahweh) claimed by critics to have originated not earlier than the late kings.

Critics claim that the name means a God of battle or lightning.

Quotation from Hommel.

Critics claim late invention of Scripture names. This shown by Hommel to have been impossible.

Ancient monuments of southern Babylonia recently discovered containing Scripture names have same form as found in the Old Testament, while the later Babylonian inscriptions have a very different form.

Test by two definite bases of comparison: (1) The Arabian personal names of the Khammurabi dynasty; (2) the Tel-El-Amarna tablets period (about 1400 B.C.).

Quotation from Professor A. H. Sayce.

Contemporary environment influenced nomenclature, but not the religious code of Israel. Examples cited.

Forgery impossible after a period of a thousand years, as the names could not have been invented then to fit the facts of a preceding millennium. Such a fraud would have met with misfits at every point.

The authenticity of the inscriptions showing these facts is confirmed by inscriptions from other regions, so that the evidence cannot be impeached.

Two quotations from Hommel.

The evidence for the history of Abraham is more convincing than that for the history of Khammurabi, but the critics will not admit it.

---

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 220-1.

## CHAPTER X

### EXPLORATIONS IN PALESTINE

**Mosque of Omar.** More frequently than perhaps any other city, Jerusalem has been conquered and destroyed, but upon the ruins of the old a new city has always been built. While its fall has been often predicted by inspired prophets, none of them ever predicted that Jerusalem should never be rebuilt. It is said that in many places the debris that covers the old city from our view is more than 100 feet deep. The Mohammedan Mosque of Omar now stands on the site of the ancient temple of Solomon on the east hill where Mary's well or the Gihon sends forth its waters. It is said that no Jew will enter within the enclosure of the ancient temple area for fear that he may tread on the holy or most holy place. Many and important are the discoveries of recent date made in Palestine and adjacent territory bearing upon Bible history.

**Map of Syria, Palestine and Egypt.** In 1896, a mosaic floor in an old church in Madaba, where the Greeks were building a new one, came to light, consisting of a map of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt. While a great portion of this map had been destroyed, the remainder furnished valuable information on the location of places hitherto unknown, showing plains, mountains, lakes, the Salt Sea, springs, pools, trees, and wells. The map is said to have been made between 350 and 450 A.D.

**Siloam Inscription.** In the year 1880 what is known as the Siloam inscription was discovered at the pool of Siloam by some boys while bathing. A thief removed the inscription by breaking it from the rock wall on which it was inscribed, but the Ottoman government captured him and recovered his plunder, and placed it in its fragmentary form in the museum at Constantinople.

The inscription records the digging of a conduit leading from the ancient spring of Gihon to the pool of Siloam. It tells how the workmen who began at opposite ends met, and how, when only a short space separated them, they could hear one another's voices. The place where they met is said to be 150 feet beneath the surface, and that it can be readily identified by the pick marks in the rock. It is said Hezekiah made this conduit to prevent the enemy from obtaining water outside the city walls during a siege. A record of it is found in 2 Chron. 32:30, giving Hezekiah as the builder.

**The Moabite Stone**, discovered at Dibon, the royal city of Moab, by F. Klein, a German minister, in 1868, is chiefly important from both its contents and the ancient Hebrew in which it is written. The stone was broken in pieces by some Bedouins, after impressions had been made from its face from which it was translated. The fragments were placed together, and it now rests in the Louvre in Paris. This stone is said to be the earliest known monument of the Hebrew language and writing, having the oldest Semitic alphabet known to us. The contents are a complement of 2 Kings 3, and the inscription dates about 896 B.C. The author of this inscription is King Mesha of Moab, a contemporary of Ahaziah and Jehoram, kings of Israel, and Jehoshaphat, king of Judah. The Bible tells of the combined effort of Jehoram and Jehoshaphat to regain the kingdom of Moab which had revolted (2 Kings 3). Mesha recites the events which led up to this war, telling how Omri and his son Ahab, kings of Israel, had oppressed Moab. Mesha gives credit to his god, Chemosh, for recovering the land. The inscription is a strong confirmation of Bible history.

**Strongholds of Jericho, Megiddo, and Jerusalem.** Objections have been made by skeptics to the Bible account of Joshua's conquest of Jericho as being impossible. But recent research has revealed that the entire territory covered by that ancient fortified city was less than the Colosseum at Rome; it is also now known that Megiddo, one of the largest of early fortified cities, contained only eleven acres, and that Jerusalem covered not more than thirteen acres when it was the stronghold of the Jebusites of David's time. They were walled and strongly fortified as places of refuge in time of siege, not all of the inhabitants having their residence inside the walls. It was an easy matter, therefore, for Joshua and his army to march around the walls of Jericho seven times in a day. Recent excavations have shown also that the walls of Jericho were thrown down by some sudden force as an earthquake.

**Miscellaneous Confirmations.** Ruins of a palace whose walls were faced with white marble have been discovered at Samaria, the capital city of the northern kingdom, which is supposed to be Ahab's "ivory house" (1 Kings 22:39).

It would be a tedious task to undertake to give all the cases of cuneiform inscriptions confirming the Bible history. It is a fact, however, that such confirmations are found of Ahab of Israel and Ben-



hadad of Syria, of Jehu, and Shalmaneser, of Pul (Tiglath-Pileser), of Menahem, of Peka, of Ahaz, of Manasseh, Esarhaddon, etc., besides many nations and cities connected with Bible history. But it is a significant fact that no inscriptions have been found mentioning either David or Solomon, while Rehoboam and many others are mentioned. This can be explained by the fact that David and Solomon met with no defeats in contact with their enemies over which the enemy could boast. It is characteristic of human beings to glory over their successes, but no king ever recorded his own failures. David's record was one of continued victories over his enemies and Solomon was a man of peace.

The Bible gives so much detailed history of dates, names, and places along with the facts it records that if it had been written at a later date as claimed by modernists, modern research would not have confirmed it as it has at every point. Writings of a later date would have betrayed errors through the misfit setting. The proof by confirmations of archaeology is so universal and minute that it amounts to a demonstration of the divine origin and inspirations of the Bible as the word of God.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER X

Jerusalem destroyed and rebuilt often. Predicted by prophets.

Mosque of Omar. Temple area sacred to Jews.

Map of Syria, Palestine, and Egypt.

Siloam inscription. Constructed by King Hezekiah to prevent the enemy from obtaining water outside the city walls during a siege (2 Chron. 32:30).

Moabite Stone. Date of about 896 B.C. Earliest known monument of Hebrew language and writing.

On this stone King Mesha of Moab recites events leading up to the war recorded in third chapter of Second Kings, and how Omri and his son Ahab, kings of Israel, had oppressed Moab. Mesha gives credit to his god, Chemosh, for recovering the land.

Strongholds of Jericho, Megiddo, Jerusalem.

It is now known that the territory occupied by these fortified cities was very small, that of Jericho being less than the Colosseum at Rome.

Strongly fortified as places of refuge during a siege. Not difficult for Joshua and his army to march around the walls of Jericho seven times in a day.

Miscellaneous confirmations. Ahab's ivory house (1 Kings 22:39).

Ahab of Israel and Benhadad of Syria. Jehu and Shalmaneser, Pul (Tiglath-Pileser), Menahem, Peka, Ahaz, Manasseh, Esarhaddon—all these, besides many nations and cities of Bible history, are mentioned in the inscriptions, and in every case the Bible record is confirmed.

No inscription found so far mentioning David or Solomon. The enemy gained no victories over them and had nothing to boast of in connection with

these kings. But the Egyptian king records his victory over Rehoboam, son of Solomon.

Conclusion. Writings of a later date would have betrayed errors through misfit settings.

## PART III

### NEW TESTAMENT CRITICISM

## CHAPTER I

### THE NEW COVENANT MESSAGE

#### *Section I*—THE GOSPEL STORY

Having examined the claims of modernism regarding the Old Testament and found them to have no support in fact or history, we now turn to their assaults upon the New Testament with a view to ascertain what evidence, if any, has been produced against this portion of God's word.

**The View of Critics** is that the gospel story is the *product* of a reverent and "practically unconscious" *invention* of the early church. They tell us that to the simple story of Jesus, as originally given by the apostles, constant additions and changes were made by Christians who were enthusiastic and imaginative but ignorant; that they gave to Jesus as the hero of their faith legendary greatness which necessarily attaches to a hero; and that his devotees placed about his head a halo of miracles, and put into his mouth discourses of wisdom and supernatural claims and self-assertion. They explain that there was no intention of fraud or deception, but that his followers were themselves so grossly deceived by their devotion and love for Jesus that they were unable to discern between truth and falsehood, and thus they honestly believed the false message which they delighted to proclaim. Higher critics have never produced this "simple story of Jesus" minus the miracles and supernaturalisms, which they contend existed at the first, and they have no right to impose such an imaginary document upon the public until they give trustworthy evidence of its existence. There are too many witnesses who testify under too many varying circumstances for us to conclude that the apostles were deceived and that their message is a pious fraud.

#### *Section II*—ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Referring to the Levitical code, Abbott says: "It borrowed most of its form and some portions of its underlying theological conception from pagan religion."<sup>1</sup> The charge is freely made by critics that the Christian religion is borrowed, in large measure, from Greek mythology and influenced by other heathen worship.

**Figurative Language Applied as Literal.** In order to make out a case of absurdity for the purpose of ridicule a passage clearly

---

<sup>1</sup> Lyman Abbott: "Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews," p. 149.

figurative with a spiritual application is taken by the critics in a literal sense with a physical application. This is seen in a quotation from Dr. Smith, in which, referring to Paul's teaching in 1 Cor. 11, he says:

How perfectly crude were Paul's ideas of this magical effect is brought out in verse 30, where he attributes the prevalence of sickness and death among converts to the misuse of the holy food.<sup>2</sup>

Fairness and honesty demand that this passage be construed as referring to a memorial feast (verses 24-26), and that Paul was talking about spiritual sickness and spiritual death, and not physical results. Referring to Paul's words, "This is my body," this author says, "It is certain that he took them literally." Such perversion in face of Paul's declaration to the contrary is unworthy of honorable controversy, and reflects seriously upon his scholarship or his sincerity or both. He thinks Paul instituted the Lord's Supper, borrowing it from heathen religion, and then says: "Paul fabled that Christ had instituted the supper."<sup>3</sup> Dr. Smith knows these statements are challenged by intelligent people and by the Bible itself, and yet he offers no sort of proof of what he asserts. What right has he to expect his readers to accept his statements?

**Other Critical Perversions.** Preserved Smith feels himself preserved to make another unsupported assertion as follows:

The idea of the god sacrificed to himself, that his flesh might be eaten by his worshipers thus assured of partaking of his divinity, arose at the dawn of religion, was revived by the mystic cults of the Greeks, and from them borrowed by Paul and implanted along with the myth of the dying and rising Savior God, deep in the soil of the early church (p. 7).

Again no proof is offered of what he asserts. The Bible makes no such claims regarding the purpose of the memorial feast, neither does Paul nor any authentic history. Paul nowhere says that he instituted the supper, but plainly tells us that Christ did. We would like to know how Preserved Smith learned that Paul "fabled" this on Christ.

He next cites the custom of the heathen Cheremiss on the Volga as giving "to each a mug of beer to drain; next he cuts and hands to every person a morsel of bread." Dr. Smith then asserts without the semblance of proof that this "ceremony is the prototype of the eucharist." He further cites the Aino of Japan regarding their cereal offering as an "eaten god"; the East Indian sacramental meal as

<sup>2</sup> Preserved Smith: "A Short History of Christian Theophagy," p. 54.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 76.

"eating the soul of the rice," and of "eating a god" sacramentally by Aztecs, Mexicans, Hindus, Malays, Veddas of Ceylon, and even by Egyptians.<sup>4</sup>

Granting these customs and rites to be true of the peoples named, question arises, "How do we know that the Lord's Supper was borrowed from any of them, and if so, from which one?" There is no historical evidence that Jesus borrowed anything from any one of them, and, besides, there is small similarity between the Lord's Supper and these heathen rites. But the critic cares little for proof, all he offers is his *ipse dixit*.

Once more we quote Dr. Smith from page 39 as follows: We refer to the Greek god of wine, Dionysus, who "died a violent death and was brought to life again." A sacred rite to this deity included animal sacrifice, the animal being "torn to pieces and a fragment of his flesh given to each worshiper and eaten raw as a sacrament, in order to impart to each some of the divine life." He says that a later form of this rite included a human being as the sacrificial victim, or the "barbarous rite of holy cannibalism," and then concludes: "Now all this seems to us such revolting savagery that it is hard to believe it became imbedded in a religion of great moral purity and lofty idealism. Such, however, is the case."<sup>5</sup>

Indeed it is hard to believe and especially so without proof. No one could believe what Dr. Smith here asserts in the absence of any sort of evidence unless he is so eager to find fault with a "religion of great moral purity and lofty idealism" that he is willing to discard evidence and accept prejudice as a guide.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER I

### *Section I*—THE GOSPEL STORY

The critics' view. Practically unconscious invention.

Produced by enthusiastic and imaginative, but ignorant, hero-worshippers of Jesus. That they gave to Jesus legendary greatness and supernatural claims and self-assertion.

No intention of fraud or deception, but that they were themselves so grossly deceived they could not discern between truth and falsehood.

Critics' claim of "simple story of Jesus" minus the miracles, etc., which they think existed at first. Not possible that twelve men should all be deceived in the same way at the same time and in the same manner.

---

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 28. <sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 39.

*Section II*—ORIGIN OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

Claim that Christian religion was borrowed from Greek mythology, etc.

Figurative language applied as literal. Illustrated in quotation from Preserved Smith on 1 Cor. ch. 11.

Claim that "Paul fabled that Christ had instituted the supper."

Other critical perversions. Quotations from Dr. Smith.

Various customs and rites of heathen people cited as sources from which the Lord's Supper was derived, but no effort to show from which one it was borrowed.

Prejudice not a safe guide.

## CHAPTER II

### DEVELOPMENT OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE

**A Principle of Roman Catholicism.** Bible students may marvel that we have selected such a title as the above heading, for in reality it contradicts the essence and spirit of the New Testament. Christian doctrine is not a development, but is given by inspired revelation from God. The development idea comes through sectarianism and was borrowed from Roman Catholicism. Cardinal Newman, in his "Development of Christian Doctrine," fairly sets forth the view of the Roman Catholic Church on this point, as shown by the quotations which we use from his book. On page 58 he says:

All bodies of Christians, orthodox or not, develop the doctrines of scripture. Few but will grant that Luther's view of justification had never been stated in words before his time: that his phraseology and his positions were novel, whether called for by circumstances or not. It is equally certain that the doctrine of justification defined at Trent was, in some sense, new also. The refutation and remedy of errors cannot precede their rise; and thus the fact of false developments or corruptions involves the correspondent manifestation of true ones.

Several errors are to be found in the above quotation. In the first place, Christians have nothing to do with developing the "doctrines of scripture," for such doctrines are given by inspiration in the Bible with which production uninspired men had nothing to do. Yes, the refutation and remedy of errors can precede their rise. God in his wisdom, mercy, and love made provision for the refutation and remedy of errors, knowing that they would rise. Paul warned the elders or bishops of Ephesus thus:

I know that after my departing grievous wolves shall enter in among you, not sparing the flock; and from among your own selves shall men arise, speaking perverse things, to draw away the disciples after them (Acts 20:29, 30).

He follows this warning with commending them to God and to the word of his grace, not to any development of doctrine as a remedy after they had fallen into the error. The Bible abounds with admonitions and warnings against error and makes ample provision for guarding against error and for the correction of the same. Indeed this is the very essence of the Bible, and if robbed of this feature its chief value disappears. The doctrines adopted by Christians or uninspired men are those which the Savior condemned as belonging to



vain worship (Matt. 15:9). If he had said these things of "Religious Doctrine," Cardinal Newman would have been correct, for the sectarian world has been developing religious doctrine since the great falling away spoken of by Paul.

**Baptism.** On page 61 Cardinal Newman concludes that infant baptism is development "necessarily required, yet as far as we know, not provided for his need by direct precept in the Revelation as originally given." The trouble with this statement is that he does not show that it is "necessarily required." The question is "who required it?" and what value can be attached to a thing in religion if not required in "Revelation as originally given?"

Again the cardinal displays his ignorance of Christian doctrine when he admits that baptism is for the remission of sins, and then adds but is there any means of a second remission for sins committed after it? . . . A graver and more practical question cannot be imagined than that which it has pleased the divine author of the Revelation to leave undecided, unless indeed there be means given in that Revelation of its own growth or development.<sup>1</sup>

Among these developments he includes the "doctrine of penance as the complement of baptism, and of purgatory as the explanation of the intermediate state," and calls this a "reasonable expansion of the original creed."

Again, on page 68, the Cardinal delivers himself as follows:

If we turn our attention to the beginnings of apostolical teaching after his ascension, we shall find ourselves unable to fix an historical point at which the growth of doctrine ceased, and the rule of faith was once for all settled. Not on the day of Pentecost, for St. Peter had still to learn at Joppa that he was to baptize Cornelius . . . not at the death of the last apostle, for St. Ignatius had to establish the doctrine of episcopacy. . . . No one doctrine can be named which starts complete at first, and gains nothing afterwards from the investigations of faith and the attacks of heresy.

This is a plain contradiction of the New Testament at every point and specifically of Paul's declaration:

Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work (2 Tim. 3:16, 17).

Our understanding of the doctrine may gain by "investigations of faith and the attacks of heresy," but that does not alter the doctrine. The Cardinal grossly errs when he argues from the parable of the mustard seed that Christianity is a development "both as to polity and

---

<sup>1</sup> Cardinal Newman: "Development of Christian Doctrine," p. 61.

as to doctrine" ("Development of Christian Doctrine," p. 73). The polity and doctrine are fixed by inspiration, but the spread of the kingdom of Christ as taught by this parable is a different matter, which, it seems, the Cardinal ought to know.

**Roman Catholicism Borrowed from Heathenism.** The same authority (p. 380) admits "that great portion of what is generally received as Christian truth is, in its rudiments or in its separate parts, to be found in heathen philosophies and religions." He specifies among these the ceremony of washing, the rite of sacrifice, celibacy, a sacerdotal order, and other items of the Roman Catholic faith. He thinks these valid, not because borrowed from heathenism, but because adopted by the church. If these heathen ceremonies had been incorporated by inspired teachers in the divine revelation the case would be different. The truth is that Christianity has not adopted these things, but the Roman Catholic Church has, and some ignorant people have falsely charged them upon the church of Christ and the Christian religion. Christianity has borrowed nothing from heathenism, and recognizes no authority in religion except the Bible as the inspired word of God.

Finally, Cardinal Newman argues that those who hold to only inspired authority are "ever hunting for a fabulous primitive simplicity; we repose in Catholic fullness. They are driven to maintain, on their part, that the church's doctrine was never pure; we say it can never be corrupt."<sup>2</sup> The foregoing clearly shows a contrast between truth and Catholic error. Primitive simplicity is not fabulous, but a serious reality, and we do not have to hunt for it since it has been fully revealed in God's word. This word or doctrine is not owned or originated by the church. The church has no legislative authority to originate or have a doctrine. It is the pillar and ground of the truth which comes from God through inspired men who wrote the Bible. Any legislation by the church is unauthorized, and, therefore, spurious and corrupt.

**Other Corruptions Adopted by Catholics.** To the list of developments specified by Newman may be added many fundamental doctrines of the Catholic Church, such as the worship of relics and images, the worship of the virgin Mary, invocation of saints, praying for the dead, purgatory, and indulgences, etc. None of these is authorized by the inspired writings. The burning of incense, though

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 382.

enjoined by the law of Moses and a prominent feature of paganism, was never authorized by Christ or his inspired apostles. The use of holy water "is so notoriously and directly transmitted . . . from paganism that their own writers make not the least scruple to own it." Rev. John Dowling in his "History of Romanism" quotes the Jesuit LaCerde, in his notes on a passage of Virgil where this practice is mentioned, "Hence was derived the custom of the holy church to provide purifying of holy water at the entrance of their churches."<sup>3</sup> The burning of candles in daytime is also a pagan rite, and Dr. Dowling quotes Mabillon as saying:

They hang up lamps at every altar. . . . Another proof and example of the conformity of the Romish with the pagan worship; by recalling to his memory many passages of the heathen writers, where their perpetual lamps and candles are described as continually burning before the altars and statues of their deities.<sup>4</sup>

Dr. Dowling also covers a number of the doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church as follows:

The scholar, familiar as he is with the classic descriptions of ancient mythology, when he directs his attention to the ceremonies of papal worship, cannot avoid recognizing their close resemblance, if not their absolute identity. The temple of Jupiter, Diana, Venus, or Apollo, "their altars smoking with incense" (Virgil), their boys in sacred habits, holding the incense box, and attending upon the priests (Ovid), their holy water at the entrance of the temples (Virgil) with their *aspergilla*, or sprinkling brushes, their *thuribula*, or vessels of incense, their ever-burning lamps before the statues of their deities (Virgil) are irresistibly brought before his mind, whenever he visits a Roman Catholic place of worship and witnesses precisely the same things.<sup>5</sup>

Dr. Dowling gives the account of Gregory's instructions to Augustine as related by Bower "not to destroy, but to reserve for the worship of God, the profane places where the pagan Saxons had worshiped their idols." He also instructed that he should treat "the more profane *images, rites, and ceremonies* of the pagans in the same manner, that is, not to abolish, but to sanctify them by changing the end for which they were instituted, and introduce them, thus sanctified, into the Christian worship."<sup>6</sup>

This all shows indeed borrowing from heathenism and the development of religious doctrine, but this is far from saying that Christian doctrine or scripture doctrine is thus borrowed or developed. Let the reader note well this distinction.

---

<sup>3</sup> John Dowling: "History of Romanism" (1881), p. 116.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 121.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 109, 110.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 130, 228.

Edwin Hatch claims that Christian doctrine was influenced by allegories and symbols, a system of interpretation used by the Greeks. But this cannot apply to the making of the New Testament. At first this method was rejected by the fathers. We quote this authority:

Irenaeus and Tertullian bring to bear upon it their batteries of irony and denunciation. It was a blasphemous invention. It was one of the arts of spiritual wickedness against which a Christian must wrestle. But it was deep-seated in the habits of the time; and even while Tertullian was writing, it was establishing a lodgement inside the Christian communities which it has never ceased to hold.<sup>7</sup>

Celsus, an Epicurean philosopher of the second century, was the earliest important writer to oppose Christianity. His opposition as quoted by Origen bears unwitting testimony to the claims of Christianity. He is represented as saying, in effect, to Christians:

You think you get rid of difficulties in your sacred books by having recourse to allegory; but you do not. In the first place, your scriptures do not admit of being so interpreted; in the second place, the explanation is often more difficult than the narrative which it explains.<sup>8</sup>

Hatch further says:

Up to a certain time there is no evidence that Christianity had any secrets. It was preached openly to the world. It guarded worship by imposing a moral bar to admission. But its rites were simple and its teaching was public. After a certain time all is changed; mysteries have arisen in the once open and easily accessible faith; and there are doctrines which must not be declared in the hearing of the uninitiated.<sup>9</sup>

Greek influence is clearly seen in the later corruptions of the "faith which was once for all delivered unto the saints," but said influence had no part in its making.

**Borrowing Not Proved.** Many hostile critics and enemies of the Bible make the bold charge that the Christian religion, including practically all of its rites, was borrowed from the Greeks.<sup>10</sup> But their only proof consists of alleged similarity of the rites. Among these is the rite of baptism which they claim comes from that source. Hatch mentions a kind of baptism practiced by the Greeks preceded by confession of sin, the baptism being a bathing in the pure waters of the sea, and the number of immersions varying with the degree of guilt which was confessed. This was followed by a sacrifice.<sup>11</sup> It is

---

<sup>7</sup> Edwin Hatch: "Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages Upon the Christian Church" (fifth edition), p. 75.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 80.

<sup>9</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 293.

<sup>10</sup> Lyman Abbott: "Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews" (1901), p. 149.

<sup>11</sup> Hatch: *Op. Cit.*, pp. 287ff.

true that the Greeks and other heathens included among their religious rites forms of washings and sacrificial meals, but these are so unlike anything in the New Testament that it would require a great strain of imagination to see the identity or similarity. They do not conform in either form or purpose. One might as well argue that Greeks were religious; Christians are also religious. Therefore Christianity was borrowed from the Greeks.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER II

A principle of Roman Catholicism.

Quotation from Cardinal Newman. Christians have no part in development of Christian doctrine. The Bible provides refutation and remedy for errors before their rise. This is a leading purpose of the Bible.

Not Christian doctrine, but religious doctrine has been in process of development ever since the falling away predicted by Paul.

Baptism—infant baptism—baptism for remission.

Ample provision made for remission of sins committed after baptism.

When did the growth of Christian doctrine cease? Quotation from Cardinal Newman. Scripture quotation (2 Tim. 3:16, 17).

Polity and doctrine fixed by inspiration.

Roman Catholicism borrowed from heathenism.

Newman cites the ceremony of washing, sacrifice, celibacy, a sacerdotal order as borrowed items. Newman thinks these valid because adopted by the church.

Christianity has not adopted them, but Catholicism has.

Primitive simplicity not fabulous, but revealed in God's word.

The church has no legislative authority to originate or have a doctrine. This is furnished ready-made in God's word.

Other corruptions adopted by Catholics. Worship of relics and images, worship of the virgin Mary, invocation of saints, praying for the dead, purgatory, and indulgences. Burning of incense and holy water.

Quotation from Dr. Dowling.

Allegories and parables. Quotation from Hatch.

Celsus bears unwitting testimony.

Greek influence is seen in later corruptions of the faith.

Hatch mentions a kind of baptism. The Greeks and other heathens had forms of washings and sacrificial meals, but they are unlike anything in the New Testament.

## CHAPTER III

### PROPAGANDA VS. FUNDAMENTAL TRUTH

#### *Section I*—AGENCIES FOR PROPAGANDA OF UNBELIEF

**Agencies Many and Varied.** The devil is always active and alert, never losing an opportunity to do evil and propagate unbelief, "for the sons of this world are for their own generation wiser than the sons of the light" (Luke 16:8). Hostility to the Bible is to be seen in the most powerful agencies for the spread of infidelity in some form or other. It is manifested not only in the works of avowed atheists and other species of infidelity, but it works unceasingly through professed Christian ministers, through the college professors, through social and educational associations, through magazines and daily papers, through the picture shows, and by radio; it is seen in historical and scientific societies, and in many sectarian churches of modern times; but by far the greater agencies for the spread of unbelief are to be found in our modern colleges and universities in connection with the literature which has come into popular favor within the past half century. It is manifested in the funny page of our daily papers, and in other ways where the fabulous ape-man, or missing link between the ape and man, is represented, often with human features, but still retaining his monkey hair and tail.

**Leading Exponents of This Propaganda** are such publications as H. G. Wells' "Outlines of History," "Encyclopedia Britannica," and other leading reference works, Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible," S. R. Driver's "Literature of the Old Testament," President Eliot's five-foot shelf of books, containing works of Darwin and other atheistic books, but no Bible; the Polychrome Bible; James Moffatt's translation, Goodspeed's translation, and other editions of the Bible with notes discrediting the Bible story. Many other publications in the form of books of a religious character and textbooks for use in colleges and high schools, books on biology, on sociology, on zoology, geology, botany, etc.—nearly all such books published in modern times are brimful of infidelity.

**The Unitarian Church.** Among the religious organizations most active in this propaganda of unbelief in the Bible is the Unitarian Church. Their doctrine of belief in only one person in the godhead is ancient, not modern. It was first made prominent by Arius in the fourth century when Constantine called the first general council of

the church in A.D. 325 to settle the question of the divinity of Jesus Christ. But the modern Unitarian has receded from this doctrine, for he no longer believes in even one person in the godhead. Neither is this doctrine new or modern. It was held nearly at the dawn of Christianity by Celsus and the Ebionites, and has been echoed by all the atheists and agnostics through the centuries, including Jean Astruc, Voltaire, Tom Paine, Robt. G. Ingersoll, and many others. There is system in the madness of the Unitarians. Their great aim and purpose is not the salvation of souls, but the gaining control of leading theological schools and universities, and many such have fallen prostrate victims of their schemes and machinations, including such great institutions as Harvard University, Chicago University, Union Theological Seminary, and scores of others. When they gain control of such institutions they do not stop there, but their next step is orderly and businesslike for their purposes. They make a specialty of placing as many of the graduates of such schools as pastors in influential centers (of any kind of church), and as professors in schools of religion as may be possible. They make a specialty of placing these graduates as professors in schools of religion, and then undertake to get said schools of religion affiliated with some great university beside which they have, in many cases, squatted. One of the professors of this Unitarian zeal for spreading their unbelief is quoted by Dr. Gordon thus:

We cannot use force on the evangelical church, but we have another weapon in order to overpower it. That is to appoint the greatest possible number of radical and liberal professors, and then it will of itself and from within go to pieces.<sup>1</sup>

**Academic Credits.** For colleges and universities academic credits are given in a course in Biblical literature, using as textbooks such works as "Old Testament History," by Ismar J. Peritz; "The New Appreciation of the Bible," by W. C. Selleck; "Life and Literature of the Ancient Hebrews," by Dr. Lyman Abbott, and many other books of rankest infidelity are recommended for side reading. But in such course no place is found for the Bible itself. The situation is well expressed in the words of Alexander Campbell:

Tell it not in Rome, publish it not in Constantinople, that in the schools and colleges and seminaries in the United States of America the Bible is no more a textbook than the Koran of Mohammed or the Zendavesta of Zoroaster; that Roman and Grecian mythologies are read and studied in our colleges and

---

<sup>1</sup> Ernest Gordon: "Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 145.

universities, in the center of Christian civilization, while Moses and David and Solomon, while Jesus and Peter and Paul, are seldom or never permitted to be heard or appealed to, any more than the Arabian Nights or the tales of elves and fairies.<sup>2</sup>

Professor Leuba of Bryn Mawr College is quoted thus:

The student statistics show that young people enter college possessed of the beliefs still accepted in the average home of the land and that as their mental powers mature and their horizon widens, a large percentage of them, abandon the cardinal Christian beliefs. It seems probable that on leaving college from forty per cent to forty-five per cent of the students with whom we are concerned deny or doubt the fundamental dogmas of the Christian religion.<sup>3</sup>

**Cocksurenness Based on Critical Authority.** Modernists are in the habit of disposing of the profoundest questions by stating their *ipse dixit* accompanied by the cocksure phrase, "it is a fact no longer to be questioned," or "we no longer think of," or "we have at length learned," or "scholars generally agree," or "the consensus of learned opinion is," etc. To the average modernist such assertion is most convincing and satisfactory. Modernists discard faith, hope, redemption, salvation; they make sport of the idea of sin, conversion, prayer, future punishment, and reward; they think humility and reverence for God are relics of a superstition of heathenism and the atonement a revival of totemism; they not only think of Jesus Christ as a mere man, repudiate miracles and all supernaturalisms, but assert that the idea of God is "superfluous in every science, even that of religion itself,"<sup>4</sup> and declare that "an intelligent man who now affirms his faith in miracle can hardly know what intellectual honesty means."<sup>5</sup>

On the book, "Finality of the Christian Religion," by Foster, a Chicago daily is quoted thus:

We are struck also with the hypocrisy and treachery of these attacks on Christianity. This is a free country and a free age, and men can say what they choose about religion, but this is not what we arraign these divinity professors for. Is there no place in which to assail Christianity but a divinity school? Is there no one to write infidel books except the professors of Christian theology? Is a theological seminary an appropriate place for a general massacre of Christian doctrine? . . . We are not championing either Christianity or infidelity, but only condemning infidels masquerading as men of God and Christian teachers ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 181).

---

<sup>2</sup> Campbell: "Popular Lectures and Addresses," p. 227.

<sup>3</sup> Gordon: *Op. Cit.*, p. 119.

<sup>4</sup> Gordon: *Op. Cit.*, p. 179.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.* p. 179



*Section II*—THE SETTING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

**Figure of Iris Minus the Head.** Some years ago while excavating at Athens near the Parthenon a bas-relief of a female head was found. Some thought it belonged to the frieze of Phidias on the Parthenon, but others doubted. It was suggested that among the marble statues in the British museum there was a figure of Iris, the goddess of the rainbow, minus the head. When a cast was made it was found that the broken part exactly fitted the marble figure in the museum. No further argument was demanded to prove where the head belonged.

**Setting of First Century.** So it is with the setting of the New Testament. All the historical, social, political, and religious references fit the first century in the minutest details, and they would fit no other period. Beginning with the Christian era evidence of the influence of Christianity is everywhere abundant. The monuments and churches, the homes and the literature, all testify to the influence of the New Testament beginning with the first century in no uncertain manner. But the most direct and specific evidence is found in the remains of literature, written on parchment, vellum or papyrus. Papyrus records of an early date have been discovered recently in great abundance in Egypt, showing Christianity to have been established in that country almost at the beginning of the church. Reports are published of a recent discovery, in Egypt, in the year 1932, of a papyrus manuscript of a large portion of the Bible, which is believed by scholars to date back to the second century. Papyrus was made from the pith of the papyrus plant which grew in water and was common in ancient Egypt. The sheets were pasted together to form a papyrus roll of any length desired, some specimens of over one hundred feet in length being yet in existence. The New Testament is said to have been written at first altogether on papyrus. Papyrus records have all perished except in the dry climate of Egypt.

**Many Records Not Yet Published.** In 1900, Grenfell and Hunt made valuable discoveries in Tebtunis, south of the Fayum in Egypt, including crocodiles mummified and stuffed with papyrus records, covering varied subjects. It is said that from the Ezra Synagogue in Cairo some 12,000 ancient Arabic documents and a vast quantity of Hebrew manuscripts have been recovered which have not yet been published. Scholars are continually working on these documents, and their translation and publication in the future may be looked to with interest and confidence as further confirming the Bible record.

*Section III—A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE*

**Time Required for Development of Corrupted Gospel.** Critics tell us that time is required for the development of a corrupted gospel, and that since the four canonical gospels are corruptions they could not have been written in the first century. They have, therefore, placed them in the second half of the second century. It is freely conceded that time is required for the development of a corrupted gospel, and this fact is one of the strongest favoring the origin of the four canonical gospels in the first century, as we shall see later. An impartial examination of the evidence shows that the four gospels were written in the first century just as we have them today, and that the corrupted gospels did not exist till after the middle of the second century. Thus it is clear that the apocryphal gospels required time for their development.<sup>6</sup> But if the critics could show even one copy of the "simple gospel" minus the miracles which they claim existed, they would still lack the support of a general acceptance of it by the followers of Jesus in the first century. On this contention they produce no historical evidence, but rely upon theories and conjectures advanced by skeptical German scholars, supplemented and added to by different authors of their own school. They draw inferences that are unwarranted and unsupported by the facts. If they believe their own perversions of the facts which they seem to delight in proclaiming, it is due to the self-deception induced by a lack of the love of the truth.

**Philosophy of Memory.** It requires a long time for a myth or legend to become fixed and accepted by the people. On the philosophy of memory Campbell said:

The history of the world, ancient and modern, as far back as all authentic tradition reaches, furnishes not, I fearlessly assert, one instance of a monumental institution established in commemoration of a fiction. . . . The history of all nations, languages, and of all antiquity may be challenged for an instance of any commemorative institution got up at the time or near the time of any alleged sensible fact or event that has been proved or can be proved not to have happened.<sup>7</sup>

The same is true of the memoirs of the life of Christ. It would have been equally impossible to fix in the public mind, or even in the

---

<sup>6</sup> Camden M. Coburn: "New Archaeological Discoveries" (second edition), pp. 219ff; Wm. B. Hill: "Introduction to the Life of Christ" (1911), pp. 21ff.

<sup>7</sup> Alexander Campbell: "Popular Lectures and Addresses," p. 288.

mind of twelve men, the miracles and supernatural facts of the gospels had they been false. The life and teachings of Jesus, his miracles and mighty works, and his death and resurrection all stand out boldly in the gospels as monuments fully accepted and established at the time in the minds of the people who heard him. The claim that they did not understand cannot be maintained, but it can be shown that the four canonical gospels were in existence and established among his followers in the first century when these things transpired. But that is not all. Jesus was great from the beginning. The angel said he should be great and sit on the throne of David; the shepherds hailed him as great as he lay in the manger; wise men from the east worshiped him as a babe; Anna the prophetess and Simeon the saint worshiped him and spoke of his greatness and supernaturalness while he was an infant. Elisabeth said, "Whence is this to me, that the mother of my Lord should come unto me?"

**Vital Difference Between Jesus and Claims as to Buddha and Confucius.** But the claim is made that virgin birth and resurrection were ascribed to Buddha and Confucius also, and thus we are told that the claims of Jesus are equally matched by teachers whose claims are repudiated by the followers of Jesus. The difference, however, lies in the fact that in the case of Buddha and Confucius a long period of time was required to get these claims fixed in the mind of followers. The challenge has been made and never met to show that these claims were made and accepted during the time or near the time of these leaders. All the elements of greatness, which are ascribed to Buddha and Confucius, and which required centuries to crystallize, were extant in the days of the childhood of Jesus in his own city and country. We do not have to get centuries away from Jesus to know of his greatness and wonderful character.

But this is not all, for the picture of Jesus is given to us in the inspired record some 1,500 years before he was born. He is referred to in Gen. 3:15 as the seed of the woman, and was promised to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob fifteen centuries before his advent into the world. The place of his birth is specifically mentioned about 710 years previous to his birth (Micah 5:2), and this was well known by the Jews when Herod asked them where the Messiah should be born. His virgin birth, his character as king, and the character and nature of his kingdom were specifically predicted by Isaiah some 750 years before he was born of a virgin. These characteristics, then, were not developments in fancy and imagination requiring a long time to

become accepted, but were actual facts known and accepted at the time he lived on the earth. Not only is this true, but no record written at the time when these things were current history denying these facts has come down to us.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER III

#### *Section I*—AGENCIES FOR PROPAGANDA OF UNBELIEF

Agencies many and varied.

Not confined to avowed atheists or schools of infidelity, but is seen in the work of professed Christian ministers, college professors, social and educational associations, magazines and daily papers.

By far the greater agencies for the spread of unbelief are to be found in modern colleges and universities with the literature they have developed during the past half century.

Leading exponents of this propaganda named.

The Unitarian Church.

Their activities systematic and businesslike for their purposes.

Academic credits given in colleges and universities for courses in Biblical literature, using as textbooks the works of men who reject the inspiration of the Bible and the claims of Christianity.

Quotation from Alexander Campbell.

Quotation from Ernest Gordon.

Cocksureness based on critical authority.

Quotation from a Chicago daily.

#### *Section II*—THE SETTING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Figure of Iris minus the head. Head found in Athens near Parthenon, found to exactly fit the figure in British museum.

Setting of first century harmonizes with the New Testament, and 'the New Testament references to historical, social, political, and religious conditions would fit no other period.

Most direct and specific evidence found in the remains of literature, written on parchment, vellum or papyrus.

Papyrus records from Egypt.

Many records not yet published. Records from Ezra Synagogue.

#### *Section III*—A FUNDAMENTAL PRINCIPLE

Time required for development of a corrupted gospel.

Critics claim the canonical gospels are corrupted, therefore not written in the first century.

It is conceded that time is required for the development of a corrupted gospel, and this principle is strong evidence in favor of the gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, all of which were produced in the first century.

No "simple story of Jesus" minus the miracles has ever been found, and there is no evidence of the use or acceptance of any such gospel by the early disciples.

Philosophy of memory. Time required for a myth or legend to become fixed and accepted by the people.

Quotation from Alexander Campbell.

Life and teachings of Jesus, his miracles and mighty works, and his death and resurrection, prominent features of the gospels, fully accepted and established at the time in the minds of the people who heard him.

Jesus great from the beginning. Testimony of the angel, of the shepherds, of wise men, of Anna and Simeon. Elisabeth.

Vital difference between Jesus and claims as to Buddha and Confucius. Claims of virgin birth and resurrection for Buddha and Confucius not made or accepted at or near the time of these leaders.

All the elements of greatness ascribed to Buddha and Confucius, and which required centuries to crystallize, were extant in the days of the childhood of Jesus in his own city and country.

Picture of Jesus in the inspired record many centuries before he was born. Genesis, Micah, Isaiah.

## CHAPTER IV

### INTERNAL EVIDENCE CONCLUSIVE

#### *Section I*—CREDIBILITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE

**Quelle (Q).** Higher critics assume, without any proof or evidence worthy the name, that Matthew and Luke compiled their gospels from some unknown source or document that has been lost, which original source they call *Quelle* (what?), usually abbreviated Q., and which they refer to as freely as if it were a reality. This is in keeping with the practice of the critics, for this is not the only case where they have met the requirements of their theory by supplying the missing factor from their own manufacture. In all history there is not a hint of the existence of such a document except in the fertile brain of the critic.

History must rest on documents as they are in their plain sense, and not on theories and speculations of biased minds who simply want history to read to fit a theory. All schools of infidelity deny the authorship and date as well as the integrity of the Bible, for if they should accept the authorship and date they would be forced to accept the Bible itself. "It has been related that Voltaire, the great French infidel, said if he could be convinced that the fifty-third chapter of Isaiah is genuine, he would concede that at least one prediction of the prophets was fulfilled" ("McGarvey's Sermons," p. 128). The supreme effort, therefore, of infidelity through its various schools, has been to discredit the authorship, and especially the date of the different books of the Bible as well as their integrity.

#### *Section II*—INTERNAL EVIDENCE

**Changes in the First Century.** The strongest evidence for the claims of the Bible are to be found in the Bible itself. Applied to the New Testament this internal evidence is fully verified by changes in the first century:

1. Jerusalem was destroyed as prophesied, A.D. 70.
2. Jewish temple worship ceased.
3. Sanhedrin and Jewish sects disappeared.
4. Effects of the Christian religion were sudden and tremendous, destroying Greek and Roman mythology and changing political and social conditions which rapidly extended to the ends of the earth.

It would have been impossible for a writer of the second century or later to have produced a forgery to conform so completely with first century conditions and events as found in the gospels. Modern research by both friend and foe has shown no errors in the historical facts recorded in the gospels.

**Spurious Gospels.** Fortunately, we can learn what an invention of a later date would produce by reading the gospel of Thomas, or the gospel of Peter, which were written as late as the second half of the second century.<sup>1</sup> In these we find the most absurd stories of Jesus' boyhood, of how he made pigeons of clay and caused them to fly, and of how he shamed his teachers by displaying his superior knowledge, of resenting correction by Joseph and of killing his playmates, etc. Such are some of the developments of a later period concerning an unknown portion of the life of Jesus, which are entirely out of harmony with the known history and character of Jesus.

It is evident from the first chapter of Luke that many had undertaken to write a history of the life of Christ, and it is said by archaeologists that some twenty or more of such apocryphal gospels are referred to in the early Christian writings, some of which have been discovered in recent years. Among all these there is not one new parable or beatitude. None of the canonical gospels is dated, or bears the name of the writer, except the gospel of John, and he does not mention it till near the end of the book. In the apocryphal gospels the name of the author is made prominent, and it is said that the circumstances under which the writing was done are often given. A forger would naturally take special pains to make an early date and apostolic authorship unmistakably clear.

The influence and teaching of the four canonical gospels are seen in Christian literature from the very beginning, including manuscripts of songs, hymns, prayers, church diaries, sermons, and letters of the first and second centuries. This is true also of the art and architecture, but no such influence of the apocryphal gospels appears before the fourth century.

### *Section III*—NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

**Common Language of the First Century.** Until some forty years ago scholars tell us that no scholar had ever seen a profane document written in the language of the New Testament. They tell

---

<sup>1</sup> Wm. B. Hill: "Introduction to the Life of Christ," pp. 21ff; Camden M. Coburn: "New Archaeological Discoveries" (second edition), pp. 219ff.

us this style of Greek is entirely different from classical Greek and constituted the common language of the people in New Testament times. It is now claimed that thousands of such documents are in the possession of scholars. During the first century Greek was spoken not only in Greece, but also in Italy, Palestine, Asia Minor, and Egypt. It is well known that language grows, and that the character of abbreviations and changes in handwriting and spelling, as well as the grammar, make it easy to determine the date of a manuscript, just as we can readily distinguish between a seventeenth century and a twentieth century English document. In our King James Version of the Bible we find words that are now obsolete, and some of them, such as the word "let," have a meaning now exactly opposite to that in that version. Indeed we might not understand the apostle Paul in 2 Cor. 8:1, where he says in the King James Version, "Moreover, brethren, we do you to wit of the grace of God," but when we read in the American Revised Version, "We make known to you the grace of God," the meaning is perfectly clear. It is now claimed by scholars that the style of the language determines the date of the New Testament Greek, which characteristic indicates the writings were produced in the first century. Skeptical scholars cannot nullify this evidence.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IV

##### *Section I*—CREDIBILITY OF THE BOOKS OF THE BIBLE

Quelle (Q). Claim original source of Matthew and Luke lost, but no evidence that any such document ever existed. Reputed statement of Voltaire.

##### *Section II*—INTERNAL EVIDENCE

Strongest evidence internal. Four salient facts.

Impossible for a writer of second century or later to produce a forgery to conform so completely with first century conditions and events as found in the gospels.

Spurious gospels. Gospel of Thomas and gospel of Peter.

Examples of the corruption of time. Absurd stories of Jesus as a boy.

Among the twenty or more apocryphal gospels there is not one new parable or beatitude. Hence, not a gradual growth or development as claimed.

Influence and teaching of the four canonical gospels seen from the beginning, including manuscripts of songs, hymns, prayers, church diaries, sermons, letters, etc., of the first and second centuries. No such influence is seen of the apocryphal gospels before the fourth century.



*Section III*—NEW TESTAMENT GREEK

Common language of the first century.

Until some forty years ago no scholar had ever seen a profane document written in the language of the New Testament, which is different from classical Greek.

Language grows. Character of abbreviations, handwriting, spelling, grammar, etc., indicate date of a document. See 2 Cor. 8:1.

## CHAPTER V

### CONFIRMATIONS FROM MANY LANDS

#### *Section I*—SPECIFIC CONFIRMATIONS

**Paul and Other New Testament Characters.** Paul's experience at Ephesus, given in Acts 19, is confirmed by recent discoveries. A marble inscription found there tells of the magical arts of the Ephesians, of the goddess Diana, of the business of the silversmiths making shrines for her, and a list of magistrates contains the name of Demetrius.

An inscription found at Corinth mentions Titus as a most noble character, and another found in 1908 contains the name of Gallic as proconsul of Achaia mentioned in Acts 18:12. A recent discovery at Antioch consists of an inscription mentioning Quirinius as governor of Syria (Luke 2:2). One found at Paphos on the island of Cyprus mentions the name of Sergius Paulus as proconsul, one of Paul's converts. In all of these the dates correspond with Paul's time.<sup>1</sup>

**Papyrus Records.** In 1897 Grenfell and Hunt made important discoveries in ancient Oxyrhynchus, about 120 miles south of Cairo, in the valley of the Nile. Hundreds of papyrus records written in Koine Greek (the Greek of the New Testament) were found, though very many had been discovered before which were counted of no value by the natives who burned them for fuel. Oxyrhynchus was an important Christian center very early in the Christian era. Many fragments of the New Testament, including portions of Matthew and Romans, which scholars date in the third century, also a fourth or fifth century New Testament containing the canonical gospels and other portions of scripture, were found in 1908 and 1909. A calendar of church services of twenty-six churches of Oxyrhynchus, beginning October 21, 535, is among recent discoveries.

#### *Section II*—MISCELLANEOUS CONFIRMATIONS

**Catacomb Inscriptions.** Simplicity and brevity mark the catacomb inscriptions of the first century. Later they are more elaborate and extensive and show a gradual development of corruption of the gospel. The cross as a religious emblem first appears in the end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. The halo appears about the Savior's head in the third century, and later around the head of

---

<sup>1</sup> Camden M. Coburn: "New Archaeological Discoveries" (second edition), pp. 538ff.

any saint. No trace of the crucifix is seen till the seventh century, when the "man of sin" is fully developed in the person of Boniface III, who became the first pope or "universal father" in the year A.D. 606. Dr. Coburn says the very oldest baptismal picture found among the catacombs of Rome represents the new convert as "coming up after immersion from the river, which reaches over his knees, and joining hands with the baptizer, who is dressed in a tunic; . . . while in the air hovers a dove with a twig in its mouth."<sup>2</sup> And Dr. Coburn was a Methodist, a noted archaeologist, and a scholar.

**Odes and Psalms.** In 1909, Dr. J. Rendel Harris discovered and published a large Syriac manuscript comprising a songbook consisting of sixty-four leaves which scholars believe dates back to the end of the first century or earlier. Dr. Camden M. Coburn says that "no one doubts that we have here a collection of hymns and spiritual songs coming from the apostolic age and breathing the deepest thoughts of the New Testament."<sup>3</sup>

These songs bear a strong resemblance in thought and style to the gospel of John which proves the existence of John's gospel at so early a date. One of the odes, No. 16, it is said, "shows the author did not keep the Sabbath."

Among the doctrines of the odes and psalms are the doctrine of the "Trinity, Virgin Birth, Descent into Hades, Christ's Preeminence and Preexistence, Spiritual Union with Believers, His Deity as Son of the Most High, Word and Messiah."<sup>4</sup> It is said that 166 books or articles were published on this discovery between 1909 and 1914.

The reader is referred to the writings of the apostolic fathers for very early mention of the gospels and other books of the New Testament.

### *Section III—AT MOUNT SINAI*

**Synchronism.** "It is one of the divinely foreordained synchronisms of history that the mountain which gave to the Israelites and, therefore, to all modern nations the 'law' should in these times have given to the world the gospel." That is, the same Sinai that gave the law of Moses has in modern times given to the world the most ancient Greek Bible known, and other ancient documents constituting the strongest external evidence for the claims of the Bible.

---

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 400. See also Philip Schaff: "Teaching of the Twelve Apostles" (Didache), pp. 36ff.

<sup>3</sup> Coburn: *Op. Cit.*, p. 311.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 312.

**Greek Bible Found at Mt. Sinai.** In 1859, Dr. Constantino Tischendorf made the most important discovery of modern times in the field of archaeology, that of the *Codex Sinaiticus*, or Greek Bible, discovered in the Greek Convent of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai. On his first visit to this convent in 1844 he obtained from the Greek monks of the convent forty-five leaves of the Old Testament on vellum among other documents, which were about to be burned as of no value. Fifteen years later Dr. Tischendorf visited this convent again when he obtained a loan of this Greek Bible "to carry to St. Petersburg, and there to have it copied as accurately as possible." The Russian government had 300 photographic copies made of this Bible, and distributed them among the leading libraries of the world, one being given to the Library of Congress at Washington, D. C. The manuscript was never returned to the convent, but the Czar of Russia, in 1869, "sent to the monks of St. Catherine 7,000 rubles and various decorations in return for this manuscript, and no written protest against this settlement is known to exist." Recent press reports state that the British government has purchased this ancient Greek manuscript, *Codex Sinaiticus*, for the sum of 100,000 pounds, and its future resting place will be in the British museum.

**Omission of Part of Mark's Gospel.** Critics have seized upon the fact that the last twelve verses of Mark's gospel are omitted in the two oldest complete Greek Bibles, the Sinaitic and the Vatican, to discredit our English Bible at this point, as the English versions have these verses. Others biased by prejudice against baptism as a condition of salvation have also stressed this fact to minimize or repudiate the great commission given in these verses by our Savior after his resurrection and just before his ascension. But the futility of this effort is manifest when we find the same doctrine clearly taught in other portions of God's word. These ancient Greek Bibles, in which this omission occurs, are dated from the first quarter of the fourth to the middle of the fifth century, while numerous translations of the gospels are known to have been made much earlier and they contain these disputed verses. Among these there are several Syrian translations, some Egyptian or Coptic versions, the Old Latin, and others dating from the second or third century which contain these omitted verses. These translations into different languages were evidently made from a Greek text which was older than any Greek text known today. It does not require a knowledge of the Greek for one to decide which of the two classes of texts is the more dependable.

Besides the greater antiquity of these translations over the Greek texts mentioned, their greater number in the different languages gives a much greater preponderance of evidence in favor of the former. Furthermore, these verses are quoted by Irenaeus, a very learned Christian of the second century, as the last of Mark's gospel. This last chapter in full is contained in hundreds of other Greek texts, besides early Latin and Gothic translations. Again the position of the critics fails for lack of support of all the facts.

**Early Syriac Gospels—a Palimpsest.** In 1892, Agnes Smith Lewis and her twin sister, Margaret Dunlop Gibson, discovered in the Convent of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai a Syriac manuscript containing all the four gospels except about eight pages. It is said that this manuscript, written on parchment, was made in the fifth or sixth century, and after being used for some two hundred years was so worn it was discarded. But due to the great value of parchment as writing material, it was used again for recording the lives of some of the female saints, the later writing being made across the older writing, which had faded. A manuscript used a second time in this way is called a palimpsest. The 356 pages of this manuscript "had evidently been unturned for centuries," and were so glued together by time they had to be separated by "steaming." By the application of chemicals the original text was restored and was copied and published a few years after its discovery.

The overwriting bore the date of A.D. 778, but from this Syriac text and others, especially one from Egypt discovered by Wm. Cureton, a translation of the gospels has been established dating back very near the apostles, and some two hundred years before any Greek manuscript of the gospels now known. This Syriac translation, dating as it does back to within fifty or sixty years of the apostles or earlier, and containing as it does the four gospels practically as we have them now, is strong proof that the four canonical gospels existed and were recognized by the church as standard authority at this early period "in the eastern branch of the very language which our Lord and his apostles spoke." These Syriac translations, dating back "almost if not quite to apostolic times, include our four gospels, and they contain not a single extract from the gospel of Peter, or any other private memorandum of events," or any spurious gospel.

**Epistle of Barnabas, Bishop of Hermas, Apology of Aristides.** Other manuscripts found by Dr. Tischendorf at Sinai were the Epistle

of Barnabas, which was not previously known in Greek, and about one-fourth of the Bishop of Hermas. The Bishop of Hermas or Shepherd of Hermas, a treatise similar to Pilgrim's Progress, was not known for a long time, except from translations and quotations, till this discovery in 1859. Other portions of this treatise were found later at Athens, Greece, and at Oxyrhynchus, Egypt. This religious work is dated by scholars at from A.D. 100 to 150. Important features of the treatise include an exhibit of the thought and conduct of the Christians of Rome at this time, the statement that the gospels were four by divine ordination and the church founded "not on Peter," but on the "rock of the Son of God."

In addition to the foregoing a number of very ancient manuscripts have been found among the archives of the Convent of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai, including a Syrian translation of the Apology of Aristides found there by J. Rendel Harris in 1889. This Syriac translation is placed by scholars in the seventh century, but the original Greek text is said to be the oldest known argument for Christianity, and its date is placed at A.D. 117 to 171. It mentions the fact that the followers of Christ were called Christians, and gives many other fundamental items of the faith presented in the gospels.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER V

### *Section I*—SPECIFIC CONFIRMATIONS

Paul and other New Testament characters. Acts 19.

Titus a most noble character, indicated on an inscription at Corinth.

Gallio, proconsul of Achaia (Acts 18:12).

Sergius Paulus, etc.

Papyrus records.

Discoveries at Oxyrhynchus.

### *Section II*—MISCELLANEOUS CONFIRMATIONS

Catacomb inscriptions at Rome, simple and brief at first.

Later on they were more elaborate and showed gradual corruption of the gospel. The cross as a religious emblem appears in end of the third or beginning of the fourth century. Halo about the Savior's head in third century, later around the head of any saint. The crucifix appears first in the seventh century.

Oldest picture of baptism is by immersion. Dr. Coburn a Methodist. See also Philip Schaff in the *Didache*, pp. 36ff. Dr. Schaff was a Presbyterian.

Odes and psalms coming from the apostolic age.

Doctrines of the odes and psalms identical with New Testament.

### *Section III*—AT MOUNT SINAI

The same mountain that gave the law of Moses has in these modern times given to the world the oldest Greek manuscript of the Bible now known and other ancient documents of great value.

Greek Bible found at Mt. Sinai by Dr. Constantine Tischendorf in 1859.

Russian government made 300 photographic copies of this text which were distributed among the leading libraries of the world—one in the library of Congress at Washington, D. C.

Russian government did not return the manuscript, but made settlement for it by payment of 7,000 rubles to the monks of the Greek Catholic convent of St. Catherine at Mt. Sinai.

Recent press reports state that the British government has purchased this ancient Greek Bible for 100,000 pounds.

Omission of part of Mark's gospel.

Last thirteen verses of Mark's gospel not included in the two oldest Greek manuscripts—the Sinaitic and the Vatican.

The omission seized upon by critics to discredit the English Bible.

Others biased by prejudice against baptism as a condition of salvation have also stressed this fact to minimize or repudiate the great commission given by the Savior.

Same doctrine taught in other portions of God's word.

These ancient Greek Bibles in which this omission occurs dated in the fourth or fifth century.

But these verses are included in the Alexandrian Greek Bible and in other Greek texts later than the two named. They are also found in a number of translations made much earlier than the date of either the Sinaitic or the Vatican Bible.

Several Syrian, some Egyptian or Coptic versions, the Old Latin, and some others dating from the second or third century do contain these disputed verses. It does not require a knowledge of Greek for one to decide whether the proof favors the omission of the verses in question or not. All of those translations were made from Greek texts older than either the Sinaitic or the Vatican.

These disputed verses are quoted by Irenaeus, a learned Christian writer of the second century, as the last of Mark's gospel.

Early Syriac gospels—a Palimpsest.

A Syriac manuscript containing all four of the gospels except about eight pages found at Mt. Sinai in 1892 by Agnes Smith Lewis and her twin sister, Margaret Dunlop Gibson.

This manuscript was made in the fifth or sixth century, and after it had been used for some two hundred years it was discarded on account of its worn condition. The parchment on which it was written was then used to record the lives of some of the female saints, the later writing being made across the older writing which had faded. Original text was restored by the use of chemicals.

This manuscript proved to date back to within fifty or sixty years of the apostles or earlier. They are practically identical with our present gospels and contain not an extract from a gospel of Peter or any spurious gospel.

Epistle of Barnabas, Bishop of Hernias, Apology of Aristides. These all found at Mt. Sinai date back very near to the first century and are of great value.

## CHAPTER VI

### EVIDENCE ON PARCHMENT, VELLUM, AND PAPYRUS

#### *Section I*—THE DIDACHE OR TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

**Oldest Ritualistic Discipline.** In 1875, there was found a Greek manuscript in the monastery of Constantinople, containing 120 leaves of parchment, called the Didache or Teaching of the Twelve Apostles. This oldest of all known disciplines gotten up by uninspired men is in the Greek of the New Testament period, and scholars place its date at from A.D. 100 to 120. This discovery created much interest, and its translation and publication in 1883 brought to light many of the fundamental teachings of the church which were found to agree with those of the New Testament in nearly every item. It demands baptism in the threefold name by immersion if sufficient water can be had, but if sufficient water cannot be had, then a threefold pouring on the head is permitted. The Lord's Supper is to be celebrated every Lord's day, but it does not contain any commandment to keep the Sabbath. It mentions only one church, the church of God, and the word of God as the only accepted authority. Bishops and deacons are the only officials mentioned in the church organization with "prophets and teachers." It mentions Paul and his teaching, but does not mention Peter nor a pope nor the Virgin Mary. It gives the Lord's prayer and other simple forms of prayer, but all are addressed to God. On the action of baptism the exception seems superfluous, for people could not exist long in a place where enough water could not be had for an immersion. Indeed the cattle and sheep would suffer, and the people would occasionally require a bath. But when men undertake to write a discipline at all we may expect some departure from the word of God. The penalty imposed in the scriptures for adding to God's word should deter us from such an undertaking.

#### *Section II*—TATIAN'S DIATESSARON

**Harmony of the Gospels.** Tatian, a Syrian scholar, was born A.D. 110. He studied the learning of the Greeks and was dissatisfied with it. He studied under Justin Martyr at Rome and became a Christian about A.D. 150 to 170. He also studied philosophy which drew him away from the simplicity of the gospel, and this led him to deny Christ's humanity. He came to be regarded by the church as a dangerous heretic and as such was banished. But it is probable that



before he fell *so* far from orthodoxy he wrote his Diatessaron, perhaps between A.D. 153 and 170.

This work was an attempt to weave together in one continuous narrative the four gospels. It was at one time read in the churches instead of the gospels and a commentary on it was written by Ephraem Syrus. But both the original text and the commentary were lost, and nothing remained of them but the name Diatessaron and a few quotations. The critics admitted the early date and the significance of the title Diatessaron (by means of four), but found reasons satisfactory to them for rejecting the idea that the work was a composite of the four canonical gospels. They confidently asserted that it could not be a compilation of the four gospels, and although one writer stated that it began with "in the beginning was the word," indicating that Tatian used the gospel of John, they ridiculed this idea, for they were sure that the gospel of John was not written before the time when Tatian compiled his Diatessaron. They claimed that it was probably a brief and imperfect life of Christ taken from the apocryphal gospels. As for the commentary of Ephraem Syrus, the critics claimed this was not on the Diatessaron at all.

**Diatessaron and Commentary Found.** In 1836, the commentary was found at Venice and later a Syrian manuscript of the Diatessaron itself was found in the Vatican at Rome, and a second copy was afterwards found in the hands of an Egyptian scholar, and it has been translated and published in English.

Since the long lost Diatessaron has been found it has proved to be a life of Christ, compiled from the four canonical gospels—"these four and no more." It contains the greater part of the first three gospels and nearly all of the gospel of John—just what the critics thought it could not be. It does not contain one sentence from any gospel of Thomas, or gospel of Peter, or other spurious gospel.

**Gospels of First Century Not Corrupted.** The more candid of the critics have been compelled to admit that this discovery contradicts their theory as to the dates when the gospels were written, and, according to their own logic, the miracles and supernatural character of the gospels could not have developed contrary to facts in so short a time. This discovery establishes the fact beyond controversy that the four gospels were in common use at that early date; that they were commonly accepted by the church and had become fully established before this compilation was undertaken by Tatian, and further

that no other gospels were recognized at that early date. These considerations necessarily throw the date of the gospels back into the first century, where they belong, with their miracles, supernaturalisms and all. The claims of the gospels are thus firmly established, for it is evident that such claims, if false, would never have been established and fixed in the faith of Christians at the very time these things were claimed to be transpiring. If not true they would have known it.

*Section III*—THE TRINITY AND INCARNATION

**Critics' View.** Modernists represent many conflicting views regarding the trinity and the incarnation, but they are a unit in rejecting the plain teaching of the Bible on these subjects, charging that the doctrine of the trinity is polytheism or tritheism, and that the incarnation is not peculiar to Jesus alone. In other words, the doctrine of modernism at this point, as in many others, is the doctrine of Unitarianism, which holds that there is only one person in the godhead, and that Jesus is not the son of God in any unique sense, but only a mere man. They have in recent years become avowed atheists in many cases.

**Three in One.** Unitarians ridicule the idea of three persons being in any sense one and one as being three. This does appear to be impossible of independent, dissimilar or antagonistic beings, such as the gods of paganism or other forms of polytheism, which are largely represented as jealous and envious of one another, and frequently at war with and among themselves. The trinity of the Bible, the godhead, is entirely different from his view. While there are three beings or persons in the godhead, they are interdependent, similar in all their attributes, harmonious, and simultaneous. Their activities are harmonious and coordinate, as the executive, legislative, and judicial functions combine to make one orderly government. All of their characteristics are purity, holiness, perfection. They are infinite in power, knowledge, wisdom, and have the same benevolent purpose. The same values pertain to all activities of each person of the godhead like the terms of a simultaneous equation in mathematics.

The unity of the trinity may be further illustrated by the human being, consisting of body, soul, and spirit. Again, it may be like the composite soul which is an absolute unit. The attributes of the soul, knowledge, will, desire and other faculties are not to be classed as independent or unrelated units, "mutually exclusive," but these are factors of a single functioning soul. Knowledge, will, and desire func-

tion coordinately and unanimously in the normal mind. Dr. Harris puts it thus:

The three divine persons are not parts of, but are distinctions within, one indivisible substance, which is wholly in all; they are (1) unseparable, (2) co-inherent, (3) mutually containing, and (4) substantially one in the one indivisible substance of the one God.<sup>1</sup>

God the father is the Great Designer and Architect, and gave his plans and specifications for the construction and government of the universe; Jesus Christ is the Great Executor to carry into effect the Father's will, while the Holy Spirit is the Revealer of that will. As a divine being, omnipotent and omniscient, Jesus never "thought" he was the Messiah, or "decided to be the Messiah," as charged by some of the modernists. Neither did he ever express doubt, speculation or indecision. His teaching and sayings were in terms of knowledge. "Never man spake like this man!" His resurrection is the great demonstration of his claims, and this is substantially attested in scripture.

Given the bodily resurrection of Jesus, the events which followed among the disciples and among the Jews and in the heathen world are naturally explained; given only the spiritual resurrection, as understood by modernism, they are an insoluble enigma.

In view of the evidences presented in favor of the Bible and the absence of evidence that can stand the test of investigation against it, the only conclusion that can be held in the light of truth and reason is that the Bible is in deed and truth the word of God, "*quod erat demonstrandum.*"

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER VI

### *Section I*—THE DIDACHE OR TEACHING OF THE TWELVE APOSTLES

Oldest ritualistic discipline. Found in Greek manuscript in 1875, in the monastery of Constantinople, containing 120 leaves.

Date of the Didache placed at about A.D. 100 to 120.

Contents in agreement, in nearly every item, with the New Testament.

Demands baptism in the threefold name by immersion if enough water can be had. If not enough water, then a threefold pouring on the head is permitted.

The Lord's Supper to be celebrated every Lord's day. No command to keep the Sabbath.

One church, the church of God, and only one authority, the word of God.

Bishops and deacons the only officials mentioned in the church organization with "prophets and teachers."

Paul and his teaching mentioned, but no mention of Peter or of a pope or of the Virgin Mary.

---

<sup>1</sup> Chas. Harris: "Creeds or No Creeds" (1927), p. 288.

Gives the Lord's prayer and other simple forms of prayer, but all are addressed to God.

On the action of baptism the exception superfluous, for people could not survive very long where there could not be had enough water for an immersion. Livestock would need water and people would occasionally require a bath.

#### *Section II—TATIAN'S DIATESSARON*

Harmony of the gospels. The four gospels woven together.

Tatian born A.D. 110. Studied under Justin Martyr and became a Christian about A.D. 150 to 170. Studied philosophy which led him away from the simplicity of the gospel and to deny the humanity of Christ. Banished as dangerous heretic.

For some time was read in the churches. Ephraem Syrus wrote a commentary on Diatessaron. Finally lost for several hundred years.

Critics admitted the early date from quotations of the Diatessaron and the significance of the title (by means of four), but denied that it was a composite of the four gospels. Ridiculed the idea that it contained anything from the gospel of John, for they were sure the gospel of John was not written before the time of Tatian.

The Diatessaron and commentary found. The latter found at Venice and the former in the Vatican at Rome.

Contains the greater part of the first three gospels and nearly all of John, but not a sentence from a gospel of Thomas or of Peter.

Gospels of first century not corrupted gospels.

Discovery of the Diatessaron establishes the fact beyond controversy that the four canonical gospels were in common use at that early date, that they were commonly accepted by the church and established as authoritative before the compilation by Tatian was undertaken.

Origin of the four canonical gospels thrown back into the first century where they belong with miracles, supernaturalisms and all, a fact that the more candid critics have to admit.

#### *Section III—THE TRINITY AND INCARNATION*

Critics reject the doctrine of the Trinity. Agree with Unitarians.

Three in one. Unitarians ridicule the idea of three persons being in any sense one or one as being three. Impossible of independent, dissimilar or antagonistic beings, such as the gods of paganism or other forms of polytheism.

Persons of the godhead interdependent, similar in all their attributes, harmonious, and simultaneous. Like the executive, legislative, and judicial functions of an orderly government.

Like body, soul, and spirit of persons.

Like composite soul—knowledge, will, and desire.

Same values pertain to all activities of each person of the godhead, like the terms of a simultaneous equation in mathematics.

God, the Father, is the Great Designer and Architect. Jesus Christ, the Great Executor. Holy Spirit, the Revealer.

Conclusion: The Bible is in deed and truth the word of God.

## **PART IV**

# **FALSE CLAIMS OF EVOLUTION**

## CHAPTER I

### HYPOTHETICAL AND CONJECTURAL PHILOSOPHY

#### *Section I—EVOLUTION A FACT*

**Evolution and Involution.** Much confusion may be avoided by admitting in the beginning that there is such a process in nature as evolution—an unwinding, unfolding, or developing, as the evolution of a rose from the bud or a frog from an egg. There is also the opposite process of involution—a winding in or infolding—the reverse of evolution. The one is progressive, while the other is retrogressive; the one positive, the other negative. That both processes are in constant operation in nature, within fixed limitations, is too apparent to require proof. We think too much of our fine strains of hogs, cattle, sheep, and chickens to call in question the principle of a limited evolution. These two processes may be classed under the general head of "Variation." The only question raised at this point is regarding the nature and extent of variation.

It is axiomatic that every order has a beginning. It is equally true that no new order ever came into existence through autogenesis or spontaneous generation, and therefore every new order must be brought about by the intervention of an external power not acting through established law. Established law cannot regulate or affect nonentity. Law deals with things that exist. The first man must have come into being full grown with functions fully developed, capable of providing food and self-protection. The same holds true of all beings.

#### *Section II—STATUS OF EVOLUTION*

**Dogma of Evolution Generally Accepted.** Evolution has been accepted as the foundation or basis for all knowledge, excepting possibly history and pure mathematics, and even pushes these aside when necessary to make room for the doctrine. It is thoroughly fixed in our civilization and dominates our literature and learning. Textbooks used in colleges and high schools openly declare that evolution is accepted. "Outlines of Sociology," by Blackmar and Gillen, used in colleges and universities, declares on page 52:

Perhaps it hardly needs to be said that in the study of social origins it is assumed that man has developed from a lower animal form. The work of the prehistoric anthropologists and archaeologists has made it comparatively easy to retrace in some degree the steps in the physical evolution of man from a

being which was neither man nor ape, but had characters similar to those of both. The remains of Dubois' "Pithecanthropus erectus," of the Neanderthal man, and of the Heidelberg man give us our best conception of what that being was. The remains of prehistoric men found in the caves of France and Portugal represent the next higher step in evolution. The development in the art and industry of prehistoric men corresponds roughly with their physical evolution. What their social life was like we do not know. The fact, however, that man has developed from animal-like ancestors, considered in connection with the social habits of certain higher animals, makes it highly probable that man's prehistoric ancestors had a social organization intermediate between that of the animal and that of lower types of living men. All these discoveries have made a little clearer for us that shadowy past, out of which man emerged with some social organization and some social ideas.

Hegner, an outstanding zoologist, says:

Practically every zoologist at the present time believes that the complex animals have evolved from simpler forms at some period in the world's history. How this evolution has taken place is still a moot question ("Hegner's Zoology," taught in most colleges and universities, page 8).

High-school zoologies are even more emphatic.

Organic evolution is a fact demonstrated and accepted (Kellogg and Doane, "Economic Zoology," page 336, a work used in high schools).

### *Section III—DARWINIAN EVOLUTION*

**Universal and Unlimited.** In modern times the peculiar doctrines of Chas. Darwin are usually meant by the term "evolution," which is also frequently called "Darwinism," because it was he that placed the theory before the world in such form and manner as to give it both prestige and popularity, and gained for it, through his publications in the nineteenth century, a world-wide recognition.

Darwin endeavored to establish universal and unlimited evolution through certain hypothetical laws and assumptions. The most important of these may be stated as follows:

1. **Natural Selection and Survival of the Fittest.** According to this law, he assumes that the struggle for existence among individuals of both the animal and the vegetable kingdoms is a life-and-death one, and that only the strongest and fittest win the battle and survive.

2. **Variation and Heredity.** He adopts the well-known fact of variation, assumes that it is unlimited, and may operate toward continued improvement of the group through acquired beneficial characters, which, added to the already selected qualities of those that survive in the struggle for existence, are transmitted to the offspring by heredity.

Darwin admits that "the evidence that accidental mutilations can be inherited is at present not decisive"; but later, when he wished to account for the loss of the monkey's tail, in "Descent of Man," Vol. I, page 50, he argues that the monkey began to sit erect, thrust his tail to one side of the buttocks, which caused the tail to become "rubbed and chafed," and thus injured. In this connection he says:

We now have evidence that mutilations occasionally produce an inherited effect. . . . Finally, then, as far as we can judge, the tail has disappeared in man and the anthropomorphous apes, owing to the terminal portion having been injured by friction during a long lapse of time, the basal and embedded portion having been reduced and modified so as to become suitable to the erect or semierect position.

It is clear that Mr. Darwin reverses himself in order to sustain a theory, but he offers no proof that mutilations "occasionally produce an inherited effect." We believe he would have produced it if he could have found one such case. But all history testifies to the contrary, as may be seen from the fact that the Chinese have been mutilating their feet with bandages for ages without producing such effect. If mutilation could produce an inherited effect, it seems that the Jews would have ceased circumcision long ago, for they have been practicing this rite since the time of Abraham, nearly 4,000 years ago.

3. **"Natural Selection Can Act Only Through and for the Good of Each Being."** He assumes that "all the individuals varying in the right direction, though in different degrees, will tend to be preserved." He further assumes that through natural selection only useful and beneficial qualities can be acquired, while injurious structures will be eliminated.

If all individuals in the world were evolved from the monera, according to evolution, every life cell is acquired (we must assume) by natural selection. How, then, could injurious structures be acquired if natural selection acts only through and for the good of the individual? Surely natural selection was not suspended or asleep on duty when this happened!

4. **Sexual Selection.** Darwin says: "This depends on the advantage which certain individuals have over others of the same sex and species solely in respect of reproduction." He says we may reasonably suspect that the absence of hair in man "has been gained by sexual selection." In other words, Mrs. Monkey chose as her life partner, or mate, the Mr. Monkey that had the least amount of hair;



and this process repeated through ages finally produced the hairless son of a monkey—man.

5. **Extinction.** While admitting "retrogression of organization in some few cases," he assumes that the less favored forms "of the same species, as well as the original parent-species itself, will generally tend to become extinct."

And while he admits the difficulty of explaining why we do not find living individuals representing all shades of variation between the species, he thinks it probable that such intermediate forms have existed, but are now extinct. On this point he says: "We need not marvel at extinction. If we must marvel, let it be at our own presumption in imagining for a moment that we understand the many complex contingencies on which the existence of each species depends." We would suggest that such presumption is equaled by his "imagining for a moment" extinction without proof or explanation. Let us marvel at this! It is indeed strange that he will make such admission at a vital point like this, where the very life of his theory hangs upon a pure assumption applying to all the species in the world.

He makes, if possible, a more startling admission when he speaks of making "due allowance for our profound ignorance on the mutual relations of the inhabitants of the world at the present time and still more so during the past ages." Many are the admissions of ignorance at vital points throughout his effort to establish his guess.

6. **Similarity of Structures and Characters.** Similarity of physical structures or similar characters in any respect between species as proof of descent is not conclusive. It does not point out which of two given types, if either, is the descendant. Thus iron and copper have malleability, ductility, elasticity, which fact is no sort of proof that one is evolved from the other. Likewise, similarity in anatomy, embryology, instinct, and other characters count for nothing. It might indicate that all were produced at the same factory—the "God that made the world and all things therein."

**What of Edible Plants and Animals?** On Darwin's repeated assertion that no species of plant or animal life ever possessed a characteristic for the exclusive good of other forms of life, we may ask: What of the edible flesh of some animals and the edible flesh and eggs of many birds? Why do they not have the nonedible flesh of hawks or vultures? Why does not the law of selection evolve such beneficial characters for the protection of quails and turkeys? Truly

they were placed under the dominion of man, for his use and benefit, as the Bible says.

**Darwin Did Say as Much.** Occasionally we hear some one remark that Darwin never said man descended from a monkey. The following quotation from "Descent," Vol. II, page 315, makes it clear that he did say even as much, and the same thought is expressed in other words in many places in his "Descent":

By considering the embryological structure of man, the homologies which he presents with the lower animals, the rudiments which he retains, and the reversion to which he is liable, we can partly recall in imagination the former condition of our early progenitors, and 'can approximately place them in their proper place in the zoological series. We thus learn that man is descended from a hairy, tailed quadruped, probably arboreal in its habits, and an inhabitant of the Old World. This creature, if its whole structure had been examined by a naturalist, would have been classed among the Quadrumana [an order of animals, having all four feet handlike, including monkeys], as surely as the still more ancient progenitor of the Old and New World monkeys. The Quadrumana and all the higher mammals are probably derived from an ancient marsupial animal, and this through a long line of diversified forms, from some amphibian-like creature, and this again from some fish-like animal. In the dim obscurity of the past we can see that the early progenitor of all the Vertebrata must have been an aquatic animal, with branchiae [gills], with the two sexes united in the same individual, and with the most important organs of the body (such as brain and heart) imperfectly or not at all developed.

**Imagination and Probability.** Again it will be noted that he says "we can *partly recall in imagination* the former condition of our early progenitors," and the "Quadrumana and all the higher mammals are *probably* derived from an ancient marsupial animal." All "*imagination*" and *probability!*<sup>1</sup> But he is certain that man descended from "a hairy, tailed quadruped." The Bible and true science agree that the fruit tree yields "fruit after his kind" and the "living creatures after their kind." This is scientific, but to say that similar produces different is unscientific and contradicts true science, the Bible, and observation.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER I

### *Section I*—EVOLUTION A FACT

An unwinding; unfolding, developing, as the evolution of a rose from the bud or a frog from an egg.

Opposite process of involution—a winding in or infolding.

The one is positive, the other negative—progressive, retrogressive.

Both processes in operation in nature, within fixed limitations.

---

<sup>1</sup> Italics in this paragraph ours.

Variation—its nature and extent.

No new order ever came into existence through autogenesis or spontaneous generation.

*Section II*—STATUS OF EVOLUTION

Dogma of evolution generally accepted.

Thoroughly fixed in our civilization and dominates our literature and learning.

Textbooks openly declare for evolution. Quotation from Blackmar and Gillen. Quotation from Hegner and from Kellogg and Doane.

*Section III*—DARWINIAN EVOLUTION

Darwin endeavored to establish the doctrine of universal and unlimited evolution through certain hypothetical laws and assumptions.

Natural selection and survival of the fittest.

Variation and heredity.

Natural selection can act only through and for the good of each being.

Sexual selection.

Extinction.

Similarity of structures and characters.

What of edible plants and animals, if his doctrine be true that no plant or animal life ever possessed a characteristic for the exclusive good of other forms of life?

Darwin did say as much—that man descended from a monkey.

His conclusions all based on speculation, probability or possibility.

## CHAPTER II

### ASSUMPTION AS MAJOR PREMISE

#### *Section I*—VARIATION AND INHERITANCE

**Variation a Fact.** Darwin devotes much time and space in proving variation and thinks this is evidence for evolution. In this his time is wasted, for variation is too obvious to require proof, and we know of none who denies it. All individuals are distinguished by variations, no two being exactly alike, not even among black-eyed peas. The trouble with evolution here is its assumption that variation is unlimited and may operate to the extent of changing species. The truth is "they are merely fluctuations around a mean, to which mean the offspring tend constantly to return."

**Limited.** While variation continually operates among individuals of the vegetable and animal kingdoms, and is seen in all departments of the social functions of man, it never appears in what Darwin calls the "social life" of the lower animals. The lower animals appear to act solely through fixed and unvarying instinct. This is an important distinction between man and the brutes. But the great issue on this subject is confined to the extent of variation, and it is denied that independent species have originated through its so-called laws.

**Design.** If all variations come by accident independent of design on the part of an all-wise Creator, how can we account for the fact that all twining vines turn to the right? Why not some of them turn to the left by accident? If variation occurs in a haphazard way without the directing power of an overruling Designer, how do we account for the fact that on the Pacific Coast all individuals of the five or six varieties of salmon leave the ocean to spawn in the rivers, and after spawning every individual dies; while on the Atlantic Coast they likewise leave the salt water to spawn in the fresh-water streams, but none dies as a result of the spawning? Truly, "God moves in a mysterious way his wonders to perform"!

**Species Criterion.** The theory of evolution is based on variation, and variation is admitted within the limits of the species as abundantly proved by experiment and observation in the breeding of domesticated animals and plants. But no amount of observation or experimentation has ever shown a case of variation crossing the species

line, or a change that effected sterility between the old and the new types. The sterility between different types of animal or vegetable life is the true criterion for determining different species. A cross between the horse and the ass produces sterile offspring, and the mule has ever been a stumbling block to evolutionists.

**Inheritance of Tendency to Vary in One Direction.** The inheritance of acquired qualities, a Lamarckian doctrine, adopted by Darwin, requires the transmission, not only of an acquired character, but of a *tendency* to vary in a given direction. Thus if the struggle for existence causes the short-necked giraffe to die of starvation, while those with necks one inch longer survive, the offspring of the latter would, by inheritance, have necks the same length as the parents. But this does not meet the requirements of the evolution theory. The theory demands the transmission of a tendency or habit of continual variation in a given direction, and this can only be represented by a *curved* line, while inheritance signifies a *straight* line of descent.

**Directed Selection.** We are prepared to admit that there is such thing as selection in connection with variation, but it is a directed selection, not a haphazard one.

Man has by selective breeding produced great diversities in structure and habits of domesticated animals and plants. He has, for example, produced dogs as different as the mastiff and the toy spaniel, which have sufficient structural differences to be classed almost as different species. . . . Breeding outside the strain must be rigidly prevented or the organism reverts back to the original stock.<sup>1</sup>

In spite of all our breeding of pigeons, which has extended through more than three thousand years, two of the most differentiated varieties can interbreed; this fact obviously shows that they are still the same species since their young are not sterile, and what is even more significant, the pigeons from such crossbreeding, in a few generations, still revert back to the original ancestral type. . . . In other words, the tendency to revert must be considered as universal a law of nature as the tendency to vary. . . .

New varieties and races created by artificial selection revert to the original type as soon as they are left to their own devices; and in no case has mutual sterility been produced between different varieties. . . . It is evident that fixity of traits and sterility are essential to establish a species, and that in some way these must occur in a state of nature.<sup>2</sup>

We have been discussing an artificial selection directed by the hand of man who alters the environment, directing the habits, the feeding, the mating, etc., to develop certain desired variations and

---

<sup>1</sup> L. T. More: "Dogma of Evolution," pp. 216-7.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 219-221.

eliminate those not desired. By man this directed selection can be carried on continually in one direction.

**A Variation Selected by a Fixed Environment** as that of climate, or moisture or food seems likely.

Thus an animal covers itself with thicker fur to protect itself against the chill of winter, and others have a winter pelt of white fur as a further protection, since that color is the best reflector of heat.<sup>3</sup>

But no case is on record where a species has been developed by either artificial selection or by a fixed environment, the variations being always limited within the species. Certainly a species change cannot be shown to have occurred in the wild state apart from a directed selection. Four years after the publication of his "Origin of Species" Darwin said:

The belief in natural selection must at present be grounded entirely on general considerations. . . . When we descend to details, we can prove that no one species has changed (i. e., we cannot prove that a single species has changed); nor can we prove that the supposed changes are beneficial, which is the groundwork of the theory.<sup>4</sup>

Fossil remains indicate that some species have disappeared, but the causes of their disappearance are absolutely unknown. The unknown laws governing fecundity and sterility may be responsible rather than a struggle for existence. The sudden appearance at irregular intervals of great swarms of locusts and other insects which disappear abruptly with no increase of enemies or lack of food furnishes an example of great fluctuation not due to struggle for existence or other known cause.

Evolutionists have attached great importance to the supposed support of their theory from protective coloration of animals, of worms, and other insects and birds, which counterfeit leaves, twigs, the bark of trees or the ground. But it is difficult to see how any kind of selection could bring about such variation in advance and assist the individual in avoiding an enemy.

**Design Unwittingly Admitted.** A curved line of descent as demanded by evolution would indicate an intelligent designer to direct the course always in the right direction, but the evolutionist will have none of this.

Huxley, after giving an account of how the adult is developed from the ovum, or egg, says that in the higher animals the changes involved in this development are extremely complicated, but that they

---

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 210.

<sup>4</sup> "Life and Letters," Vol. II, p. 210, in P. S. of letter of date May 22 [1863], to G. Bentham.

have been "almost completely unraveled by von Baer and others." He then adds the following startling statement:

Nature, by this process, has attained *much the same result* as that which a human artificer arrives at by his operations in a brickfield. She takes the rough plastic material of the yelk and breaks it up into well-shaped, tolerably even-sized masses—handy for building up into any part of the living edifice. Next, the mass of organic bricks, or *cells*, as they are technically called, thus formed, *acquires an orderly arrangement!*<sup>5</sup>

This figure represents well the notion of most biologists as to how the adult is built up from cells. But the question is in order:

Who is this artificer, Nature, which makes these extraordinary cell bricks and gives them the power to acquire an orderly arrangement? Nature has here the characteristics we used to assign to an intelligent God.

And this simile of an artificer constructing according to the design of an architect is the picture or metaphor which the biologist employs, although, at other times, he denies anything but matter and physical force. After comparing the cells to bricks, he jumps over the whole difficulty by innocently remarking that the cells or bricks *acquire* an orderly arrangement. He pays absolutely no attention to the meaning of the word *acquire* and apparently most readers accept it without question. Just imagine a mass of bricks *acquiring* an orderly arrangement and becoming a house! It is this extraordinary fact that the cellular organism does act independently of its environment and arranges its order from within which makes it absolutely different from bricks and all other inanimate matter. This is the sort of language, and these are the loose ideas of men of science when they wander out of their own field and try to vivify matter. And the astounding thing is that they have "put it over" and confused the simple knowledge of men by technical words which mean no more than the common ideas of the Greek and Latin words from which they are derived.<sup>6</sup>

Scientists unwittingly admit design which calls for a designer when their system meets with difficulty and fails to account for their findings. They refer to nature and the laws of nature as the cause of many things otherwise unknown, but fail to tell us what they mean by nature or how a law can exist without a lawmaker. Again, if the law of inheritance is the basis of evolution, the theory is gone. For God ordained this law when he said: "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind" (Gen. 1:24).

---

<sup>5</sup> "Man's Place in Nature," pp. 82-5, quoted by L. T. More.

<sup>6</sup> More: *Op. Cit.*, p. 291f.

*Section II—DISSIMILARITIES*

**Begs the Question and Charges the Opposition with It.** On the difference between the mental powers of man and those of the lower animals, Darwin says:

No doubt the difference in this respect is enormous, even if we compare the mind of one of the lower savages, who has no words to express any number higher than four, and who uses hardly any abstract terms for common objects or for the affections, with that of the most highly organized apes.

Yet in the same chapter III, Vol. I, "Descent of Man," he says: "My object in this chapter is to show that there is no fundamental difference between man and the higher mammals in their mental faculties."

Notwithstanding his efforts to prove that the mental powers of man differ from those of the lower animals "only in quantity and not in quality," he fails at every point. It is granted that man and the lower animals have many characteristics in common, including animal instinct. We believe all the tricks of animals which he exhibits as proof may be properly accounted for upon the principle of mechanical habit or instinct. But man has other qualities which the lower animals do not have, as we shall see.

His assumption denies that man alone is capable of progressive improvement, but admits that man "is capable of incomparably greater and more rapid improvement than is any other animal . . . due to his power of speaking and handing down his acquired knowledge." Again, he says:

"To maintain, independently of any direct evidence, that no animal during the course of ages has progressed in intellect or other mental faculties, is to beg the question of the evolution of species."

It would seem to be Mr. Darwin's business to prove that some lower animals have progressed. We should not be called upon to prove a negative. If there is such improvement, it seems that some of his so-called "higher types" of monkeys would learn to make tools and teach their offspring to use them. Although he claims brutes may have abstract mental activity, he offers nothing worthy to be called "evidence" to establish the claim.

**Damaging Admissions.** Another tacit admission of failure to maintain similarity between man and brute is seen when he says: "The habitual use of articulate language is, however, peculiar to man." Articulate language is not an instinct, but has to be learned. What a difference between such language and the instinctive squeak



of the monkey, indicative of bodily pain, pleasure or panic, which never varies in the monkey from generation to generation! Darwin admits that

with civilized nations, as far as an advanced standard of morality and an increased number of fairly good men are concerned, natural selection apparently effects but little; though the fundamental instincts were thus gained.

If his law is universal and unlimited, it seems that men would never cease to improve, for no one even claims to have reached perfection. But the fact that man is endowed with a moral and religious character, of which the lower animals are totally destitute, presents a difficulty that Darwin utterly fails to overcome despite his labored efforts. Ethnography knows no race devoid of religion, but only differences in the degree to which religious ideas are developed. V. von Strauss said: "Complete absence of religion, true atheism, may be the result of undermining, soul-deadening overculture, but never the effect of crude barbarism." Barbarism, in its deepest degradation, always retains in man the craving, longing, and yearning for religion and a corresponding faculty for religion, however, faultily and confusedly this may operate.

### *Section III—DARWIN'S PURPOSE*

**Conclusion Should Follow Investigation.** The naturalist, as well as all others, should love truth and seek only the truth in all investigations. He should lay aside all prejudice and preconceived notions, all speculation, surmise, and sentiment, and approach his task with an open mind and a fixed purpose not to establish some notion or preconceived opinion, but to seek truth. To place the conclusion first and follow with the investigation is to defeat the legitimate ends of scientific research. This method, however, has one flattering trait—that of arriving at "assured results"!

The very fact that Darwin postulated what he called an "hypothesis" is admission that the guess was made first, else, if it were proven, it would not have been an hypothesis (guess). But let Darwin be his own witness on this point. On page 60, Vol. I, "Descent of Man," he explains that he had changed his views on the action of natural selection and survival of the fittest, and had made the necessary change in the fifth edition of "Origin of Species," and then adds:

I may be permitted to say, as some excuse, that I had two objects in view: firstly, to show that species had not been separately created; and, secondly, that

natural selection had been the chief agent of change, though largely aided by the inherited effects of habit and slightly by the direct action of the surrounding conditions.

This unscientific procedure, so frankly admitted by Darwin, is clearly seen throughout his writings. Yet Darwin is hailed as a great scientist. His method is not only unscientific, but his aim is vicious in that he expresses the purpose to overthrow the Bible teaching of creation.

**Work of Evolutionists.** Speaking of the chief exponents of evolution, L. T. More gives the following account of their work:

These men, Spencer, Darwin, Huxley, Haeckel, and Fiske, have received their share of praise and commendation; they have moulded our thought; the condition of the world today is largely the result of their teaching; they established biology as a great science; they started the sciences of psychology and sociology, and fostered the science of history, which attract large and enthusiastic, if somewhat vague, groups of followers; they smashed the authority of the humanities, and have changed our universities into technical schools, where results can be determined by material achievement, and where scholars seek to uplift humanity by the process of leveling all inequalities; their works and ideas are chronicled in innumerable books.<sup>7</sup>

And yet we are told that

Darwin had a naive ignorance of the work of even his immediate predecessors; Spencer read no books whose fundamental ideas differed from his own; and Huxley was the strenuous opponent of classical education.<sup>8</sup>

It may be of interest to give at this point Spencer's definition of evolution:

*Evolution is an integration of matter and concomitant dissipation of motion; during which the matter passes from an indefinite incoherent homogeneity to a definite coherent heterogeneity; and during which the retained motion undergoes a parallel transformation?*

He omits mind and starts with matter and motion, but his explanation really tells us nothing about either as to how they originated nor how they operate. He really thought mind a development by evolution.

While the reasons assigned by the pioneers of the doctrine of evolution are now abandoned in large measure, the sciences they started and the result of their doctrine still hold a place of first importance in the academic courses offered in most all of our colleges and universities.

---

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, pp. 318f.

<sup>8</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 320.

<sup>9</sup> "First Principles," p. 367, author's edition.

*Section IV—SOCIAL EVOLUTION*

**Progression or Retrogression.** Variation is seen in all parts of human endeavor and social activity. These variations are not always evolutions; they are often the reverse. Man's ethics, economics, politics, laws, customs, history, language, literature, science, philosophy, arts, and religion, even his entire civilization, may vary from generation to generation, and often the change is backward rather than forward. True religion, the worship of the all-wise Creator according to his revealed will, is the basis of all real progress and the solid foundation of the science of human happiness. The Bible abounds with examples of progress, prosperity, and peace to that people, nation, or individual who faithfully served Jehovah, while those who went into sin and idolatry retrogressed by *involution* to the lowest depths of degradation and savagery if God's chastisements failed to arrest their downward course. This was true in the days of Noah, when the ancient world of wicked people was destroyed by the flood. This rule holds throughout the entire history of Israel, and every nation of antiquity recorded in history came to ruin and desolation when its people forgot God, rejected his rule, and forsook his ways.

**Result of Rejecting the Bible.** Some of the remnants or offspring of these degenerate peoples have sunk to the lowest degree of savagery, and our modern speculative philosophers think they find in them the link next to the missing link in the chain of evolution from the ape to *homo sapiens*.

Ignoring the Bible as they do and turning a deaf ear to the abundant testimony of history and archaeology in support of its claims, evolutionists have no firm foundation to support their views. They quote the speculative philosophy of other evolutionists as authority of the highest scientific value, but give no credit to the inspired teachings of Moses, David, and Solomon, or of Jesus, Peter, and Paul. In their extremity they have relied on their vain imaginations expressed in hypotheses, which they undertake to support by speculations, surmises, and fancies, "holding a form of godliness, but having denied the power thereof: . . . ever learning, and never able to come to the knowledge of the truth" (2 Tim. 3:5, 7).

The strength of a chain is that of its weakest link. The Darwinian theory rests upon no stronger evidence than a "perhaps," "possibility," or "it is conceivable" that so and so is so. Darwin makes use of such expressions many, many times in his various works, and

then naively asks self-respecting, intelligent people to accept his guesses as demonstrated science. The following example represents well the process of evolutionists in support of their theory:

a "probably"= $x$

b "probably"= $y$

Therefore  $a+b=x+y$ .

Even at the most vital points of his system Darwin does not hesitate to call to his relief the ever-ready witness of "probability" or "possibility." Such a course is unscientific and merits ridicule rather than serious argument. Man's origin is not subject to scientific discovery; it belongs to the realm of the unknown and the unknowable except as it is revealed by the inspired word of God.

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER II

### *Section I*—VARIATION AND INHERITANCE

Variation a fact.

Limited.

Design—Twining vines—Habits of salmon on Pacific and Atlantic Coasts.

Species criterion—sterility between two different types.

Inheritance of tendency to vary in one direction, correctly diagramed by a curved line, while inheritance requires a straight line.

Directed selection. Quotations from L. T. More.

Variation selected by a fixed environment. Quotation from L. T. More.

Quotation from Darwin.

Protective coloration.

Design unwittingly admitted. The curved line of descent demanded by the evolutionists requires an intelligent designer to direct the course always in the right direction. Quotation from Huxley.

Quotation from L. T. More.

Scientists unwittingly admit design. They refer to nature and the laws of nature as the cause of many things otherwise unknown, but fail to tell us what they mean by nature or how a law can exist without a lawmaker.

If the law of inheritance is the basis of evolution, the theory is gone. For God ordained this law when he said: "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind" (Gen. 1:24).

Work of evolutionists.

Quotation from L. T. More.

Spencer's definition of evolution.

While the reasons assigned by the pioneers of the doctrine have been generally abandoned as untenable, the sciences they started and the conclusions they reached still hold a place of first importance in most of the courses offered in our colleges and universities.

*Section II—DISSIMILARITIES*

Begs the question and charges the opposition with it.

Quotations from Darwin.

Darwin denies that man alone is capable of progressive improvement.

He then charges that "to maintain, independently of any direct evidence, that no animal during the course of ages has progressed in intellect or other mental faculties, is to beg the question of the evolution of species."

It is his place to prove that some animals have improved or progressed. We should not be called upon to prove a negative.

Damaging admissions.

If his law is universal and unlimited, it seems that man would never cease to improve—and the monkey would share the same progress. Instead the monkey never changes his instinctive squeak, indicative of pain, pleasure or panic, which never varies in the monkey from generation to generation.

*Section III—DARWIN'S PURPOSE*

Conclusion should follow investigation.

The aim of the naturalist, as well as all others, should be to ascertain truth. To place the conclusion first and follow with the investigation is to defeat the ends of scientific investigation.

The postulating of an hypothesis is admission of placing the conclusion first.

Quotation admits that he had the purpose of showing "that species had not been separately created; and, secondly, that natural selection had been the chief agent of change."

This is a plain admission of unscientific procedure.

*Section IV—SOCIAL EVOLUTION*

Progression or retrogression.

Variation does not necessarily mean evolution. It may mean the reverse.

Man's ethics, economics, politics, laws, customs, history, language, civilization, and religion may vary from generation to generation.

The Bible abounds with examples of people who progressed when they were faithful to Jehovah, while those who went into sin and idolatry retrogressed by involution to the lowest depths of degradation and savagery if God's chastisements failed to arrest their downward course.

Result of rejecting the Bible.

Some of the remnants or offspring of degenerate peoples have sunk to the lowest degree of savagery, and our modern speculative philosophers think they find in them the link next to the missing link in the chain of evolution from the ape to *homo sapiens*.

The strength of a chain is that of its weakest link. The Darwinian theory rests upon no stronger evidence than a "perhaps," "possibility," or "it is conceivable." This is not science.

Man's origin is not subject to scientific discovery; it belongs to the realm of the unknown and the unknowable except as it is revealed by the inspired word of God.

## CHAPTER III

### THEISTIC EVOLUTION

#### *Section I—DARWINISM vs. THE BIBLE*

**Darwin an Agnostic.** Many evolutionists make the claim that evolution does not conflict with the Bible or the Christian religion, but a glance at a few of Darwin's own statements will be sufficient to show his attitude on this point. He says:

"Hence, if I have erred in giving to natural selection great power, which I am far from admitting, I have, at least, as I hope, done good service in aiding to overthrow the dogma of separate creation." Again, just before his death, he said, as quoted by Mr. Bryan: "The mystery of the beginning of all things is insoluble by us; and I, for one, must be content to remain an agnostic." At many points he thinks there is a conflict.

Learning of every kind should have in view some useful end, but no such end has yet been pointed out as a result of Darwinism. On the other hand, it can have but one effect on those who accept its conclusions, and that is disbelief in the Bible. The absence of any reference to faith in revealed religion (a subject religiously avoided by evolutionists), together with Darwin's rejection of the Bible account of creation, has the effect of undermining faith in the inspired word of God. It strikes at the very vitals of the Christian religion and destroys its influence as a moral force in the world when the Bible is dethroned. Teach a man that he evolved by accident from a monkey, that he was not created by an all-wise Creator as a responsible creature who must give an account of the deeds done in the body, and you destroy all incentive to righteousness. He will feel no restraints to his fleshly animal passions except that imposed by the laws of the land, which he knows he can often evade, and even those laws are much weakened and often nullified by such influence.

**Science and Philosophy.** While Darwin was not directly responsible for applying the theory of evolution to the making of the Bible, he has set an example of projecting the wildest kind of speculation, based on a guess, and then boldly proclaimed this unsupported hypothesis as science. This is clearly a perversion of the word science which means classified knowledge, coming from the Latin *scire*, to know. Unproved theories and hypotheses may be referred to as philosophy, but should never be called science. The Evolutionary

Hypothesis, like its twin brother, the Documentary Hypothesis, has no beneficial end or influence, but both strike a death-dealing blow to faith in God and the Bible to the extent they are accepted. When Christians compromise their faith by holding to evolution the result is always the same and means a tragedy to the faith in God's word, which is fitly illustrated by George McCready Price in quoting the old limerick:

There once was a lady of Niger  
 Who went to ride with a tiger;  
 They returned from the ride  
 With the lady inside,  
 And a smile on the face of the tiger.<sup>1</sup>

*Section II*—CONJECTURAL PHILOSOPHY

**Bible the Basis of True Science.** One by one the world has witnessed the rise and fall of theories and hypotheses, which, for a greater or lesser time, held a firm grip on the learned. Many such speculations have run their course and have been supplanted by others, which in turn have suffered a similar fate. This is specially true of all theories conflicting with the Bible, while those teachings in harmony with divine revelation can never be impeached. The Ptolemaic theory of astronomy has been altogether discarded because it contradicted the word of God, while that of Copernicus and Galileo has been fully established and demonstrated because in harmony with the eternal truth. Others, such as perpetual motion, fatalism, spontaneous generation, etc., have been proved false and rejected by true science.

**Geology—Index Minerals.** The science of geology has had its share of speculative philosophy, much of which has been in opposition to the Bible. A. G. Werner, a German professor, is credited with originating the science of geology as a special branch of scientific study. It was he that originated the fundamental schedule of geologic ages based on "index minerals." He undertook to arrange the strata of minerals of the earth in order, assuming that certain minerals were found only in certain strata of the earth deposited while the earth was under water, other minerals being deposited at a later time under similar conditions, always in layers or strata, like the folds of an onion, those at the lowest depths were the older, while that on the surface is the most modern. For a time this theory was accepted as

---

<sup>1</sup> G. M. Price: "A History of Some Scientific Blunders" (1930), p. 11.

ascertained truth, about which there could be no further doubt. But Werner's theory has been set aside for various scientific reasons.

**Geology—Index Fossils.** But the general principle set forth by Werner was adopted by Wm. Smith, nicknamed "Strata" Smith, and later by Chas. Lyell (1797-1875), the latter being credited with making the new science of geology popular. Smith had proposed fossils as the basis for determining the different periods of the formations of the earth's crust, and Lyell took over this theory without critical examination and pushed the doctrine of uniformity and succession, which became the foundation of geology.

With Lyellism established and accepted as proved science based on "index fossils" uniformly and successively deposited on the earth's crust, Chas. Darwin began work on his theory of evolution, though the theory had been promulgated by Lamarck, who had just preceded him, and by others. Darwin was closely associated with Lyell in the Geological Society of his time and saw the triumph of Lyell's doctrine of uniformitarianism, or the doctrine of the uniform deposit of fossils in the rocks of a certain assumed period. This gave the cue to evolution which Darwin was quick to take up. Darwin took with him a copy of Lyell's first volume on geology on his trip in the *Beagle* to the southern hemisphere and made special study of it.

**Fossil Remains Not Uniform or Successive.** If one accepts the current theory of uniformitarian geology he cannot logically escape the theory of evolution. It postulates evolution and is evolution's strongest argument. But is it true, as taught by Lyell, that geological formations may be determined by fossil remains in uniform and successive order? On this point we wish to quote George McCready Price as follows:

In our day, with all the abundant proofs which we now have, there is not the slightest excuse for any intelligent person saying that the Cambrian fossils, wherever found around the world, are always older than the Carboniferous, or the latter older than the Cretaceous or than the Tertiary. But if we cannot with the sternest and clearest logic maintain these relative ages of these "index fossils," what is the possible sense of trying to construct some system of organic evolution? The stories of "Alice in Wonderland," the "Wizard of Oz," or any other form of "Jabberwocky" would be about as scientific.<sup>2</sup>

We may add that Mr. Price, quoted above, is a leading authority on geology and has written several books on scientific subjects. But his statement cannot be denied, for geologists all know now that

---

<sup>2</sup> G. M. Price: *Op. Cit.*, p. 123.



"geological formations and fossil deposits are known over the face of the globe in nonconformable and nonsuccessive order."<sup>3</sup> Professor Louis T. More says:

We can then be certain that geology cannot and never will be able to translate the thickness of any one stratum into an equivalent length of time, and that it cannot, and never will be able to, establish real contemporaneity of time in different parts of the world.<sup>4</sup>

The arrangement of the fossils and rocks in a graded series for the world is a purely artificial scheme, "good as a mere scheme for classification purposes, but without the slightest scientific value as a, definite chronology for the world as a whole."<sup>5</sup>

**Creation or Spontaneous Generation.** The value of conjectural philosophy is small indeed until proved, and in those fields which forbid human observation and experimentation we must rely on history or be content to remain in ignorance. This is where science has often blundered. Its legitimate sphere is in dealing with things as they are, and not in trying to determine the origin of the earth and things therein. And here is where they are absolutely inconsistent. There can be only two theories in regard to the origin of things, one by creation and the other by spontaneous generation. Virchow and Pasteur proved the latter to be false, and their verdict has been accepted by the scientific world. This demonstration did not come till after the triumph of Darwin's theory of evolution in a popular sense. Yet "consistent evolutionists have always held that spontaneous generation is a 'philosophic necessity' of their creed."<sup>6</sup> "All who are determined not to believe in creation must believe in spontaneous generation."<sup>7</sup> Since the latter is gone what will they do? They have offered no other foundation and they are at sea without chart or compass.

### *Section III—DOES CHRISTIANITY OPPOSE SCIENCE?*

**False Charges Against Christianity.** Evolutionists make the bold charge that Christianity is opposing science in rejecting Darwinian evolution; that it is the same error that the church made about 1634 in opposing and persecuting Galileo for his scientific views on the solar system; that strict Christians thought the earth was flat, and condemned Galileo as a dangerous heretic because he taught it

---

<sup>3</sup> E. A. Elam: "Bible vs. Theories of Evolution," p. 237.

<sup>4</sup> More: "The Dogma of Evolution," p. 151.

<sup>5</sup> G. M. Price: *Op. Cit.*, p. 121.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 65.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 62.

was round and revolved upon its axis and around the sun. They tell us that Christianity, as in the case of Galileo, will have to yield to science and should even now apologize for rejecting the doctrine of Darwinian evolution.

But, unfortunately for their position, there is no parallelism between the two cases adduced. It *is* true that Galileo was persecuted and imprisoned on account of his teaching, and his release was allowed only upon the condition that he would abjure and recant by oath on his knees the sublime truths of his scientific creed. This he was weak enough to do. But all of this was done by the Roman Catholic Church through the Pope and the (un) Holy Inquisition. Strict Christians had no part in it, nor could they, under the law of Christ, persecute any one. For the purpose of contrast we give below the teaching of Galileo and that of the Catholic Church in parallel columns:

## GALILEO'S DOCTRINE

1. Did not contradict the Bible by his scientific creed, but incidentally his views are supported by the Bible when it declares: "He stretcheth out the north over empty space, and hangeth the earth upon nothing."

Also impersonated wisdom says: "When he established the heavens, I was there: when he set a circle upon the face of the deep."

2. Agrees with the Bible when it says: "It is he that sitteth above the circle of the earth."

## CATHOLIC DOCTRINE

1. Was wrong and had no Bible teaching for their view.

2. Was in error in assuming that the earth was flat. The "four corners of the earth" has no bearing upon its form, but simply refers to the cardinal points.

The sun stood still at the command of Joshua, and the Bible speaks of the sun rising and setting or going down; but we use the same expressions, and the daily papers publish every day the time of the rising and setting of the sun.

Galileo's teaching was not an unsupported hypothesis, but has been so fully demonstrated and the proofs are so universal and convincing that no one denies it.

The case of Christianity and evolution may be contrasted thus:

## CHRISTIANITY

1. Has Bible teaching to support the belief that "God . . . made the world and all things therein."

## EVOLUTION

1. Plainly and clearly contradicts the Bible by its hypotheses. Darwin himself admits this.

2. Has never been demon-

"Let the earth put forth grass, herbs yielding seed, and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth."

"God made the beasts of the earth after their kind, and the cattle after their kind, and everything that creepeth upon the ground after its kind."

"God created man in his own image."

strated, and the evidence offered is not convincing, but is based upon imagination and fancy, and many of its most zealous advocates lament the lack of proof.

Its necessary links are connected by nothing more than mere conjecture, possibility, or probability.

Such are the features of the two cases so often presented by evolutionists in an attempt to fasten upon Christianity the odium of ignorance and stupidity in opposing science. There is no similarity in the two cases, and the claim is false in every particular.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER III

#### *Section I*—DARWINISM vs. THE BIBLE

Darwin an agnostic.

All learning should have some useful end.

The doctrine of evolution undermines faith in the inspired word of God.

When the Bible is dethroned the Christian religion and its influence as a moral force in the world is destroyed.

To give an account of the deeds done in the body is an incentive to righteousness.

Science and philosophy.

Unproved theories and hypotheses may be called philosophy, but not science.

To compromise faith by holding to evolution is disastrous.

#### *Section II*—CONJECTURAL PHILOSOPHY

The Bible the basis of true science.

Theories conflicting with the Bible not permanent because not demonstrated truth.

Geology—index minerals.

A. G. Werner originated science of geology based on index minerals.

Geology—index fossils.

Wm. Smith originated the doctrine of index fossils as a basis.

Chas. Lyell adopted theory of index fossils and pushed the doctrine of uniformity and succession.

Darwin took his cue from Lyell and established his evolution theory on the doctrine of uniform and successive deposit of the earth's crust.

Fossil remains not uniform nor successive.

Quotation from Geo. McCready Price.

Uniformitarian geology evolution's strongest argument.

Quotation from Louis T. More.

Can be only two theories of origins—creation and spontaneous generation. Those who reject creation must accept spontaneous generation, but the latter has been repudiated by the scientific world.

*Section III*—DOES CHRISTIANITY OPPOSE SCIENCE? False charges against Christianity.

Persecution of Galileo cited as parallel to opposition of evolution. Work of the Roman Catholic Church and the Inquisition. Galileo's doctrine compared with Catholic doctrine of his time. Christianity compared with evolution. No parallelism between the two cases.

## CHAPTER IV

### DARWINISM REFUTED

**Testimony of an Evolutionist.** We give below a copy of the greater part of an article on evolution published in the "New Republic," New York, April 11, 1923, under the title, "Where Evolution Stands Today," by Vernon Kellogg. Until 1920, Mr. Kellogg was professor of entomology and lecturer on bionomics at Leland Stanford University, and at the time of this publication he was permanent secretary of the National Research Council, Washington, D. C.:

The principal difficulty today about evolution is to know what causes it. This has, indeed, been an outstanding difficulty all along. Biologists have for a long time had no doubts at all about the reality of evolution, but they have had doubts always about the validity of the various causes that have been suggested from the times of the Greeks to those of the mutationists and the Mendelians—which are the times of today—to explain it. Oddly enough, the antievolutionists have taken little advantage of this uncertainty among the evolutionists concerning the causal factors of evolution. They have mostly devoted themselves to affirming dogmatically, or trying to prove, that there is no such thing as evolution—at least and particularly, no such thing as the evolution of man. They could have made more trouble if they had stressed more the differences of opinion among the evolutionists regarding the causes and control of evolution. . . . But, under any circumstances, any present-day discussion of evolution must include a special attention to the status of our knowledge of its causes. . . . The "unknown factors of evolution" are the biologists' great riddle today.

But let me repeat—because the biologists do not know, or only partially know, the causes of evolution, to assume from this that they have any doubts at all of the reality of evolution would be to assume what is not true. I do not know of a single living biologist of high repute—and I do not determine repute on a required basis of a belief in evolution—who does not believe in evolution as a proved part of scientific knowledge.

Since Darwin's day much has been added to our knowledge of the facts about the manner and the effect of evolution, but only the important new alleged causal factors have been presented for consideration as primary causes of evolution. These are mutations and Mendelian inheritance. Neither has had any general acceptance as sufficient explanation of either species forming or adaptation, which are the coordinate fundamental problems of organic evolution. In this same post-Darwinian period also the two most important explanations of evolution current in Darwin's time—namely, Lamarckism, or the inheritance of accrued characters, and Darwinism, or natural and sexual selection—have been weakened rather than strengthened as sufficient causes of evolution. If this is ammunition for the antievolutionists, let them make what use of it they can. We can afford to be honest.

Lamarck's explanation is simple and plausible. Basing itself on the familiar fact that plant or animal individuals do become adaptively modified during their lifetime in response to environmental conditions, it assumes that such individually acquired changes or characters are passed on, in some degree, by heredity to the offspring of these individuals, which, in turn, further change and pass on their changes by heredity, and so on through succeeding generations until new types of species and increased degrees of adaptation or fitness result.

A plausible explanation, but one wholly dependent on the inheritance of acquired characters, which, unfortunately, does not seem to happen. Both extensive observation and intensive experimentation unite in shattering this absolutely essential assumption in the Lamarckian explanation of evolution. The germ plasm from which new individuals arise is so distinct from the rest of the body in the plant individual, so protected from the influence of external conditions or of local changes in other body parts, that there seems to be no means for causing it to produce in its development into new individuals a replica of the local changes suffered by the parent body in its lifetime. And this conclusion, arrived at by modern study of the germ plasm and heredity mechanism, is confirmed by the observed results of completed development. Acquired characters in the Lamarckian sense, are not inherited.

Darwin's explanation of species change and adaptation is based, like Lamarck's, on both certain observed facts and certain assumptions. Small, spontaneous, fortuitous variations appear in all new individuals born—this is an observed fact; and there is an overproduction of young by every species—another fact. Hence, Darwin assumed that there will be a severe struggle for existence among these young for place and food among themselves and in competition with the young of other species, in the course of which struggle these small variations will play a life-preserving or life-losing role, depending on whether these variations are advantageous or disadvantageous in the face of the environment. Those young which are better, even very slightly better, equipped for this struggle, by virtue of their variations, this "better" being, therefore, in the direction of fitness, will win in the struggle and leave offspring varying as themselves, assuming these variations to be inherited; while the others will be extinguished, together with their disadvantageous variations. By cumulations through generations this "natural selection" will result in species change and increasing adaptation.

Also a plausible explanation, but also much weakened, if not shattered by the results of modern biological study, which have shown that many of these small variations are not inherited. They are merely fluctuations around a mean, to which mean the offspring tend constantly to return. Also it is asking too much to ascribe a life-or-death determining value to these minute variations despite any conceivable intensity of the struggle for existence. Indeed, most of the species differences, let alone the individual differences among such animals as the insects and others represented by large numbers of species, are of a kind which require a very lively imagination to see as differences of life-and-death determining value. There is a large family of little beetles, called "ladybird beetles," among which the different species are recognized by very slight differences in the number or size or color of minute spots on the wing covers.

Similarly many little flies are distinguished as to species by the number and size of small bristles on the back and small differences in wing venations. One often needs a hand lens to distinguish them. Now, are these differences, which we have to reinforce our eyes to see, going to decide whether a toad or lizard or insect-eating bird sees and devours, or does not see and devour, individuals of one rather than another of these insect kinds, or, even more fantastic, one individual rather than another, both belonging to one species and differing from each other by even more microscopic variations?

Mutations are larger variations, which are undoubtedly heritable. But they are, so far as much careful observation goes to show, not abundant, nor can they be assumed to be adaptive in character. They may be so pathologic or abnormal as to insure early death to the individual showing them, and to that extent are "selected out"—that is, the very bad ones get extinguished; but if not too bad, they may persist and really establish a new species. That they actually do this is proof that it is not merely the fittest who survive. But to explain the extraordinary, precise adaptation of orchids and other insect-pollinated flowers to their insect visitors, and the equally extraordinary adaptations of these visitors to their plant hosts, or the remarkable adaptations of parasites, or of protectively colored and patterned butterflies and moths, mutations are simply hopeless.

Then there is the offered explanation of the origin of new species or races through hybridization in nature and the juggling of characters and character combinations through Mendelian inheritance. Here again it is only the origin of new kinds of plants or animals, and not adaptations, which are explained—if anything at all is explained. Only one-half of the evolution problem is even approached by the Mendelian explainer.

This sounds discouraging for the evolutionists, but it really is discouraging only to the seekers after the causes of evolution. Every year the old proofs of evolution are reconfirmed and new ones found. Evolution is proved by all the evidence of comparative anatomy, embryology, paleontology, and geographical distribution, evidence which increases in amount every year. The evidence from any one of these fields of science alone is sufficient to prove evolution. From them all together it is overwhelming.

All this applies to the evolution of man as well as to the evolution of the plants and lower animals. The old evidence of human evolution from lower animal forms, based chiefly on comparative anatomy and embryology and the existence of and suggestive distribution of various living human types, has been in recent times especially confirmed by the numerous finds of the fossils of prehistoric, anciently prehistoric man. The series from *Pithecanthropus* to *homo sapiens* is being steadily revealed, with every promise of the early future filling in of the remaining gaps. There has been also, in recent times, a notable addition to the proof of man's relationships to other animals through physiological discoveries, especially those relating to blood characters.

But to the candid examiner and weigher of facts these additional evidences are only surplusage. Huxley had enough evidence to convince any fair-minded person. Without ever seeing the relics of *Pithecanthropus* or glacial time man, we could yet be certain of man's evolution. Seeing them is to see him

actually evolving—just as seeing the horse series from little five-toed Eohippus of early Tertiary times, through later and larger four-toed Orohippus, and still later and larger Mesohippus to one-toe Equus of today, is to see the actual evolution of the horse.

The silver tongue of Bryan cannot overcome the gold of ascertained fact, but it can hypnotize many people for a longer or shorter time by its tinkling.

From the above article it is clear that Professor Kellogg accepts Darwin's conclusions, but rejects his reasons and exposes the fallacy of his much-boasted law of natural selection and survival of the fittest, and that his other laws—Lamarckism, or inheritance of acquired characters, and sexual selection—have been weakened.

**Other Damaging Testimony from the Ranks of Evolution.** Alfred Russel Wallace, a noted scientist contemporary with Darwin and a co-worker with him in working out his proofs of evolution, later deserted Darwin on sexual selection and expressed his dissatisfaction with his hypothesis.

Professor M. Caullery, professor of biology in the University of Paris, an avowed evolutionist, in a lecture printed in the "Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute," 1916, says of evolution: "We have not reached a precise conclusion."<sup>1</sup> He relates that eight years before, F. Le Dantic, a former disciple of evolution, wrote a book stressing contradictions, which, according to him, were to result in the ruin of the very idea of evolution. Professor Caullery adds:

(1) Since that time opposition has been even more marked; and at the present day, either tacitly or explicitly, certain of the most authoritative men, by their works, have arrived very near to a conception which would be the negation of transformism [evolution] rather than its affirmation. (2) It is evident, then, that all is far from being clear in the present conception of transformism [evolution]. (3) We must also recognize that, since the time of Darwin, natural selection has remained a purely speculative idea, and that no one has been able to show its efficacy in concrete, indisputable examples. (4) As far as the theory of evolution is concerned, the results obtained up to this time have been rather disappointing.

Professor William Bateson, M.A., F.R.S., whose lecture of August, 1914, on heredity is given in the "Annual Report of the Smithsonian Institute of 1915," says:

Formerly it was hoped that by the simple inspection of embryological processes the modes of heredity might be ascertained, the actual mechanism by which the offspring is formed from the body of the parent. In that endeavor a noble pile of evidence has been accumulated. All that can be visible by

---

<sup>1</sup> Caullery: *Op. Cit.*, p. 321ff.



existing methods has been seen; *but we come little, if at all, nearer the central mystery* (author's italics).<sup>2</sup>

He argues that individual characters are made up of cells or factors composing the organism, and says further:

We thus reach the essential principle that an organism cannot pass onto offspring a factor which it did not itself receive in fertilization. Parents, therefore, which are both destitute of a given factor can only produce offspring equally destitute of it. ... My predecessor said last year that in physics the age is one of rapid progress and profound skepticism. In at least as high a degree this is true of biology; and as a chief characteristic of modern evolutionary thought, we must confess also to a deep, but irksome, humility in the presence of great vital problems. Every theory of evolution must be such as to accord with the facts of physics and chemistry, a primary necessity to which our predecessors paid small heed, for them the unknown was a rich mine of possibilities on which they could freely draw. . . . The appearance of contemporary variability proves to be an illusion. Variation from step to step in the series must occur either by the addition or by the loss of a factor. Now, of the origin of new forms by loss there seems to me to be fairly clear evidence; but of the contemporary acquisition of any new factor I see no satisfactory proof, though I admit there are rare examples which may be so interpreted. . . . We have done with the notion that Darwin came latterly to favor; that large differences can arise by accumulation of small differences. . . . Modern research lends not the smallest encouragement or sanction to the view that gradual evolution occurs by the transformation of masses of individuals, though that fancy has fixed itself on popular imagination. . . . New species may be now in course of creation by this means, but the limits of the process are obviously narrow.

Professor Kellogg in his article repudiates and refutes the leading arguments of Darwin, and what he left of Darwinism is shattered into hopeless wreckage by the foregoing quotations from Professor Caullery and Professor Bateson with one or two minor exceptions which they did not cover. All three of these men are avowed evolutionists, but they appear to be candid in dealing with scientific facts as they see them. They still cling to evolution as a "fact," even though the causes do not appear, their main reliance being upon fossil remains of anciently prehistoric man, which will be treated under a separate heading.

**Chief Apostles of Evolution Testify.** But in addition to the damaging testimony contained in the above quotations, we have admissions from some of the chief apostles of evolution, which, if taken at face value, repudiate all scientific claims of evolution and place it

---

<sup>2</sup>Bateson: *Op. Cit.* p. 359ff.

"among the hypotheses" where it belongs. The following quotations are from the "Bible vs. Theories of Evolution":

Those who hold the doctrine of evolution are by no means ignorant of the uncertainty of their data, and they only yield to it a provisional assent.— Tyndale.<sup>3</sup>

So long as the evidence at present adduced falls short of supporting the affirmative, the doctrine must be content to remain among the hypotheses.— Huxley.<sup>4</sup>

We cannot prove that a single species has changed. Many of the objections to the hypothesis of evolution are so serious I can hardly reflect on them without being staggered.—Chas. Darwin.<sup>5</sup>

**Leading Scientists Testify.** In addition to these unwilling or proevolution witnesses, we have a great abundance of evidence from leading scientists and biologists whose reputation for scholarship is probably equal that of any evolutionist (though Professor Kellogg and other rabid evolutionists deny any acquaintance with them). Two other quotations from "Bible vs. Theories of Evolution" are in order at this point:

It is one of the strangest phenomena of humanity; it is utterly destitute of proof.—Sir. J. William Dawson, the great geologist of Canada.<sup>6</sup>

In all this great museum there is not a particle of evidence of the transmutation of species. This museum is full of proofs of the utter falsity of the views.—Dr. Etheridge of the British Museum.<sup>7</sup>

Finally, we refer to one who is, perhaps, the greatest witness of modern times on the theory of evolution. Rudolf Virchow was not only a great scholar and scientist of the highest rank, but an independent thinker, who was not content to truckle after a popular theory which had for its support nothing more than imagination. His discovery of the germ theory of disease marked the greatest epoch in the history of medical science and won for him the title of "Father of Modern Medicine." He refuted and discarded forever the old idea of spontaneous generation, and showed in his "Cellular Pathology" nature's immutable law that *omnis cellula e cellula*—all cells come from cells, all life from antecedent life. The great progress in surgery and medicine in modern times has been made possible by the discovery of Rudolf Virchow, and he stands today as the greatest benefactor to the human race of modern times. Not only did this eminent scientist refute the false hypothesis of abiogenesis so ardently

---

<sup>3</sup> E. A. Elam: "Bible vs. Theories of Evolution," p. 234.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 234.

<sup>5</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 234.

<sup>6</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 232.

<sup>7</sup> *Ibid.*, p. 238.

advocated by Lamarck, Haeckel, and other evolutionists (not including Darwin), but he rejected and actively opposed the Darwinian theory of evolution and its conclusions. Among other things he is quoted as saying: "In vain have its adherents sought for connecting links which should connect man with the monkey. Not a single one has been found."

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IV

Quotation from Vernon Kellogg in "New Republic."

Professor Kellogg accepts Darwin's conclusions, but rejects and exposes his reasons as false.

Other damaging testimony from the ranks of evolution.

Alfred Russel Wallace, co-worker with Darwin, deserted him.

Testimony of evolutionists: Professor M. Caullery, University of Paris; Professor Wm. Bateson, lecturer; Professor Vernon Kellogg.

Testimony of chief apostles of evolution: Tyndale, Huxley, Darwin.

Leading scientists testify: Sir J. William Dawson, great geologist of Canada; Dr. Etheridge of the British Museum; Rudolf Virchow.

## CHAPTER V

### FOSSIL REMAINS AND ENIGMAS

#### *Section I—THE MISSING LINK*

**Darwinism in Scrap Pile.** It will be seen that, according to the authorities already quoted, and a host of others that might be quoted who stand high in the ranks of science, the bulk of Darwinism is thrown into the scrap pile. It seems that nothing remains but the head and tail of Darwinian evolution—the term "evolution" and the conclusion. And since all of his causal laws or reasons have been repudiated, it seems that the question may be in order: What is evolution? The plea of ignorance appears as the only answer at this time.

**Claim of Disappearance of Fossil Remains an Alibi.** The latest shift in this extremity to find a basis for the conclusion is that claimed to be found in the fossil remains of animal and vegetable life in the earth. They say we have no living specimens of the numerous missing links between the distinct types of life, but that they have existed in ages past. Some evolutionists admit and lament the fact that we have no satisfactory evidence in the fossil remains of the earth. Darwin himself keenly felt the force of this deficiency and lamented the fact; but he was always resourceful, and, drawing again on his inexhaustible store of "possibilities," he assumed that the geologic record is not complete. It is complete enough, however, to reveal types of life in the Paleozoic age which are exact replicas of living types of today, showing no change whatever during a period variously estimated by geologists in millions of years. These facts, however, make but little impression on those who want to find support for a pet theory. Professor Kellogg, while repudiating Darwin's reasoning, is in full accord with Haeckel, who says: "*The descent of man from an extinct Tertiary series of primates (apes) is not a vague hypothesis, but a historical fact*" (italics ours).

**Pithecanthropus Erectus.** These scientists find in the skeletal remains of what they term the "Neanderthal man," the "Heidelberg man," the "Piltdown man," and specially "Pithecanthropus erectus" (erect ape man) what they are pleased to believe is the long-lost missing link between man and ape.

Since more importance is attached by them to the last named, we will give briefly some of the leading facts regarding "Pithecanthropus

erectus," the remains of which were found by Dr. Eugene Dubois on the island of Java in 1894 among the bones of a number of animals, including rhinoceros, hyena, hippopotamus, tapir, elephas, and some others which are said to be extinct. The scanty remains of this supposed ape-man consisted of a small portion of the skullcap, one femur, or thighbone, and two teeth. Professor Haeckel admits that "*it is obviously impossible to form from these scanty remains a complete and satisfactory reconstruction of this remarkable Pliocene primate*" (our italics).

At the International Zoological Congress held in Leyden in 1911 a very animated discussion of this find was provoked; and "of twelve experts present, three held that the fossil remains belonged to a low race of man; three declared them to be those of a manlike ape of great size; the rest maintained that they belonged to an intermediate form, which directly connected primitive man with the anthropoid apes." Haeckel dogmatically says: "This last view is the right one. . . . He is indeed the long-searched-for missing link."

There, now, we have it—a small piece of skullcap, a thighbone, and two teeth! And this is the best one of all the missing links! We do not pretend to say what these bones represent. They may belong to one or more animals, man or ape. Those twelve experts did not know, and we are persuaded that Professor Haeckel knew no more about it than that hung jury knew. But we have often wondered what the ape-man (?) was doing there with all those bones of beasts over which God gave man the dominion.

The eminent scientist, Rudolf Virchow, was one of those present at the Leyden Congress, and vigorously opposed the theory that the bones were those of a missing link between man and ape. He also vigorously denied that the remains found in caves of France, Spain, and Germany were those of an intermediate type between man and apes, claiming they were simply degenerate types of man.

### *Section II—PROOF (?) BY RECONSTRUCTION*

**A House with No Foundation.** Evolutionists have generally admitted that they are unable to show the causes of evolution and many of their leaders have repudiated the reasoning of Darwin and others heretofore relied on as evidence for the processes of evolution. But the adage holds in their case —

Convince a man against his will,  
He'll be of same opinion still.

And so the evolutionists hold tenaciously to what they are pleased to call the "fact" of evolution even in the absence of any proof of the causes or processes. A house with no foundation cannot stand.

**Evidence Manufactured.** But some evolutionists are very resourceful and where proof is lacking they manufacture the needed evidence. This is seen in Professor Ernst Haeckel's genealogy of man.

Starting with single-celled primeval animals, he arranged a progressive series, coming up through worms, fishes, amphibians, mammals, semiapes, apes, ape-men, and culminating in man—twenty-two steps, numbered consecutively. Some of these even Haeckel himself admitted had never been seen, either fossil or otherwise; but the so-called "law of evolution" required their existence; hence they were included.

**Regarding this pedigree M. de Quartrefages is quoted as follows:**

The first thing to remark is that not one of the creatures exhibited in this pedigree has ever been seen, either living or fossil. Their existence is based entirely upon theory. All species, existing or extinct, are said to have been preceded by ancestral forms, which have disappeared, leaving no vestige behind. . . . All the ancestral groups, more or less ill represented in the actual organic world, do not suffice to fill up the gaps in his pedigree. From one stage to another there is sometimes too broad a gulf. Then Haeckel invents the types themselves, as well as the line of descent to which he assigns them.

**To show the justice of the above charge Haeckel himself is quoted by the same authority:**

The vertebrate ancestor No. 15, akin to the salamanders, must have been a species of saurian (lizard). There remains to us no fossil relic of this animal. In no respect did he resemble any form actually existing. Nevertheless, comparative anatomy and ontogeny authorize us in affirming that he once existed.

**It is charged that Professor Haeckel "falsified the illustrations of embryos, even assigning to them names other than their own." Professor Arnold Brass is quoted as saying:**

These tables show intentional falsifications to uphold the false caption (skeletons of the five anthropoid apes).

The uprightness of man's carriage is concealed. The gorilla's knee has been pressed to make it appear to be standing straight. The walking posture of all the apes is false. This table is an example of how Haeckel uses the works of other people.

**Other examples of fraudulent "reconstructions" are to be seen in the Field Museum in Chicago and in other places where a progressive series is arranged beginning with a very small monkey and others larger in size in order, including baboon, gorilla, and gibbon. But the gap is too great at this point for them to be satisfied with**

placing even a low type of man next. So it happens that they have in some cases "reconstructed" the missing links necessary to complete their progressive series. The first link is a reconstruction of *Pithecanthropus erectus*, the Java Man, reconstructed from only a thighbone, a small piece of skull bone, and two teeth found on the island of Java, the different parts being some distance from one another and not known to belong to the same individual. This effort is to be seen among the "intermediate" "links" in the Hall of the Age of Man, American Museum of Natural History, New York. Much has been made by evolutionists of the other similar discoveries, as the Piltdown man, the Neanderthal man, the Heidelberg man, etc., and similar reconstructions have been made with only a few fragments to build upon. Noted scientists have declared these reconstructions to be nothing but frauds, claiming that these structures are made up of the remains of different individuals, as the skull of a man, the teeth of a monkey, or the jawbone of a chimpanzee. These frauds have been so fully exposed by A. W. McCann in "God—or Gorilla" and by others it is deemed unnecessary to give further details here.

**Size of Cranium.** The evolutionists have tried to find evidence from the brain capacity of their "missing links," but here they have met with nothing but disappointment. The brain capacity of the highest forms of apes is said to be about 600 cc., while that of the males of Central Europe averages about 1,500 cc. and females about 1,300 cc. In order to find evidence on this point it was necessary for the "missing link" to have a brain capacity intermediate between these, so the Neanderthal skull was fixed at 1,033 cc. "Even Huxley, however, was forced to correct this and admitted it was 1,230 cc., which is close to that of a normal man of fair intelligence. By some it has been placed as high as 1,408 cc." And it must be remembered that the fragments of the skull of the Neanderthal man belong to a race of true men and not to an ape-man as claimed by evolutionists, according to eminent scientists.

### *Section III*—THE SEVEN ENIGMAS OF EVOLUTION

**No Basis.** Time was when evolutionists had a plausible basis for their theory, that of spontaneous generation or abiogenesis, the doctrine that life may evolve from nonliving matter. But this doctrine was exploded years ago and has been discarded even by evolutionists.

The Seven Enigmas of Evolution given in "Bible vs. Theories of Evolution" from DuBois-Reynolds, p. 234ff, are:

No. 1. **The Origin of Matter.** Not being able to account for the origin of matter, it is assumed. Shutter speaks of the "nebulous mists of cloud" that by a "process of whirling and cooling and condensing" became the globe of today. But he fails to tell us where that cloud of nebulous mists came from.

No. 2. **Where did the force, energy, power that set that cloud of nebulous mists whirling and cooling and condensing come from?** And who can explain the necessary increase of that energy to produce such wonderful and lasting effects?

No. 3. **The Origin of Life.** Vegetable, animal, soul, spirit life. Spontaneous generation having been discarded, evolutionists have nothing to offer here.

No. 4. **Order and Unity** throughout the universe. The doctrine of chance will not account for the movements of the heavenly bodies nor for the adaptation of things to one another and for their functions in their different spheres.

No. 5. **The Fact of Species.** Evolutionists themselves have discarded Darwin's reasons for the origin of species, and, not willing to accept the account of creation given by Moses, they have nothing else to offer.

No. 6. **Man as he is** and as he has been ever since he has been known upon the earth. Rejecting the account of the origin of man as given in Genesis and not being able to offer any other solution, this enigma remains to haunt the evolutionist at every turn.

No. 7. **Religion—the Christian Religion.** Evolutionists account for everything through evolution, but as to the cause, or reason, or the process, they account for nothing. They think that religion itself is an evolution, and if Darwin's theory of acquired changes being only for the good or benefit of the species be accepted, the Christian religion and the Bible itself must be products of evolution, including miracles, prophecies, and all. Why should not the evolutionist accept these as worthy and natural products of his unvarying law of evolution?

But evolutionists will not accept the consequences of their own reasoning. Neither will they accept what history and reason clearly establish, that there is a great God back of everything, who created



all things and established the law of biogenesis or procreation for the perpetuation of each species created. God said:

Let the earth put forth grass, herbs yielding seed, and fruit-trees bearing fruit after their kind, wherein is the seed thereof, upon the earth: and it was so. ... And God said, Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind: and it was so (Gen. 1:11, 24).

This law has been universal for some six thousand years and no evolutionist has ever proved an exception to it.

In view of what has been brought out in this discussion we are reminded of the words of a great inspired writer who said:

Knowing God, they glorified him not as God, neither gave thanks; but became vain in their reasonings, and their senseless heart was darkened. Professing themselves to be wise, they became fools (Paul in Rom. 1:21, 22).

**The Result.** Now if evolution made atheists and skeptics of such men as Darwin, Haeckel, Spencer, and others, do we expect it to make Christians of our boys and girls who study evolution taught in our schools and colleges, not as an hypothesis, but as *demonstrated truth*? It is a well-known fact that a large percentage of students, even of those who are Christians to begin with, have lost their interest in religion after spending four years in such institutions. This is what may be expected where evolution is taught without the counteracting influence of the Bible.

From the foregoing facts and considerations we are compelled to conclude that the claims of evolution as accounting for the origin of species and the descent of man are false in all essential points, and that "in the beginning God created the heavens and the earth," and that "the God that made the world and all things therein" said, "Let the earth bring forth living creatures after their kind, cattle, and creeping things, and beasts of the earth after their kind: and it was so," and that "God created man in his own image."

## SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER V

### *Section I*—THE MISSING LINK

Darwinian evolution discarded.

What is evolution? Ignorance only answer.

Claim of disappearance of fossil remains an alibi.

Reliance on fossil remains, yet they claim we have neither living specimens nor fossil remains of the numerous missing links between the distinct types of life—but that they have existed.

Darwin always resourceful, draws on his inexhaustible store of possibilities, and assumes that the geologic record is not complete.

Geologic record reveals types of life in the Paleozoic age exactly like living types of today.

Skeletal remains of man. Specified.

*Pithecanthropus erectus*, erect ape-man. Found by Dr. Eugene Dubois. Found among the bones of a number of animals.

Scanty remains consisted of a small portion of skullcap, one femur, two teeth. Quotation from Professor Haeckel.

Opinion of twelve experts at the International Zoological Congress in Leyden, in 1911.

Rudolf Virchow present at the congress. His opinion.

### *Section II*—PROOF (?) BY RECONSTRUCTION

Evidence manufactured. Evolutionists resourceful.

Haeckel's progressive series—worms, fishes, amphibians, mammals, semi-apes, apes, ape-men, man—twenty-two steps numbered consecutively. Even Haeckel admitted some of these had never been seen.

Quotation from M. de Quartrefages.

Quotation from Haeckel.

Quotation from Professor Arnold Brass.

Missing link constructed to complete the progressive series.

Noted scientists have declared the reconstructions as nothing but frauds.

Size of brainpan.

### *Section III*—THE SEVEN ENIGMAS OF EVOLUTION

Origin of matter.

Where did the force, energy, power that set the cloud of nebulous mists whirling and cooling and condensing come from?

The origin of life.

Order and unity.

The fact of species.

Man as he is.

Religion—the Christian religion.

Evolutionists will not accept the consequences of their own reasoning.

God is author of the universal law of biogenesis or procreation, as revealed in his word (Gen. 1:11, 24).

Quotation from Paul (Rom. 1:21, 22).

Result of teaching evolution.

Conclusion.

**PART V**

**THE INFLUENCE OF EDUCATION**

## CHAPTER I

### EDUCATION

**A Knowledge of the Bible.** It has been said that a knowledge of the Bible is a good education. It may be nearer the truth to say that education without a knowledge of the Bible is inadequate— not that one is expected to know all about every subject touched upon in the Bible, but that one should know his duty and have a fairly comprehensive grasp upon the history of God's dealings with men. It is obviously impossible for one to learn all there is to be known on any subject or line of study or investigation. For practical purposes this makes selection necessary and all will agree that wisdom should be exercised here. "The fear of Jehovah is the beginning of wisdom." Not all will agree to this, but no one has ever disproved this statement of Solomon, nor can it be proved that anything else is more important than the fear of Jehovah. This implies faith, trust, and obedience, the very fundamentals of the greatest science in the world—the science of happiness here and hereafter.

**Positive and Negative Education.** Education comes from the Latin *e*, out or out of, and *ducere*, to lead. Not all education is beneficial and desirable. Taking truth and righteousness as a basis, education may be positive or negative. Positive education leads out of darkness into the light of truth, out of ignorance into knowledge, out of error into truth and righteousness. A negative education may lead out of truth into error, out of righteousness into sin, out of a degree of ignorance or deception into greater ignorance or deception. Again education may be composite and made up of a mixture of truth and error, and so long as we are in the flesh and exposed to error and evil, we are likely to be influenced in a negative manner. This does not imply, however, that we are altogether creatures of environment. When man transgressed God's law he suffered the penalty of separation from God, but not irretrievably. He was endowed with the power to know good and evil. Along with this knowledge was given him the power to choose between good and evil, right and wrong, truth and error, life and death, and not only this, but God pointed out to him the consequences of his choice. In all ages God has confirmed this endowment of man's inner consciousness as a guide to his conduct by divine counsel to make a wise choice in accepting and following God's revealed will, at the same time warning him against any

other course. The responsibility rests upon man to function as a free moral being in choosing between truth and righteousness on the one hand and error and evil on the other. Without this quality and responsibility man would not be an intelligent, rational being.

**Preparation for Duty.** This responsibility of choosing involves the privilege and duty of making use of all the means within man's reach for achieving good. This, in turn, involves preparation for such achievement. That this preparation includes moral, mental, and spiritual cultivation and training in a positive direction as man's chief equipment for the duties of life is axiomatic. Physical and intellectual training are valuable and should not be neglected, but there is too much of a tendency in our educational affairs to neglect the moral and spiritual training which should come first. It is not claimed that moral and spiritual training alone is all that an education should include. Indeed other subjects are necessary in order to get a proper grasp of the moral and spiritual. One must learn language, literature, history, and something of science and useful occupations if he would duly appreciate and understand God's word. However, much time and labor are wasted on worthless fiction, speculation, and false philosophy—"science falsely so called." True science makes no war on true religion. Science is classified knowledge and holds an important place in preparing for the practical and professional duties of life. But in pursuit of the arts and sciences let us not neglect the greatest and most important science—spiritual science, which is the science of human happiness.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER I

- A knowledge of the Bible.
- Fear of Jehovah, the beginning of wisdom.
- Positive or negative education.
- Operation of positive education.
- Operation of negative education.
- Man endowed with power to know good and evil and the power of choice.
- Preparation for duty.
- Moral, mental, and spiritual cultivation and training, man's chief equipment for the duties of life.
- Physical and intellectual training valuable, but not all of an education.
- Spiritual science should not be neglected.

## CHAPTER II

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION

**A Theistic Viewpoint** calls for a theistic education. That is, if there is a beneficent Ruler and Creator who has a right to demand of his intelligent creatures adoration, honor, and religious service it follows that they must be instructed in his will. This, in turn, calls for a revelation of God's will to his rational, responsible creatures. For man to ignore or repudiate this divine message is to dishonor and repudiate his Maker.

**An Atheistic or Agnostic Viewpoint** calls for nothing from the source of all good. In repudiating God and his law as revealed in the Bible, this doctrine would destroy the Bible and all that it stands for and would bring confusion, contradiction, and chaos to social order and to material progress in the world. But the atheist or agnostic is a subject of prophecy and its fulfillment:

My people are destroyed for lack of knowledge: because thou hast rejected knowledge, I will also reject thee, . . . seeing thou hast forgotten the law of thy God, I also will forget thy children (Hos. 4:6).

For man to rely on his own inner consciousness as his guide unaided by divine authority is to make a god of himself. Under this system there could be no common rule of action for either individual or social conduct, consequently no law, no order, no stable society, no standard of ethics, no civilization.

**Worship of Nature.** To assume that nature is God's only revelation to man is to adopt a system of nature worship. When men reject and repudiate God's spiritual message revealed in spoken or written language of words addressed to man's understanding, they often resort to nature worship—the worship of sun, moon, and stars; or of the sky, or sea; or of an imaginary personification of life or generation represented by idolatry. It is true that "the heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament showeth his handiwork," but this only testifies of the existence of the Creator and of his power and wisdom. This is not a revelation of the origin, relations, and destiny of man; it does not give any law or rule of conduct, nor reveal to man his duty to his fellows and to his God; it furnishes no moral or ethical standard for his guidance, nor does it reason of "righteousness, and self-control, and the judgment to come." Nature does not reveal to man his sin, nor provide a way of life and salvation.

**Religious Education of Value.** Since no stream is higher than its source and no man can lift himself by the straps of his boots, so it is impossible for man to function outside of his sphere in which God has placed him. There is no foundation in reason or revelation for the view that man can originate or provide a system of salvation. "It is not in man that walketh to direct his steps." Aside from the revelation of God man is helpless in his efforts to govern himself. The religion of Buddha, of Confucius, of Zoroaster, of Mohammed, or of any other system devised by men has no sanction in divine authority, and is, therefore, inadequate for man's redemption. It follows, therefore, that the only religious education of value is that founded on God's revealed will.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER II

A theistic viewpoint calls for theistic education.

An atheistic or agnostic viewpoint calls for nothing from the source of all good.

Results that would necessarily follow atheism. Quotation from Hosea.

Man's inner consciousness not a safe guide.

Worship of nature.

Nature not a revelation.

Religious education of value founded on God's revealed will.

## CHAPTER III

### CHRISTIAN EDUCATION

**Religious Education and Christian Education.** Compared. It is not enough to be educated, nor will religious education necessarily supply man's real needs. Education might be religious and at the same time corrupt or spurious, not authorized by divine authority. Since God has dealt with man under different dispensations, which fact he has made clear in his revelation, it becomes necessary that we recognize this fact, and comply with the specific conditions imposed in the dispensation in which we live. The Mosaic law served its purpose as a schoolmaster to bring us to Christ, and the Bible teaches us that we are no longer under the law of Moses, but under the law of Christ, and this law is revealed to us in the New Testament through inspired apostles and prophets.

The distinction between religious education and Christian education must be carefully made and observed. While Christian education is religious education, it does not follow that religious education is always Christian education, for, as we have seen, religious education may be anything other than Christian. Christian education is based on Christ and his teaching as revealed in the New Testament, and since we are under the law of Christ our religious education must be based on that law. A clear understanding of the Christian law is not readily gained without some knowledge of the law given through Moses, but this fact does not establish the law of Moses as a code binding upon Christians.

Many are the warnings given in the scriptures against perverting the word of God and neglecting or rejecting it. Paul told Timothy to "give diligence to present thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, handling aright the word of truth" (2 Tim. 2:15).

Every scripture inspired of God is also profitable for teaching, for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness: that the man of God may be complete, furnished completely unto every good work (2 Tim. 3:16).

But though we, or an angel from heaven, should preach unto you any gospel other than that which we preached unto you, let him be anathema (Gal. 1:8).

**Must Be Positive.** These warnings from the New Testament are quite sufficient to establish the fact that Christian education to



be such indeed must be positive in all of its parts. To pervert the gospel wilfully or to teach against the doctrine of Christ as given by his inspired apostles and prophets is negative education, and is nothing short of treason against the King of the universe. Men in their willfulness have been prone to turn away from the word of the Lord. A striking prophecy to this end is being fulfilled in our day:

Behold, the days come, saith the Lord Jehovah, that I will send a famine in the land, not a famine of bread, nor a thirst for water, but of hearing the words of Jehovah (Amos 8:11).

To teach about the Bible is not sufficient; the Bible must be allowed to speak for itself, and no system of education may be called Christian which does not include the sacred text.

### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER III

Religious education and Christian education compared.

God has dealt with man under different dispensations.

The Mosaic and the Christian dispensation.

Christian education based on Christ and his teaching revealed in the New Testament.

Importance of the Old Testament scriptures for understanding the New Testament (2 Tim. 3:16; Gal. 1:8).

Must be positive.

Wilful perversion of the doctrine of Christ is negative education and is treason against the King of the universe.

Quotation from Amos.

The Bible as a text.

## CHAPTER IV

### RELIGIOUS EDUCATION ORGANIZATIONS

**Religious Education Association.** A number of organizations wield a powerful influence in religious education and activity in America at the present time. Chief among these is the Religious Education Association whose function is declared to be particularly research, and while it does not undertake promotional work directly, it is active in propaganda of modernism through its advisory sections for ministers and directors of religious education, for weekday school workers, etc. By research is meant the study of science, history, philosophy— anything except the Bible. The association does not credit Christ or his word as authority, but relies on the dogma of human experience as the source of its rationalistic creed.

In a recent annual meeting at Philadelphia the general theme was "Religion in an Age of Science." One speaker at this meeting advocated the philosophy of Plato as superior to Christianity. Professor Jas. H. Leuba (atheist) of Bryn Mawr College contended in debate that "prayer is nothing but a relic of barbarism and superstition." During its twenty-sixth annual convention, held at Des Moines, Iowa, it is reported that the Lord Jesus Christ was not mentioned as such, although the name of Jesus as a man was mentioned a few times.

The Religious Education Association, with the Council of Church Boards of Education, has prepared courses in religious education for "colleges upon religious foundation," and credit has been allowed on academic work for work done in said courses.

That the Religious Education Association with its Jews and Unitarians, its Leubas and Starbucks (atheists), should actually be engaged in drawing up a religious-educational scheme for the Christian institutions of the country is perhaps the last word in effrontery. Yet this is the case, and its department of universities and colleges, of which the freethinker, Professor Starbuck, has been executive secretary, has a committee for the standardization of college and university Biblical departments which has been at work seven years and has classified about 300 of the colleges. And the official representative of the evangelical churches (the Council of the Church Boards of Education) is cooperating. "More and more," says President Micou, "it is appearing that our chief task is to unify all the religious educational forces at work in normal schools, universities, professional schools, and theological seminaries" ("Leaven of the Sadducees," page 129).

**International Council of Religious Education.** Another organization wielding a powerful influence in the field of religious education

is the International Council of Religious Education, which claims to be the official representative of thirty-nine Protestant denominations. This council is not limiting its activities to promotional functions, but "is in an increasing degree exercising legislative functions." It is said that "practically all the curriculum-making forces of the continent will be in the council. The council determines the standards for leadership training, and grants the certificates and diplomas for the same." The modernism of this council is manifested in its research activities, and in substituting social problems for the Bible as authority in lesson materials.

In carrying out their schemes of propaganda

to a state university where no religious tests can be established a school of religion is to be attached, to all intents and purposes a great established institution of religion ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 125).

Professor C. F. Kent is quoted thus:

The main objective in a modern state school of religion is to expose [as an infection] the undergraduates in the state universities to courses in religion that will meet the vital needs of which the majority are now only dimly conscious ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 125-6, note).

"A large proportion of the students in tax-supported universities," wrote Professor C. F. Kent, in 1923, "come from homes where the instruction in religion has been of the sectarian and fundamental type. ... It is not strange, therefore, that thousands of these students, when they realize how impossible is the seventeenth century faith taught them in their childhood, make the fatal mistake of discarding all religion."

Obviously this must be remedied. A National Council of Schools of Religion has been organized, of which Professor Kent was, as of so many of these enterprises, the leader. On this committee appear most of the ultramoderns, Fosdick, Jenks, Merrill, Willett, Matthews, Bade, Soares, Barton, Wild, Merrifield, Athearn, Faunce, Sanders, Hocking, Wood, Cadbury. President Eliot is an active member of the General Advisory Committee of the council. The Unitarians have for years subsidized Unitarian churches at university centers. The time is come to fill them with young people from Christian homes. I know, of course, that the scheme is "nonsectarian" in the old sense, Jews and Catholics being among the incorporators, but it represents its own sectarianism. We have, indeed, nothing else here than a modernist drive at the state universities ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 124).

Bible chairs in American colleges were established by men and women with an earnest interest in the development of Christian faith and character ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 111).

They are now dominated by men in full sympathy with the Religious Education Association whose purpose is to destroy what their founders meant to establish. Andover, Vassar, Mt. Holyoke," Bryn

Mawr, Wellesley, and many other schools founded for the purpose of teaching fundamental faith in the Bible have been looted or diverted from the original aims and purposes of their founders. Referring to Professor Leuba's connection with Bryn Mawr College, Ernest Gordon says:

When we come to Professor Leuba we have an unpardonable case of violation of a testator's wishes. Leuba is an atheist who glories in the prevalence of atheism in American college faculties ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 118f).

To show the result of the propaganda of unbelief, even among so-called Christian institutions, the "National Republic," April, 1930, page 36, is quoted as follows:

More than four hundred educators and clergymen of the "liberal" and radical type have signed a memorial in favor of the removal by Congress of the United States Treasury's right to exclude from entry at the customhouses obscene books, pamphlets, and circulars. One of the signers of this memorial is Bishop Francis McConnell, President of the Federal Council of Churches of Christ. Another is Rev. Harry F. Ward of Union Theological Seminary, President of the American Civil Liberties Union.

This regulation has had a most wholesome effect in preventing the entry into this country of foreign literary filth, some of it being an obscene attack on religious faith.

#### SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER IV

Religious Education Association.

Courses in religious education for colleges upon religious foundation. Quotation from Ernest Gordon.

International Council of Religious Education. Its activities. Quotation from Ernest Gordon.

Many schools founded for the purpose of teaching fundamental faith in the Bible looted or diverted from the original aims of founders. Quotation from Ernest Gordon. Obscene literature.

## CHAPTER V

### BIBLICAL LITERATURE

**Textbooks by Unbelieving Authors.** In the department of Biblical literature in most of the colleges and universities in this country a number of textbooks are used which have been prepared for the purpose by modernists, but little use is made of the Bible itself except for reference or collateral reading. A publisher's announcement appears in each of a group of such books as follows:

A complete course of Bible study has been outlined by a joint committee representing the eastern and western sections of the Association of College Instructors in the Bible, the departments of colleges and universities, and of teacher training of the Religious Education Association, the Student Y. M. C. A. and Y. W. C. A., and Sunday School Council.

. . . The complete course will include the following books: "Old Testament History," by Professor Ismar J. Peritz of Syracuse University; "New Testament History," by Dr. Harris Franklin Rail, President of Iliff School of "Theology; "The Bible as Literature," by Professor Irving F. Wood and Professor Elihu Grant of Smith College; "Social Institutions and Ideals of the Bible," by Professor Theodore Scares, University of Chicago; and the "History and Principles of Religious Education," by Professor F. H. Swift, University of Minnesota.

The above books are noted for their modernism and manifestations of unbelief in the inspiration of the Bible. Their authors are prominent in the councils of the Religious Education Association, are firm believers in the Documentary Hypothesis and other theories of modernism. Practically all of them agree in placing a very late date to most of the books of the Old Testament and in discrediting the historicity of the contents of many of them.

In the "Bible as Literature," by Wood and Grant, we find on page 45, referring to Isa. 7:14, that they claim "'virgin' is a wrong translation. The word means simply 'a young woman.'" But we see no reason for accepting their translation as against that of the groups of great scholars who translated the King James Version and the Revised Version of our English Bible. Besides, it would have been no sign as proposed by the prophet for a young woman to bear a son in the natural process, nor would there have been any reason for calling his name Immanuel. The Alexandrian Jews could hardly have had any motive for rendering the word *parthenos* (virgin) had this not been its true meaning as given in the Septuagint.

Another textbook used in colleges and universities, especially in the Biblical literature course in a large university in the South, is entitled the "History of the Hebrew Commonwealth," by Albert Edward Bailey, A.M., Director of Religious Education in Worcester Academy, and Chas. Foster Kent, Ph.D., Litt. D., Woolsey Professor of Biblical Literature in Yale University. A few quotations from this book will suffice to show what is being taught in the name of religion:

His (David's) god was a being who might break out with disaster on the slightest provocation, and who had to be appeased by sacrifices, even human ones (p. 119f).

Referring to "Jeroboam the son of Nebat who made Israel to sin":

There is no doubt that the Jehovah images caused an increase of idolatry, because the people soon forgot that they were only symbols; but the king hardly merits the wholesale condemnation the Biblical writers mete out to him. It would seem from the scant data given that Jeroboam was a ruler of strength and sagacity, in every way devoted to the welfare of his subjects (p. 146).

A caution ought to be given at this point against accepting in general at their face value the estimates passed upon the kings of Judah and Israel by the Biblical writers (p. 147f).

On the whole, he (Ahab) was the ablest monarch that Israel produced, farseeing, energetic, politic, and, for the most part, just. The great religious crisis which occurred in his reign should not blind us to Ahab's essential greatness (p. 153).

Ahab showed astonishing leniency. When Benhadad offered to restore all the captured Israelite cities and to give a whole bazaar in Damascus to the Israelite merchants for their free use, Ahab accepted and gave Benhadad his freedom. People of narrower views than Ahab possessed criticized him most severely for freeing his bitterest foe; in fact, the bands of the prophetic dervishes who had now risen to prominence sent one of their number to the king to denounce his policy and to curse him (p. 156),

referring probably to one of the sons of the prophets who rebuked the king for his course by delivering a message from Jehovah (1 Kings 20:35ff).

Referring to the victory of Judas Maccabaeus, leader of the Jews, over Antiochus, this book says:

This glorious deliverance from the jaws of death was the signal for many a paean of praise:

"Jehovah saith to my Lord, Sit thou on my right hand,  
Until I make thine enemies thy footstool" (Psalm 110).

"Not to us, O Jehovah, not to us,  
But to thy name give glory" (Psalm 115).

"O give thanks unto Jehovah; for he is good;  
For his lovingkindness endureth forever" (Psalm 118) (p. 316).

The foregoing quotations indicate such gross perversions and such disregard for the claims of the Bible that comment seems hardly necessary. These are only a few of the many like perversions that appear in the book.

One of the authors of this book, Professor C. F. Kent, has written a number of other books, in which he assumes extreme rationalistic and materialistic views. He did not believe in the resurrection of Jesus, denied his miracles, thought our Lord could not have walked on water, etc. He is said to have given great offense on an occasion when he said "one might as well speak of the wool of the Lamb as of the blood of the Lamb" ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 124).

**Dawn of Conscience.** It may be well to give some attention to a new book just published by Professor J. H. Breasted, of Chicago University, entitled "Dawn of Conscience." While we do not know that this book has yet been adopted by any of our colleges or universities, it is well known that the author has written several other books used as textbooks and for side reading in colleges and universities, the same views being maintained more or less uniformly in all of them. A few quotations will suffice to illustrate the educational influence from this source:

The rise of man to social idealism took place long before the traditional theologians' "age of revelation" began. It was a result of the social experience of *man himself* and was not projected into the world from the outside.

Out of prehistoric savagery, on the basis of his own experience, man arose to visions of character (p. xvi).

Man became the first implement-making creature not later than the beginning of the Ice Age, probably a million years ago, and possibly earlier. At the same time he also became the first weapon-making creature (p. xxv).

If man was the first implement-making and the first weapon-making creature, we would like to know what creature is the second, third, etc.:

In the "Pyramid Texts" we find the oldest pictures of a celestial hereafter— ideas which grew up over five thousand years ago, and in which we must without doubt recognize the original background out of which we were taught in childhood (p. 83).

Breasted classes the Egyptian writers, Upuwer and Neferrohu, as Messianic prophets in a class with the Hebrew prophets, insofar as they predict the coming of a Messiah. But in the case of the first

he definitely specifies the return of a former ruler, the sun-god Re, while the latter names a man whom he knew as a contemporary. The most striking feature of these references is that of Neferrohu mentioning the invasion of the Asiatics into Egypt, which likely refers to the Hebrews who went to Egypt (pp. 200-208).

In the tomb of the king's nobles in the cliffs behind the new city, Tel-El-Amarna, are found inscriptions from which most of our information about the reign of Ikhnaton (Amenophis IV before he changed his name). Among these is a hymn from which Breasted takes portions and compares same with selections from the Psalms, especially 104, which is claimed to be so similar to Ikhnaton's hymn. These are given in parallel columns:

## NIGHT AND MAN

## IKHNATON'S HYMN

When thou settest in the western  
 horizon of the sky,  
 The earth is in darkness like death.  
 They sleep in their chambers,  
 Their nostrils are stopped,  
 And none seeth the other,  
 While all their things are  
 stolen, Which are under the heads, And  
 they know it not.

## PSALM 104:20

Thou makest darkness, and it is  
 night, Wherein all the beasts of the  
 forest creep forth.

Other comparisons are made with about the same similarity indicated. And yet the claim is made that the Psalms and Proverbs are taken from Egyptian originals (see pp. 282-286).

In one illustration taken from this Psalm (104:24) there is a striking similarity in one sentence:

## IKHNATON'S HYMN

How manifold are thy works!  
 They are hidden before men  
 O sole God, beside whom there is no  
 other.  
 Thou didst create the earth according  
 to thy heart.

## PSALM 104:24

O Lord, how manifold are thy works!  
 In wisdom hast thou made them all:  
 The earth is full of thy riches.

The likeness is found only in the first line, and this is the best the critics are able to do. They tell us that the sayings of the Egyptian sages were translated into Hebrew and were used by the Hebrew writers of the Old Testament. Breasted makes this claim repeatedly (p. 309), yet referring to the translation of the "Wisdom of Amen-



emope" into Hebrew, he says, "There is little likelihood that we shall ever see that translation" (p. 380).

**Hebrew Contact with Egyptians.** When it comes to the wisdom of the Egyptian sage, Amenemope of the tenth century B.C., from which the critics, including Breasted, claim the Hebrews borrowed much, there does seem to be a similarity, especially in the Proverbs, which might indicate contact and familiarity with the older document. But both deal with wise sayings and adages among two peoples who were well advanced in a high order of civilization, and it is admitted that in the time of Amenemope the Egyptians had reached a high degree of moral teaching never before attained. Both covered common ground in the subject matter of their writings and having high ideals as a common purpose of bettering humanity, why should they not express similar views on a given subject? and why might they not even express those views in simple language which might be so translated as to have a striking resemblance the one to the other? Besides, it is well known that the Hebrews had for *a*. long time been in close contact with Egypt, and we see no reason why the Hebrews should be regarded as doing all of the imitating and copying (if there be such indeed). It is much more likely that the Egyptians obtained their highest ideals from their contact with the Hebrews. Amenemope of the tenth century B.C. certainly had as much opportunity to learn from the Hebrews as did the Hebrews to learn from the Egyptians. The Egyptians had the advantage of the life and influence of the Hebrews and the activities of Joseph and Moses as great leaders who believed in the true God in their own country, while no such opportunities are recorded in history regarding a local contact of Egyptian leaders among the Hebrews. The statement that Amenemope lived and wrote before any of the Hebrew literature made its appearance is gratuitous, as well as the claim that his writings had been translated into Hebrew and had been read by Hebrews before any of the Old Testament was written. To make such claims is but to ignore altogether the claims of Moses and all of the early literature of the Old Testament, including the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, and the abundance of support of these claims found in nearly all subsequent Hebrew literature and including the testimony of Jesus himself. It is to array unsupported hypotheses against the facts of history. Aside from the influence of contact with Hebrews in Egypt, it is far more reasonable to suppose that the wisdom of Ptah Hotep and Amenemope of Egypt came down

by tradition from the patriarchs, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham, than to suppose that it was originated and developed from the experiences of men in the Nile valley.

**A Helpless Situation.** It is easy to imagine the helpless situation of the student in college, with little or no knowledge of critical views and methods, and believing that any study of Biblical subjects would be helpful. Besides the negative influence of such textbooks, as we have briefly noticed, he is under the instruction of a teacher who is in full accord with such views. The professor usually has a high degree of scholarship, including a knowledge of Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and other languages, and is familiar with the views of other such scholars, which he brings to bear in presenting his negative teaching on the Bible in his classes. He cites the many variations in the numerous ancient manuscripts of the Bible as proof that the Bible is not infallibly correct, and calls attention to certain apparent contradictions as evidence of probable errancy in the original Biblical records. The student is taught also that in ancient times the scribes of the Biblical text while copying would sometimes add in the margin some item of interest or interpretation which he wished to preserve. Then it would sometimes happen that a succeeding copyist would suppose this marginal note was something omitted by accident and include it as a part of the text in his copy.

Transcribing Bibles, like any other copying, was a slow and tedious process, and subject to errors and variations. Notwithstanding the great pains taken by scribes in copying the sacred text many errors crept into the various manuscripts, and, as might be expected, the later manuscripts show the greater number of variations. While the number of the variations found in even the best and most ancient texts is great, nearly all of them are so unimportant as not to change the sense in any way. In the few that may be regarded as changing the sense the correct original is believed to be determined by a preponderance of evidence so convincing that no room is left for doubt. It is said that these variations that affect the sense amount to not over one-thousandth part of the text, and scholars agree that all the doctrines, duties, and privileges of Christianity remain unaffected by any of them. This is indeed remarkable when we consider the great number of times the text had been copied and recopied.

The art of printing invented in 1438 effectually checked this tendency, and now when the text is set in type and plates made from it, there is no chance for variations. Scholars have diligently compared the various ancient texts and versions, and, adopting the preponderance of evidence, have eliminated those readings which are obviously incorrect. It is believed that in this way we have a text which is practically the original, free from errors, and which "thoroughly furnishes the man of God unto every good work." Those who repudiate the Bible upon the ground of such variations would do so under any circumstances,

though if the record of a will in which they are financially interested shows some trivial variation which does not change the result their attitude is quite different.<sup>1</sup>

Again, the student learns that the ancient Hebrew writing of the Old Testament had no vowel points, and that the ancient Biblical text was not separated into words as our modern writing is. For example, the expression "Thebooksheread" might be "The book she read," or "The books he read." And again, "Godisnowhere" might be "God is now here," or "God is nowhere." While this fact may sometimes make the Biblical text doubtful, it is true that the context will usually determine what is the correct reading.

### **Product of a Critical School.**

Miss Helen M. Gould founded a professorship in Biblical history in Wellesley College. It is now filled by Professor Eliza H. Kendrick who is prominent in the Religious Education Association. Professor Kendrick appeared in the 1917 convention of the Religious Education Association with a pupil who read a paper on the effect of the two years' required Bible study at Wellesley. It describes an unenlightened girl coming to college "into a community where independence of thought is developed."

She enters a class in Biblical history. One by one, she sees them go—the facts which to her were the very foundation of her religious life. She can no longer believe in the creation of the world as told in the Old Testament or in the story of Moses and the burning bush. As she goes on into the study of the New Testament higher criticism lays bare to her the fact that the story of Jesus' birth is not authenticated, that the feeding of the five thousand and Christ's walking on the sea cannot be taken literally, and that possibly her belief in the resurrection is groundless. In fact, all the mysteries and supernatural gifts of Jesus which had formed the core of her spiritual life now seem either based on unhistorical facts or disapproved by the workings of natural laws. . . . Her loss of faith in everything divine first stuns her, but leaves her at last, as she styles herself, "a regretful agnostic" ("Leaven of the Sadducees," p. 115).

The testimony of other students is given in the same connection, but this is enough. Christian fathers and mothers should decide whether this is the accomplishment they desire for their boys and their girls when selecting a school for their life training.

### **SYNOPSIS—CHAPTER V**

Textbooks by unbelieving authors.

Publishers' announcement, listing books and authors.

Books noted for their modernism, and their authors prominent in the councils of the Religious Education Association.

---

<sup>1</sup> Allison N. Trice: "Bible vs. Romanism," pp. 21, 22.

The "Bible as Literature," by Wood and Grant.

Claim that virgin in Isa. 7:14 is wrong translation—that it should be translated "young woman."

"History of the Hebrew Commonwealth," by Albert Edward Bailey and C. F. Kent, contains many perversions and false charges.

"Dawn of Conscience," by J. H. Breasted. Abounds with perversions and false claims.

Comparison of Ikhnaton's hymn with Psalm 104:20.

Ikhnaton's hymn compared with Psalm 104:24.

Claim that sayings of Egyptian sages translated into Hebrew and used by Hebrew writers. Yet Breasted admits there is little likelihood that we shall ever see the translations.

Hebrew contact with Egyptians.

Similarity of the wisdom of Amenemope to the Proverbs striking.

Reasons for similarity. Deal with similar subjects—might be translated so as to show striking similarity without either having been borrowed from the other.

More likely that the Egyptians obtained their highest ideals from contact with the Hebrews.

Egyptians had the advantage of the life and influence of Hebrews and of the great leaders, Joseph and Moses, in their own country.

Possibility that the Egyptians obtained their ideals by tradition handed down from the patriarchs, Enoch, Noah, and Abraham.

A helpless situation. The student entering a critical school.

Quotation from "Bible vs. Romanism."

Ancient Hebrew writing had no vowel points—words not separated.

Product of a critical school.

## LIST OF AUTHORS CONSULTED OR REFERRED TO

Abbott, Lyman	Life and Literature of Ancient Hebrews
Addis, W. E.	Documents of the Hexateuch
American Standard Edition of the Revised Bible	
Bacon, Benj. W.	Genesis of Genesis
Baikie, James	Life of the Ancient East (1923)
Bailey, Albert Edward	History of the Hebrew Commonwealth
Banks, E. J.	Bible and the Spade
	Bismya, or the Lost City of Udad
Barton, Geo. A.	Archaeology and the Bible
	Sketch of Semitic Origins
Breasted, J. H.	Dawn of Conscience
Briggs, Chas. A.	Higher Criticism of the Hexateuch (revised edition)
Budge, E. A. Wallace	Babylonian Life and History
Campbell, Alexander	Popular Lectures and Addresses
Coburn, Camden M.	New Archaeological Discoveries (second edition, 1917)
Conder, C. R.	The International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, Vol. II
Creelman, Harlan	An Introduction to the Old Testament (1917)
Darwin, Chas.	Origin of Species
	Descent of Man
Dowling, John	History of Romanism
Driver, S. R.	Literature of the Old Testament
Elam, E. A.	Bible vs. Theories of Evolution
Fosdick, Harry Emerson	Modern Use of the Bible
Gabelain, Arno Clemens	Conflict of the Ages
Geden, A. S.	Introduction to Hebrew Bible
Gillet, C. R.	The New Schaff-Herzog Religious Encyclopedia, 1909, Vol. IV
Gordon, Ernest	Leaven of the Sadducees
Gore, Chas., et al.	New Commentary on Holy Scripture, 1928
Green, W. H.	Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch
Harris, Chas.	Creeds or No Creeds
Hastings, James	Dictionary of the Bible

- Hatch, Edwin  
Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages  
Upon the Christian Church
- Haupt, Paul  
Polychrome Bible
- Hill, Wm. B.  
Introduction to the Life of Christ
- Hilprecht, H. V.  
Explorations in Bible Lands During the  
Nineteenth Century
- Hommel, Fritz  
Ancient Hebrew Tradition, 1897
- Josephus, Flavius  
Jewish Antiquities
- Kyle, M. G.  
The Problem of the Pentateuch; Inter-  
national Standard Bible Encyclopedia,  
revised edition, 1929, Vol. II
- Langdon, S. H.  
Mythology of Races, Vol. V
- Layard, Austin Henry  
Buried Cities of the East:  
Nineveh: a Narrative of the Discoveries of  
Mr. Layard and Mr. Botta at Nineveh and  
Khorsabad;  
Nineveh and Babylon, London, 1853;  
Early Adventures in Persia, Susiana, and  
Babylonia, second edition, London, 1894
- Marshall, Francis W.  
Layman's Legal Guide
- Maunder, E. W.  
Astronomy and the Bible
- More, Louis T.  
The Dogma of Evolution
- McCann, A. W.  
God or Gorilla
- McGarvey, J. W.  
Authorship of the Book of Deuteronomy
- Muller, W. Max  
Jewish Encyclopedia, Vols. VIII, X
- Naville, Edward  
Higher Criticism in Relation to the Pentateuch
- Newman, Cardinal  
Development of Christian Doctrine
- Orr, James  
Problem of the Old Testament  
International Standard Encyclopedia, five  
volumes, Jas. Orr, General Editor
- Peritz, Ismar J.  
Old Testament History
- Petrie, Wm.  
Flinders Seventy Years of Archaeology  
History of Egypt, six volumes
- Porter, F. L.  
Giant Cities of Bashan and Syria's Holy  
Places

- Price, Geo. McCready      A History of Some Scientific Blunders, 1930  
New Geology
- Price, Ira M.              The Monuments and the Old Testament
- Ramsay, F. P.              Interpretation of Genesis, 1911
- Rassam, Hormuzd        Asshur and the Land of Nimrod, New  
York, 1897
- Raven, J. H.              Introduction to Old Testament
- Rawlinson, Sir Henry    The Persian Cuneiform Inscriptions at  
Behistun Deciphered, Translated, etc.;  
Journal Royal Asiatic Society, Volume  
X (1847), XIV (1853), XV (1855);  
Journal Royal Geographic Society, IX  
(1839)
- Quotation of Encyclopedia Britannica,  
Volume 13 (fourteenth edition)
- Roberson, Chas. H.      What Jesus Taught
- Sayce, A. H.              Monument Facts and Higher Critical  
Fancies; The Higher Criticism and the  
Verdict of the Monuments, third edition,  
revised
- Schaff, Philip            Teaching of the Twelve Apostles  
(Didache)
- Sellin, E.                 Introduction to the Old Testament
- Selleck, W. C.            New Appreciation of the Bible, 1907
- Smith, Geo.                Assyrian Discoveries (third edition),  
New York, 1876
- Smith, Preserved        Short History of Christian Theophagy
- Stanfield, J. M.         The Bible and Modernism
- Tatian                     The Diatessaron, or Harmony of the Gospels
- Trice, A. N.              The Bible vs. Romanism
- Virchow, Rudolf         Cellular Pathology
- Wilson, Robert Dick    Scientific Investigation of the Old Testament  
(Harper & Brothers, 1929)
- Wood and Grant         The Bible as Literature
- Wooley, Leonard        Ur of the Chaldees, a record of seven  
years' excavation, Scribner's, 1930
- Wright, G. Frederick    Editor, Bibliotheca Sacra





## SCRIPTURE REFERENCES AND QUOTATIONS

	<i>Page</i>		<i>Page</i>
<b>GENESIS</b>		<b>EXODUS</b>	
1:24 .....	238	6:2-4 .....	25f
cl and 2 .....	27	12:25 .....	75
1:6f .....	94	14:18-21 .....	56
1:20 .....	95	16:35 .....	83
1:27 .....	27	18:2, 5 .....	87f
3:1,3,5 .....	24	20:3 .....	66
3:15 .....	108	20:1-17 .....	38, 39, 42
c5, 6, 9, 10 .....	28	20:22-26 .....	68
6:19 .....	89	20:24-26 .....	68
7:2 .....	89	c20 to 23 .....	9, 66, 67, 78
7:4 .....	89	21:1-23:19 .....	38
7:9 .....	25	21:13 .....	89
7:24 .....	89	22:18, 20 .....	66
10:8-12 .....	165	23:13, 24, 32f .....	66
10:10 .....	152	23:14-19 .....	68
12:6 .....	84	24:4 .....	78
14:14 .....	83	c25 to 30 .....	42
16:12 .....	73	27:1-8 .....	68
c16 .....	25	27:20-21 .....	38
16:13 .....	24	30:17-21 .....	38
22:1-14 .....	25	33:11 .....	88
22:14 .....	83f	34:13, 14ff .....	66
28:12 .....	25	34:11-16 .....	89
28:17-22 .....	25		
36:31 .....	85	<b>LEVITICUS</b>	
c36 .....	85	3:1-17 .....	38
37:24,28,36 .....	10	c8 and 9 .....	79
c37 .....	37	9:21, 24 .....	79
41:43 .....	139	10:8-11 .....	38
50:1-3 .....	127	16:24-34 .....	38
50:26 .....	127	17:1-9 .....	38
<b>EXODUS</b>		19:31 .....	80
1:8 .....	136	c20 .....	87
1:11 .....	137, 143	23:1-44 .....	38
1:13f .....	136	23:10 .....	75
3:13-15 .....	181	24:1-4 .....	38
4:20 .....	87	24:5-9 .....	38



JOSHUA	<i>Page</i>	2 CHRONICLES	<i>Page</i>
8:32 .....	87	8:13 .....	76
13:13 .....	71	24:20f .....	20
24:32 .....	127	29:25 .....	37
JUDGES		31:2, 4 .....	67
2:5 .....	69	31:12, 17, 19 .....	67
2:11ff .....	183	NEHEMIAH	
6:4, 5 .....	73	2:10 .....	129
6:24-27 .....	69	7:2 .....	129
8:22,24 .....	10	c8 .....	75
8:24 .....	73	8:17 .....	75
8:27 .....	90	9:26 .....	80
13:19 .....	69	JOB	
17:3-6 .....	90	26:7 .....	95
18:29 .....	83	31:35 .....	7
18:31 .....	80	PSALMS	
1 SAMUEL		14:1 .....	172
1:3 .....	76	19:6 .....	95
1 KINGS		30:4 .....	181
3:2 .....	69	53:1 .....	172
6:1 .....	134,141	97:12 .....	181
12:28 .....	90	102:12 .....	181
14:25 .....	131	c115 .....	279
20:35ff .....	279	c115 .....	279
22:39 .....	187	c118 .....	280
2 KINGS		135:7 .....	95
15:29 .....	165	135:13 .....	181
18:4, 22 .....	68, 80	ECCLESIASTES	
21:6 .....	134	1:7 .....	95
22:13 .....	65	12:12 .....	7
23:4ff .....	66	ISAIAH	
23:9 .....	66	1:11-14 .....	30
23:21 .....	76	7:14 .....	56
1 CHRONICLES		8:19, 20 .....	80
c18 .....	86	9:2 .....	57
c21 .....	37	9:6, 7 .....	57
c23 .....	37	11:1 .....	57
		13:19-22 .....	160

## IV

## BIBLE vs MODERNISM

ISAIAH	<i>Page</i>	MATTHEW	<i>Page</i>
19:28 .....	167	1:23 .....	56
20:1 .....	165	4:14ff .....	57
21:1 .....	160	12:17 .....	57
28:9 .....	27	15:7 .....	57
29:13 .....	57	15:9 .....	198
35:5f .....	57	18:18 .....	19
37:29 .....	167	19:28 .....	18
40:22 .....	95	22:41-45 .....	81
42:1ff .....	57	23:35 .....	20
47:13 .....	98		
c53 .....	57, 100	MARK	
		12:19 .....	81
JEREMIAH		12:26 .....	81
2:2ff .....	80	12:35 .....	81
7:12 .....	80	16:9-20 .....	217f
7:31 .....	134		
10:2 .....	98	LUKE	
11:3f .....	65	2:2 .....	215
33:25f .....	97	10:30-33 .....	26
48:42 .....	73	11:51 .....	20
50:38, 39 .....	160	15:11-34 .....	26
51:58 .....	161	16:8 .....	203
		20:41ff .....	81
EZEKIEL		24:27 .....	81
8:14 .....	176	24:4419, .....	81
c30 .....	124		
		JOHN	
DANIEL		1:17 .....	81
4:37 .....	163	5:45-47 .....	81
5:15 .....	98	5:46 .....	81
		7:19 .....	81
HOSEA		8:5 .....	81
12:5 .....	181	14:16, 25 .....	18
		16:13 .....	18
AMOS		20:30f .....	100
5:21-24 .....	30		
9:6 .....	95	ACTS	
		1:8 .....	19
MICAH		1:16 .....	81
5:2, .....	208	2:4 .....	19
		2:25-34 .....	81
MALACHI			
4:4 .....	78		

SCRIPTURE REFERENCES AND QUOTATIONS

V

ACTS	<i>Page</i>	2 TIMOTHY	<i>Page</i>
3:22ff .....	81	3:5, 7 .....	242
15:21 .....	81	3:7 .....	7
18:12 .....	215	3:16 .....	19
c19 .....	215		
20:29, 30 .....	197	HEBREWS	
ROMANS		1:1, 2 .....	17
1:21, 22 .....	264	2:1-4 .....	18
		2:4 .....	100
1 CORINTHIANS		2 PETER	
11:30 .....	194	1:20f	100
1:21 .....	158		
2:14 .....	158	2 MACCABEES	
2 CORINTHIANS		12:43 .....	37
3:15 .....	81	15:15-17 .....	37
8:1 .....	213		

## INDEX

- ABBOTT, Dr Lyman, on Documentary Hypothesis as no longer hypothetical, 23; on Levitical code, 193; his works used as textbooks, 204; refers to Abraham, Jacob, and Joseph as myths, 177
- ABRAHAM, as author of Genesis, 16; Jehovah not known to, 25; monotheism of, 32; tradition through, 157, 282f; born in Ur of Chaldees, 181, 183; myth of, 177; conflict with four kings of Mesopotamia, 177; name connected with Khammurabi, 181f; name found in ancient tablets, 182; not a Canaanite Weli or Saint, 185
- ABSALOM, mother of, 71
- ACCAD (Akkad), city of, 121, 155
- ACCADIANS (Akkadians), early inhabitants of Akkad, 155
- ADAB, lost city of, 119
- ADAM, age of, 157
- ADDIS, W E, Documents of the Hexateuch, 56
- ADOPTION, 105ff
- AGASSIZ, Louis, scientist, 97
- AGENCIES for Propaganda of Unbelief, most powerful, 203; among them are colleges and universities, 203; Unitarian church an active agency, 203f
- AGNOSTICS, a school of infidelity, 21
- AHAB, his house of ivory, 187; comment on, 279
- ALEXANDER the Great, his conquest of Palestine, 50; of Egypt, 128
- ALTARS, or sanctuaries, as evidence, 67; where Jehovah records his name, 68; at high places, 69; not an asylum for manslayer, 89
- AMENEMOPE, Egyptian sage, 282ff
- AMENOPHIS III, or Akhnaton, wife of, 133; cuneiform letters to, 133f; monument at tomb of, appropriated by Merneptah, 135
- AMENOPHIS IV, monotheism of, 133; cuneiform letters to, 134; hymn of, 281
- AMORITES, exclusion of, 79; order to destroy, 79
- AMRAPHEL, identified as Khammurabi, 178
- ANAKIM, of Moab, 70
- ANCIENT Hebrew Tradition, by Hommel, 62
- ANTEDILUVIAN kings, 126f
- ANTIQUITIES, lost on Tigris, 120
- ANOTHER weapon, 204
- APOTHEOSIS, Pagan doctrine of deification, 105f; conferred on Confucius, 105; on Ptolemy Epiphanes, 122; at Girton Conference, 106f

- ARAMAISMS, as evidence of lateness in Hebrew texts, 45, 51
- ARCHAEOLOGY, test of, applied to negative conclusions of critics, 30; on worship of sun and moon, 33; denned, 117; authorities on, 119; origin and development of, 118ff; has only scratched the surface, 120; identified many ancient places, 121; declares the farther back we go the more perfect is the art of the ancient Egyptians, 125; contact of Bible with, 132, 160; on Ashtoreth worship, 134f; brought to light altars of human sacrifice, 135; greatest achievement of, 151; Bible confirmed by, 160, 188
- ARCTURUS, not mentioned in Assyrian or Babylonian literature, 96
- ARGOB, refuge of Absalom, 71
- ARIOCH, king of Elasser, identified with Eri-Aku of Larsa, 177f
- ARISTIDES, apology of, 219
- ASENATH, wife of Joseph, 131
- ASHTORETH, goddess of the Phoenicians, 134f; worship of in high places, 135; referred to as Ishtar in epic of Izdubar, 166
- ASHUR and the land of Nimrod, by Rassam, 161
- ASHURBANIPAL, bas-reliefs from his palace in Nineveh lost in Tigris by sinking of raft, 120; his library at Nineveh described, 151ff; many discoveries at his library, 160; epic of Izdubar found at, 166
- ASSYRIAN kings, testimony from ruins of, 30; palaces of at Nineveh adorned with slabs of alabaster bas-reliefs, 120
- ASTROLOGY, defined, 98; not science and Bible not founded on, 98; an ancient form of superstition, 98f; fundamental and universal with Babylonians, 176
- ASTRONOMY, Bible not given as work on, 94; Ptolemaic system of, 94, 246; not based on astrology, 98; astrology led to development of, 99; Copernican system of, 99
- ASTRUCK, Jean, Roman Catholic physician, inventor of Documentary Hypothesis, 21; an unbeliever, 204
- ATHEISTS, a school of infidelity, 21
- AUTHORSHIP of the Book of Deuteronomy, by McGarvey, 89; on intermarriage, 89
- BAAL, worship of, 33
- BAAL-SHEMAIN, sun-god, 33
- BABEL, as Babylon, 121; tower of, 162f; existed before Nineveh, 165f
- BABYLON, identified by local tradition, 160; Isaiah's prophecy literally fulfilled at, 160; Jeremiah's prophecy concerning walls of, fulfilled, 161f

- BABYLONIA, moon worship of, 33; founded by a Cushite of family of Ham, 165f; history of, divided as before and after flood, 175
- BABYLONIAN, exile, 29f; influence on Hebrew language, 45-53; influence on Israel's religious code, 174-177
- BABYLONISMS, P document does not contain, 45
- BAGOHI, Persian governor of Judah, 128
- BAILEY, Albert Edward, author, 279
- BAKER, Professor Bethune, 106
- BANKS, Dr E J, at lost city of Adab, 119; authority on chronology, 126; quotes from tomb inscription, 127; on Merneptah's inscription, 135; on tower of Babel, 162f; identifies kings of Genesis, chapter 14, 178f
- BAPTISM, infant, 198; for the remission of sins, 198; claim that rite of, taken from Greeks, 201f; condition of salvation, 217; by immersion, 215f, 221
- BARNES, Canon, 106
- BARTON, Geo A, on Babylonian chronology, 126f; on worship of Ishtar and Tammuz, 176f
- BASHAN, giant cities of, 71; built by giants, 72; not ruined, 71f; inhabited by Druses, 73
- BATESON, Professor William, evolutionist, admits weakness of his doctrine, 255f
- BEDOUIN Arabs, descendants of Ishmael, 73
- BEHISTUN, trilingual inscription of, 150f; deciphered, 151
- BEL MERODACH, sun-god, 33
- BELSHAZZAR, his demand upon astrologers, 98f; dream interpreted, 164; crown prince and co-regent with his father, 164; mentioned in clay cylinder of Nabonidus in temple of moon-god at Ur, 164
- BEN SIRA, late Hebrew of, 48, 50
- BEROSUS, on walls of Babylon, 162
- BIBLE, how we got, 17-20; contains the word of God, 63; not given to teach physical science, 94f, 96; not the oldest book, 124; modernist claim of myths and legends, 156; new papyrus manuscript of, found in Egypt, 206
- BIBLE chairs, 276
- BIBLE VS THEORIES OF EVOLUTION, by E A Elam, 257
- BILINGUAL, version of creation, 160; text in Ashurbanipal's library at Nineveh, 151ff
- BLACKMAR and Gillen, Outlines of Sociology, 229f



- BOCHIM, sacrifice at, 69
- BONIFACE III, first pope, 216
- BOOK of Covenant, Ex 20-23, 66; written by Moses, 78
- BOOK OF THE DEAD, custom of burying portions of, 69; more ancient than Bible, 124f
- BOTTA, M, pioneer archaeologist at Khorsabad, 119; discovers palace of Sargon, 164f
- BOUSSARD, discovers Rosetta Stone, 121
- BOZRAH, city of Bashan, 72
- BREASTED, Professor J H, author, 280f
- BRIGGS, Professor Chas A, turned out of Presbyterian church, 24; on Pentateuchal criticism as complex, 24; attitude on Ex 6:2-4, 25f; on Driver's position on worship of "host of heaven," 33f; admits archaic style of Hebrew throughout Pentateuch, 60f; quotes Strack on Keil, 62; on legislation of Pentateuch, 74; claims Feast of Tabernacles never observed till time of Nehemiah, 75; gives first objectors, 83; contradicts himself, 83
- BRITANNICA, encyclopedia, 203
- BRUSCH, Egyptian explorer, 119
- BUDDHA, virgin birth and resurrection ascribed to, 208; a long time required to fix these claims in minds of people, 208f; religion of, 272
- BUDGE, E A Wallace, on the Babylonian god, 177
- BURKITT, Professor, on Josephus' references to Christ, 29
- BURNOUF, French scholar, his work on deciphering cuneiform, 150
- BUSHNELL, image of Christ in gospels as watermarkings in paper, 60
- CABLE, colored strand in, 27
- CALAH, the modern Nimrod, 120; human figures with eagle heads, 120; built by Nimrod, 121, 155
- CALENDAR, Jewish, 96; Babylonian, 96
- CALNEH, the modern Nippur, 121
- CAMBRIDGE Conference, 106f
- CAMBYSES, king of Babylon, 128
- CAMPBELL, Alexander, on Bible in colleges, 204f; on philosophy of memory, 207
- CANAAN, marriage with tribes of, forbidden, 89
- CANAANITES, order to destroy, 79; worship in high places, 134; language adopted after the conquest, 184; later the language displaced the Arabian, 184f
- CATACOMB inscriptions, 215

- CATHOLIC WORLD, November, 1930, quoted, 110
- CAULERY, Professor M, biologist, gives damaging testimony, 255; shatters what is left of Darwinism, 256
- CELSUS, Epicurean philosopher of second century, 201; opposed Christianity, 204
- CHAMPOLLION, Francois, deciphers hieroglyphics, 122
- CHEDORLAOMER, smote the Rephaim, 70; king of Elam, 177; identified with Kudur-Lagamar, king of Elam, 177f
- CHEYNE, T K, notes on Isaiah, 55f
- CHICAGO DAILY, quotation from, 205
- CHOOFOO, or Kufu, builder of great pyramid of Gize, 127
- CHRONOLOGY, from Manetho, 128; quotations from Manetho vary, 128; fixed by archons found in the library at Nineveh, 153; eclipse of sun in month Sivan, 763 BC, verified, 153; two great periods of Babylonian history, one before and the other after the flood, 175; Egyptian, from twelfth to seventeenth dynasties—dearth of documents, 140
- CICERO, orations of, 29; critics now deal differently with, 29
- COBURN, Dr Camden M, on Arabic documents and Hebrew manuscripts from Ezra synagogue, 206; on oldest baptismal picture, 216
- COMMANDMENTS, Judgments and Statutes, 38
- COMMON Law, Judgments, 39
- CONFUCIUS, Chinese philosopher, 105; virgin birth and resurrection ascribed to, 208; claims of, required long time to become fixed, 208f; religion of, 272
- CONJECTURAL philosophy, Ptolemaic system of astronomy, 246; index minerals of Werner, 246; index fossils of Lyell, 247; value small until proved, 248; spontaneous generation, 248
- CONTRACT, construction of, 26
- COPERNICUS, pioneer astronomer, 99; his system of astronomy, 246
- CORINTH, inscription at mentions Titus, 215; another gives name of Gallic, as proconsul of Achaia, 215
- COUNCIL of Church Boards of Education, 275
- CREEDS OR NO CREEDS, by Chas Harris, 104; on Girton Conference, 106
- CRITICAL ANALYSIS, gaps and blanks of, 28
- CRITIC, Critics, explanations of result in confusion, 26; fashion among, 28; dying hard, 29; later dates of fundamental to their theory, 29; deny existence of Levitical cities, 33; reliance on redactor, 59; deny any trustworthy history of Israel, 65; deny miracles, 65, 99f; wrong from their own viewpoint, 67; claim an epoch at Hilkiiah's

discovery of the law, 67, 80; point to high places as evidence of numerous altars, 68; claim silence where there is no silence, 76; claim book of the law found by Hilkiah was Deuteronomy, 88, 90; cite image worship, 90; claim religion of Israel borrowed from Babylon, 174f; deny that Belshazzar was king of Babylon, 164; denied existence of Sargon, king of Assyria, 165; charge fable of trees and parables as fiction and allegory, 172; reference to other books as proof of composite character of Bible, 172; that Genesis was compiled from two original sources, 175; playhouse of in ruins, 175; have played part of Baalam, 184; pronounced names in Book of Numbers forgeries, 184; claim simple story of Jesus minus the miracles, 193; that time is required for development of corrupted gospels, 207; that Matthew and Luke taken from an unknown source called Quelle, 211; discredit English Bible containing last verses of Mark, because omitted in oldest known Greek manuscripts, 217 See Modernism

CUNEIFORM, writing deciphered, 150; record of flood, 160

CURVED line, diagram of evolution, 236

CYRUS, his conquest of Babylon, 164; inscription of telling of return of captives from beyond the Tigris, 164

DARIUS Hystaspes, inscription of at Behistun, Persia, 151

DARWIN, Chas, did not originate theory of evolution, 11; evolution of, 230f; accidental mutilations, 231; admission of ignorance, 232; claim of descent from monkey, 233; his purpose, 240, 245; began work on evolution, 247; damaging admission of, 256f; testimony of, 237; unscientific, 229, 241; always resourceful, 259; atheist through evolution, 264

DARWINISM, refuted, 252; shattered by Kellogg, Caullery, and Bateson, 256; bulk of in scrap pile, 259

DAVID, King, elegy of, 172; not mentioned in the inscriptions, 188

DAWSON, J. Wm, geologist, 257

DEEKS, Florence, 11 Of

DEISTS, a school of infidelity, 21

DEITY, two names for as evidence, 23f; citations where theory fails, 24f

DELUGE, Chaldean account of, 174; record of found at Nineveh, 174; epic of Izdubar as Nimrod of Bible, 174; features of similar to Bible account, 174

DEMETRIUS, magistrate, at Ephesus, 215

DESIGN admitted, 237f

- DEUTERONOMY, equals D Document, 22; oratorical and hortatory, 41f, 64; as based on teachings of prophets, 63; main object of attack, 63; as first appearance when Book of the Law was found by Hilkiah, 66, 67f, 69; proof offered of late date of, 66; setting of, 70; written by Moses, 78; as Book of Law found by Hilkiah, 92
- DEVELOPMENT of Christian Doctrine, 197f
- DIDACHE, oldest discipline, 221
- DISSIMILARITIES, Darwin on mental faculties of man and higher mammals, 239; man's habitual use of articulate language, 239
- DOCUMENTS of critics dated, 29, 31, 63f
- DOCUMENTARY Hypothesis, a chief theory of critics, 9; documents of exist only in imagination of critics, 9; apology for, 9f; defined and explained, 21-26; invention of destructive critics, 21; claimed scientific and demonstrated truth, 22f; no longer hypothetical, 23; Dr Lyman Abbott's definition of, 23; dates of documents of, 29; late dates fundamental to, 29; trend now nearer older ideas, 32; assumption of in argument, 49; heart and soul of, 53; illustration of, 56f; purpose of to discredit Bible, S3; a main argument destroyed, 60; has no beneficial end or influence, 245f
- DOWLING, Rev John, his history of Romanism, 200; on rites and ceremonies of the pagans adopted by Catholics, 200
- DRIVER, S R, on late date for Deuteronomy, 33f; on late dates, 50; notes on Leviticus, 58; that Hommel agreed with Wellhausen, 62; his commentary of the Bible, 203
- DRUSES, present inhabitants of Bashan, 73
- DIONYSIUS, Greek god of wine, 195
- EARTH, rotation of, 95f; sphericity of, 96; suspension of, 96; not flat or square, 96
- EBIONITES, denied divinity of Christ, 204
- ECLIPSE, of the sun, 153
- EDREI, a city of Bashan, 72f
- EDUCATION, 269; religious, 271; Christian, 273
- EGYPTIAN, language similar to Hebrew in structure, 45; influence on Hebrew language, 45-53; words in Bible, 47; apotheosis, 105f; mummies, 127f; chronology from Manetho, 128; chronology of uncertain, 128, 140
- ELAMITES, conquest of Babylonia by, 155
- ELECTION, 105
- ELEPHANTINE Records, 128
- ELIOT, President, his Five-Foot Shelf of Books, 203

- ELEGY of David, 172
- ELOHIM, Hebrew, always rendered God in ARV, 23; in J sections, 25; found with Yahweh in same sentences, 58; used exclusively in Priestly Code as assumed by critics, 58; Sellin on, 90
- ENIGMAS, of evolution from DuBois Reynolds, 262f
- ENOCH, walked with God, 157
- EPHESUS, magical arts of told in marble inscription, 215
- EPIC, of Izdubar, found by Geo Smith at Nineveh, 166, 174; many Bible features of, including story of flood, 174
- ERDMANS, Professor, converted from modernism, 32, 63; barred from fellowship as scientist, 62
- ERECH, city in land of Shinar, 121
- ESARHADDON, annals of, 168
- ETHERIDGE, Dr, of British Museum, 257
- EVOLUTION, hypothesis, 9; firm hold on civilization, 11; fundamental element in literature, 11; false claims of, 229; limited variation, 229; status of, 230; definition of, 241; a curved line, 237; social, 242; process of reasoning, 243; conflicts with Bible, 245; has no beneficial end or influence, 245f; strongest argument for, 247; spontaneous generation necessary to, 248; never demonstrated, 249f
- EXPLANATORY glosses, 178
- EXTINCTION, Darwin on, 232
- EZRA, reading law of Moses, 31; Aaronic priesthood in time of, 66f; claim that Pentateuch did not exist till time of, 74; that no sacrificial or ceremonial laws observed till time of, 79; Ezra synagogue in Cairo, Arabic documents, and Hebrew manuscript, 206
- FABLE of the trees, by Jotham, 172
- FIELD Museum, progressive series of types of evolution in, 261f
- FLOOD, what of, 125; Babylonian history divided at, 126; tradition of universal, 126; mentioned in epic of Izdubar, 166
- FOSDICK, Harry Emerson, quotation from, 107
- FOSTER, Professor, his book, *Finality of the Christian Religion*, 205
- FREE love, 109
- FRESNEL, antiquities of found at Babylon lost in sinking of raft on the Tigris, 120
- FREUD, Sigmund, Austrian Jew, 108; his psychoanalysis, 108-110
- FUNDAMENTAL Principle, 207
- GALILEO, astronomer, 99, 246
- GALLIC, proconsul of Achaia, 215
- GARDNER, E, Egyptian explorer, 119

- GARSTANG, John, archaeologist 132
- GEDEN, on date of Deuteronomy, 69
- GEOLOGY, index minerals, 246; index fossils, 247; science of originated by A G Werner, 246
- GESHURITES, not exterminated by Israel, 71
- GIANT Cities, of Bashan, 70f
- GIBSON, Margaret Dunlop, discoveries at Mt Sinai, 218
- GIDEON, altar of, 69
- GIRTON Conference, 106f
- GIZEH, pyramid of, 127
- GLAZEBROOK, Canon, on Apotheosis, 107
- GOD OR GORILLA, by A W McCann, 262
- GORDON, Ernest, on policy of Unitarian church, 204; on Prof Leuba, 277
- GORE, Chas, compiler of New Commentary on Holy Scriptures, 9; on authorship of Pentateuch, 62
- GOSHEN, land of, 131
- GOSPELS, as invention of by early church, 193; time required to develop corruption of, 207; apocryphal, 207, 212; supernatural facts of fixed, 207f; no errors in historical facts of, 212; of Thomas and Peter, 212, 222; influence of, 212; early translations of, 217f; Syriac translation of, 218; faith presented in, 219
- GOULD, Miss Helen M, 284
- GRANT, Professor Elihu, 278
- GREEK, philosophers got ideas of God from patriarchs through tradition, 157; of New Testament, 212f; Bible at Sinai, 217
- GREEN, Dr W H, on critical analysis, 26f; on documentary theory, 32; Hommel's reply to, 62; critics reject miracles, 99
- GRENFELL and Hunt, discoveries at Tebtunis, Egypt, 206
- GRIFFITH, F L, Egyptian explorer, 119
- GROTEFEND, deciphers cuneiform, 150
- HAECKEL, evolutionist, 258; descent of man, 259; dogmatic statement of, 260; his genealogy of man, 261; his false construction and tables, 261; atheist through evolution, 264
- HALEVY, barred from fellowship as scientist, 62; his defense of Mosaic history, 62f
- HANANIAH, governor of castle (Neh 7:2), 129
- HARNACK, Josephus' references to Christ defended by, 29
- HARRIS, Chas, Creeds or No Creeds, 104; on Josephus' references to Christ, 29; on Girton Conference, 106

- HARRIS, Dr J Rendel, discovers a songbook, 216; discovers Apology of Aristides at Mt Sinai, 219
- HASTINGS, Dictionary of the Bible, 203
- HATCH, Edwin, Influence of Greek Ideas and Usages upon the Christian Church, 201; on secrets of Christianity, 201
- HAUPT, Professor John, editorial director of Polychrome Bible, 55
- HAYNES, J H, at Nippur, 119
- HEBREW, of Ezekiel differs from that of Pentateuch, 45; names accurately transcribed, 46, 181-183; endings, 48; tenses, 48; syntax of numerals, 48f; ----- the king, 49; prepositions *b* and *k*, 50; late words, 50; Aramaisms in, 51; glosses in Tel-El-Amarna letters, 51f, 134; language, 52f; archaic style of throughout Pentateuch, 60f; astronomical terms of, 96; calendar, 96; ancient writings all in Old Testament, 96; Babylonian-Assyrian, half sister to, 151
- HEGNER, his zoology on evolution, 230
- HEREDITY, Darwin on, 230
- HERODOTUS, a classical writer, 30; father of history, 117; on moat of Babylon, 161f; on Sennacherib's calamity in siege against Jerusalem, 168
- HERSCHEL, William, scientist, 97
- HEXATEUCH, defined, 9; higher criticism of, by Briggs, 24, 60; documents of, by Addis, 56
- HEZEKIAH, built conduit to Siloam pool, 186
- HIGH PLACES, Canaanitish worship in, 134f; corrupt worship of, 135
- HIGHER CRITICISM of the Hexateuch, 60
- HIGHER CRITICS, school of infidelity, 21; special attention to, 21; scout reality of miracles, 99
- HIGHER CRITICISM, defined, 9; apology for, 10; destructive, 15; claims of, 52; heart and soul of, 53; of Briggs, 84; a nemesis of, 113-116; refuted, 118; creed of, 205
- HILPRECHT, H V, at Nippur, 119; identifies kings of Genesis, 14, 179; on genuineness of names in Pentateuch, etc, 181
- HITTITES, order to destroy, 79; inscriptions of, 117, 132; nation of antiquity, 132; treaty of with Ramses II, 132; inscriptions deciphered, 132; encroachments of, 133f
- HIVITES, order to destroy, 79
- HOMER, text of unaltered, 29; critics change attitude in regard to, 29
- HOMMEL, Professor Fritz, barred from fellowship as a scientist, 62; no longer held critical views, 62; on critics' claim of post-exilic forgery, 178; identifies kings of Genesis, 14, 178f; genuineness of

- names in Pentateuch, etc, 181; on the divine name Yahweh, 181; on influence of Egypt on Mosaic law, 182; two bases on comparison or names, 182
- HOST of heaven, worship of, 33
- HROZNY, Professor, on Hittite language related to Indo-European, 132
- HUMAN SACRIFICES, 134f
- HUXLEY, on cells, 238; testimony of, 257; admitted error in brain capacity, 262
- IKHNATON (Amenophis IV), hymn of, 281
- IMAGE worship, 90
- INCARNATION, 106f, 223
- INDEX Fossils, 247;
- Index Minerals, 246
- INFIDELITY, schools of, 21, 203; textbooks full of, 203
- INFINITIVE with prepositions *b* and *k* as proof of lateness, 50
- INFLUENCE on Old Testament literature, 45
- INGERSOLL, Robert G, agnostic, 204
- INHERITANCE, of a tendency, 236; Lamarckian, 236; ordained by God, 238
- INSCRIPTIONS, in museum at Constantinople, not translated, 120
- INTERNATIONAL Council of Religious Education, 275
- IRENÆUS, on allegories and symbols, 201; on last verses of Mark, 217
- IRIS, goddess of the rainbow, 206
- IRWIN, H. E., 113
- IRWIN, Rev. W., A, 111f
- ISAIAH, partition of, 58
- ISHMAEL, a wild man, 73; name found in most ancient tablets, 182
- ISHMAELITES, Midianites, 10; Bedouin Arabs, 73
- ISHTAR, mentioned by Sargon, 176; Barton connects her worship with Israel, 176f
- ISRAEL, Bible contains all literature of ancient Israel handed down to us, 16; forbidden to intermarry with tribes of Canaan, 89; relation to idolatry, 90; named in Egyptian inscriptions, 135, 143f; determinative prefixed to name, 136; religion of not borrowed from Babylon, 175; religious code of not influenced by environment, 175-177, 183f
- IZDUBAR, or Gisdubar, identified as Nimrod, 165; epic of found by Geo Smith, 166; refers to garden of Eden, tree of life, deluge, etc, 166
- JACOB, goes to Padan-Aram for wife, 28; mummy of, 127
- JAIR, conquest of Bashan, 71
- JASHER, book of, 172



- JERICHO, conquest of, 187
- JEROBOAM, sin of, 68, 90
- JERUSALEM, fall of often predicted, 186
- JESUS, testimony of, 81
- JEWS, greatly influenced by religious neighbors while their religious code was not affected, 156 JONAH, Nineveh and, 170
- JONES, Sir Harford, discovered annals of Nebuchadrezzar, 161
- JOSEPH, mummy of, 127
- JOSEPHUS, references to Christ, 29; favors Mosaic authorship of Pentateuch, 38
- JOTHAM, fable of the trees, 172 KANT, Immanuel, philosophy of, 104f
- KASSISADRA, as Noah of Genesis, 174; in epic of Gizdubar, 174
- KEIL, a German scholar, 53, 62
- KELLOGG and Doane, economic zoology, 230
- KELLOGG, Vernon, on where evolution stands today, 252; repudiates and refutes Darwin, 256
- KENDRICK, Prof Eliza H, 284
- KERIOTH, a city of Bashan, 72f
- KENATH, a city of Bashan, 72f
- KENT, Prof C F, 276f, 279f
- KHAMMURABI, or Hammurabi, laws of, 39; inscriptions of, 47f; works of, 53; record of claims Nineveh and Ashur among his possessions, 172; identified with Amraphel, king of Shinar, 177, 178; connected with name of Abraham, 181; Arabian personal names belonging to dynasty of, 182
- KHORSABAD, explorers at, 119; discoveries at, 120; great inscription of Sargon at, 164f; record Sargon's expedition against Ashdod, 165; the royal city, Dur-Sargina, 166; figures of Nimrod at, 166; built by Sargon
- KLEIN, Rev. F., discovered Moabite Stone, 187
- KOLDEWEY, Dr. Robert, at Babylon, 119; located walls of Babylon, 162
- KTESIAS, classical writer, 30
- KUENEN, succeeded by Professor Erdmans, 32, 62; a chief apostle of critical view, 63
- KUFU, or Koofoo, Egyptian king, 127
- KYLE, M. G., on Egyptian influence, 40f; analyses on groups of Pentateuchal laws, 42f; on Naville at Pithom, 137; on Merneptah's inscription, 143

- LAGASH, immigrants from, built Ashur in Syria, 121
- LAKE, Dr K., on Apotheosis, 106
- LAMARCK, evolutionist, 258
- LAW of Moses, superscriptions of, 37; place of giving always indicated, 37; include none but Pentateuchal laws
- LAYARD, A. H., pioneer at Nineveh, 119; discoveries at Nineveh, 151; discovers palace of Esarhaddon, 153
- LEAVEN of the Sadducees, on Professor Leuba, 205; cannot use force, 204; quotes a Chicago daily, 205
- LEUBA, Professor, on effects of modern college education, 205; on prayer, 275; atheist, 277
- LEVITICAL cities, 33
- LEWIS, Agnes Smith, discoveries at Sinai, 218
- LITERARY Analysis, applied to Pentateuch, 36; shows variations in vocabulary due to kinds and uses, 43; critical methods of tested, 110
- LOFTUS, Wm K, pioneer in Babylonia and Persia, 119
- LYELL, Chas, geologist, 247
- MCCANN, A W, author, God or Gorilla, 262
- MCCONNELL, Bishop Francis, President of Federal Council of Churches of Christ, 277
- MCGARVEY, Professor J W, defines higher criticism, 9; barred by critics, 62; on Passover law, 88f; on marriage with foreigners, 89; sermons of, 211
- MAACHATHITES, not exterminated by Israel, 71
- MACALISTER, R. A. S., 119
- MACCABEUS, Judas, victory of, 279
- MANETHO, authority on Egyptian chronology, 128; quotations from vary, 128; not reliable, 138, 142, 146f
- MANOAH, altar on the rock at, 69
- MARK, last thirteen verses of his gospel attacked, 217f; quoted by Irenaeus, 218
- MAP, of Syria, Palestine, and Egyptian Mosaic floor, 186
- MARIETTE, Augustus, Egyptian explorer, 119
- MASPERO, Egyptian explorer, 119
- MAUNDER, E W, astronomer, 96; testimony of, 98
- MEMPHIS, as Biblical Noph, 131
- MERNEPTAH, mummy of, 127; Pharaoh of Exodus, 135, 142f; annals of, 135; inscription of, 132, 144

- MESOPOTAMIA, land of, between the rivers Euphrates and Tigris, 155
- MESOPOTAMIAN chronology, 155
- METONIC cycle, 96
- METHUSELAH, lived 243 years with Adam, 157
- MICOU, President, 275
- MIDIANITES, equal Ishmaelites, 10
- MIRACLES, rejected by critics, 99f; work of redactor a miracle, 99f; purpose of, 100; objections to, 101
- MISSING Links, links next to, 242; none among the living or dead, 259; Neanderthal man, 259; Heidelberg man, 259; Piltdown man, 259; Pithecanthropus Erectus, 259f; brain capacity of, 262
- MNEMONIC Laws, judgments, 39
- MOABITES, exclusion of, 79
- MOABITE Stone, earliest known Hebrew inscription, 49, 187; made by King Mesha of Moab, 187
- MODERN Churchman, on Girton Conference, 106f
- MODERNISM, Kantianism, philosophic basis of, 104; flourishes in America, 108; based on psychology, 108f; claims there is no truth, no proof, no absolute knowledge, 108f; free love follows in wake of, 109f; Freudism in some circles of, 110 See critic
- MOHAMMED, religion of, 272
- MONOTHEISM, of Abraham, 32; necessary sequence of, 68; of Amenophis IV, 133; Bible only source of, 132f; pure of Job, David, Isaiah, 175f; code of Israel remained pure, 183f
- MONOTHEISTIC, Judaism, Christianity, Mohammedanism, 15
- MORE, L T, author, Dogma of Evolution, 237; on geology, 248
- MOSES, wrote by inspiration, 16, 83ff; laid foundation of all legislation, 30; wrote in age of literary education, 30; discredited by critics, 30; Pentateuch denied to, 62; wrote this law and the reasons for this fact, 63f, 78; at Sinai, 64f; wrote Book of Covenant, 66; priestly law given by, 67; taught monotheism, 68; law of not given to be observed in wilderness, 75; universal tradition that he wrote Pentateuch, 78; law of familiar to Joshua, Judges, Samuel, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Amos, etc, 79; book of, 81; did not use the belief of his time on origin of world, 93, 95; mistakes of, 93; acquainted with learning of the Egyptians, 95; lived among civilized people, 124; could write, 125
- MT. SINAI, discoveries at, 216f
- MUGHAYYAR, equals Ur, 164
- MULLER, W Max, on Ramses II and Merneptah, 142f

- MUMMIES, of Egyptian kings, 127f; of Jacob and Joseph, 127; of all Egyptians, 127; of sacred animals, 127f; of Merneptah, 135
- MYTHS and Legends, claim that Bible made up from, 172; of Abraham, of Joseph, of Jacob, 177; long time required to become established, 207
- NABONIDUS, record of, 120, 125f; as king of Babylon, 164; repaired temple of moon-god, Sin, 164; clay cylinder of mentioning Belshazzar, 164
- NABOPOLASSER, restorer of Babylon, 155
- NARAM-SIN, inscription of mentioned by Nabonidus, 125; opinions as to date of, 126
- NATIONAL Geographic Magazine, 125
- NATIONAL Republic, quoted, 277
- NATURAL Selection, Darwin's law of, 230; can act only through and for good of each being, 231; Darwin changed his views on, 240f, 255
- NAVILLE, Professor E, on origin of the Book of the Law, 69; pioneer in Egypt, 119; discoveries at Pithom, 137
- NEBUCHADREZZAR, his demands on astrologers, 98; conquest of Egypt, 124; restored and fortified Babylon, 155; his annals recite conquest of Egypt, 161; his record on Tower of Babel, 163; prayer of, 163f
- NEFERROHU, Egyptian writer, 280
- NEPHILIM, sons of Anak, 70f
- NEW Commentary on Holy Scripture, its apology for higher criticism, 9f; statement on authorship of Pentateuch, 62; gives date of Deuteronomy, 63; denies historical accuracy of Bible, 93; on the flood and creation, 174f
- NEWMAN, Cardinal, author of Christian Doctrine, 197; refutation and remedy of errors, 197; on infant baptism, 198; purgatory as the explanation of the intermediate state, 198; on religious rites found in heathen religions, 199f
- NEW Republic, magazine, 252
- NEW Testament Evidence, 81
- NEW Testament Greek, common language of first century, 212; language of the Didache, 221; first written on papyrus, 206
- NEWTON, Sir Isaac, scientist, 97
- NIEBER, brought inscriptions from Persepolis, 150
- NIMROD, dominion of, 121, 155, 165; as Izdubar or Gisdubar, 166
- NIMRUD, Biblical Calah, 120; images of bulls at, 120; explorers at, 119

- NINEVEH, discoveries at, 150f; bas-reliefs from, 122; built by Nimrod, 121, 155, 172; Layard's discoveries at, 150f; tomb of Jonah at, 153; destroyed by Medes, 166; mentioned by Khammurabi as among his possessions, 172; explorers at, 119
- NINEVEH and Jonah, tomb of Jonah, 153; review of Dr Banks on, 170: Geo Smith's testimony on, 170f; Khammurabi's possession, 172
- NIPPUR, Biblical Calneh, 121-152; library at, 152
- NOMENCLATURE, evidence from, 181, 184
- OBSCENE Literature, 277
- OG, king of Bashan, 70
- OLDEST Book, 124
- OPHRAH, altar of Gideon at, 69
- ORION, not mentioned in Assyrian or Babylonian literature, 96
- ORR, James, on Bible, 15, 60; on conversion of noted critical scholars, 62f
- OVID, quoted on pagan religious rites, 200
- OXFORD Hexateuch, 36
- OXYRHYNCHUS, discoveries in, 215; part of Bishop of Herman found at, 219
- P DOCUMENT, has no trace of Babylonian influence, 45; has no Babylonisms or Aramaisms, 45f; critics claim not completed till time of exile, 63
- PAINE, Tom, atheist, 204
- PALESTINE, explorers in, 119, 186
- PAPYRUS, discovery, 29; records, 29; preserved only in dry climate of Egypt, 117; vast amount of, 122, 206; at Elephantine, 128; plant grows in water, 206; new manuscripts of Bible on, 206; mummified crocodiles stuffed with records on, 206; records of an early date recently recovered, 206; New Testament first written on, 206
- PASTEUR, Louis, on spontaneous generation, 248
- PATRIARCHS, 157, 282f
- PENTATEUCH, Mosaic authorship of, 9, 62; found by Hilkiah, 66; middle books of discredited by critics as mythical, 67; is forward looking, 85
- PERSEPOLIS, inscriptions of, 150
- PERITZ, Ismar J, author of Old Testament History, used as textbook, 204, 278
- PERIZZITES, order to destroy, 79
- PERSIAN Gulf, cradle of civilization, 152
- PETERS, Dr John P., at Nippur, 119

- PETRIE, W M Flinders, in Egypt, 119; testimony of, 125; discovers inscription of Merneptah, 135
- PEYRERIIUS, pioneer in modernism, 83
- PHARAOH, Pharaohs dealing with Moses, 136; knew not Joseph, 136
- PHILO, favors Mosaic authorship, 38
- PHILOSOPHY, false assumptions of, 104
- PHINEHAS, Egyptian name, 182
- PITHECANTHROPUS Erectus, as fossil remains of missing link, 259; scientists not agreed regarding these scanty remains, 260; first link in reconstruction in Hall of Age of Man, American Museum of Natural History, New York, 262
- PITHOM, built by Ramses II, discovered by Naville, 137
- PLACE, Victor, pioneer at Khorsabad, 119; discoveries of lost by sinking raft on Tigris River, 120
- PLATO, dialogues of, 28f; critics change attitude in regard to, 29; philosophy of, 275
- PLEIADES, not mentioned in Assyrian or Babylonian literature, 96
- POLYCHROME Bible, described, 55; color scheme of, 56; sample test of, 56; as propaganda of unbelief, 203
- POLYCHROME Bible Notes, 57, 58
- POLYTHEISM, King Tutankhamen restored, 133; Israel's code not influenced by, 156; Babylonian story of the flood stamped with, 174; fundamental and universal in Babylonia, 176
- POLYTHEISTIC, religions, 15; idolatry, 100; Israel surrounded by, 133
- PORTER, J L, testimony of, 71f
- PORTER, Ker, pioneer in Babylonia and Persia, 119; observed three lions on mounds of Babylon, 163
- POTIPHAR, Joseph's master, 131, 182
- POTIPHERA, Joseph's father-in-law, 131
- PRECEPTS, of Ptah Hotep, 39, 124
- PRICE, George McCready, geologist, quotation of an old limerick, 246; on current theory of geology, 247
- PRICE, Ira M, on date of Tel-El-Amarna letters, 134
- PRIESTS, Levitical in Deuteronomy; Aaronic in time of exile, according to critics, 67
- PRIESTLY Code, critics claim written in time of exile, 29, 31, 74; and that it is largely myths and legends, 31; critical view it used only Elohim for the deity, 58; first came into being, 74; nonobservance of, 74ff; given by Jehovah, 78; specific instructions of, 78
- PRODIGAL Son, Dr Green on, 26

- PROTECTIVE Coloration, 237
- PSALMS, all denied to David, 58
- PSYCHOLOGY, modernism based on, 108
- PTAH HOTEF, precepts of, 39, 124; wisdom of, 282f
- PTOLEMY Epiphanes, 122
- PYRAMIDS, Egyptian, 127; texts all religious, 127
- QUARTREFAGES, M de, testimony of, 261
- QUELLE (what), abbreviated Q, as source of gospels of Matthew and Luke, 211
- QUIRINIUS, governor of Syria, 215 RAFTS, sinking of in Tigris River, 120
- RALL, Dr Harris Franklin, 278
- RAMSES II, treaty of with Hittites, 132; built Raamses and Pithom, 142f
- RAMSAY, F P, exegesis of Ex 6:2-4; the theory commits suicide, 61
- RAS SHAMRA, inscriptions at (note), 96
- RASSAM, Hormuzd, at Nineveh, 119; at Abu Habba, 120f; discovered inscription of Nabonidus mentioning Naram-Sin, 125; discovered bilingual version of story of creation at Sippara, 160; explorations in Babylon, 161f
- RAVEN, J. H., testimony of, 65
- RAWLINSON, Sir Henry, testimony of, 32; at Babylon and other sites in Babylonia, 119; deciphering cuneiform, 150; translates Behistun inscription, 150f; found Nebuchadrezzar's record of repairing the Tower of Babel, 163
- RECONSTRUCTION, as proof of evolution, 262; Haeckel's genealogy of man by, 261; false construction and tables, 262
- REDACTOR, creature of critics, 59; work of, 24, 26, 28, 58; goat to bear away inconsistencies, 25; omitted portions to avoid repetitions, 28; as able, skillful, honest, reliable, 59; as dishonest, reckless, stupid, and undependable, 59; gives no account of himself, 60; his work miraculous, 100
- REHOBOTH-IR, 121
- RELICS, worship of, 199
- RELIGIOUS Education Association, 275f
- REPETITIONS, as indication of two accounts of creation, crossing the Red Sea and the Flood, 27; "precept upon precept," 27; found in critical documents, 28; claim avoided by redactor, 28
- REPHAIM (giants), inhabiting Bashan, 70
- RESIN, a city of Assyria, 121

- REVERSION, tendency to, 236; Kellogg on, 252-254
- RICH, James Claudius in Babylon and Persia, 119
- ROAD, two branches of, 25
- ROBINSON, T H, apology for higher criticism, 9f
- ROMANS, Apotheosis, 105
- ROSETTA STONE, discovery of, 118f, 121f; trilingual, like Behistun inscription, 150
- ST CATHERINE, convent of, 217
- SALECAH, a city of Bashan, 72
- SAMARITAN, Dr Green on, 26
- SARGON I, of Akkad, 155; legend of, 176
- SARGON II, of Assyria, annals of, 132; succeeded by Sennacherib, 155; his palace inscriptions, 165; conquest of Ashdod, 165
- SANCHUNIATHON, Phoenician, 33
- SAYCE, Professor A H, testimony of, 29f; deserted camp of modernists, 62f; on evidence of genuineness of names in Pentateuch, etc, 181f; on Pharaoh of Oppression and Exodus, 145f
- SCIENCE, of happiness, the Bible, 94, 269; on cause of rain and shape of the earth, 95; is classified knowledge, not unproved theories, 245; has often blundered, 248; not opposed by Christianity, 248ff
- SCHOOLS of critics, 60
- SCIENTIFIC Investigation of the Old Testament, 37, 46, 51
- SELECTION, natural, 231; sexual, 231; directed, 236f
- SELECTIVE breeding, 236f
- SELLECK, W C, his New Appreciation of the Bible as textbook, 204
- SELLIN, Professor E, on Yahweh, 90; on "Book of the Law," 90; as being read three times in one day, 90; ignorance of, 90
- SENNACHERIB, Babylonia conquered by, 155; annals of, 155f; their contents, 167, 170; gross exaggeration of his claims, 171f
- SEPHARVAIM, as Sippara, 120f
- SERGIUS PAULUS, proconsul, converted by Paul, 215
- SETTING, of Deuteronomy, 70; of New Testament, 206
- SEXUAL Selection, Darwin on, 231; Wallace, a former co-worker with Darwin, repudiated theory, 255
- SHEM, patriarch, lived 500 years after flood, 157
- SHEPHERD of Herman, 219
- SHESHANK I, as Shishack, 131
- SHINAR (Sumer), later Babylonia, 121; dominion of Nimrod, 165; known to be Sumer, 165
- SILOAM, inscription, 186
- SIMILARITY of structures, 232



- SIN, or Sen, moon-god, 33
- SINAITICUS Codex, discovered, 217; omits last verses of Mark, 217f
- SIPPARA, equals Sepharvaim, 120f; discoveries at, 160
- SKEPTICS, a school of infidelity, 21
- SMITH, George, at Nineveh, 119; discoveries in Ashurbanipal's library, 160; on history of Nineveh, 170f; discovered account of flood at Nineveh, 174
- SMITH, Preserved, misapplication of figurative language, 193f; says Paul fabled that Christ had instituted the supper, 194; perversions and false assumptions of, 194
- SMITH, Wm, nicknamed Strata Smith, 247
- SCARES, Prof Theodore, 278
- SOLOMON, not mentioned in the inscriptions, 188
- SONG of Deborah and Barak, 172
- SOTHIC Cycle, not reliable as chronology, 138f
- SPECIES Criterion, 235f
- SPENCER, atheist through evolution, 264
- SPINOZA, pioneer in modernism, 83
- SPONTANEOUS generation, philosophic necessity to evolution, 248
- STARBUCK, Professor, atheist, 275
- SUMER, land of Shinar, 121
- SUMERIAN, language, 152
- SUMERIANS, rituals of, 40; succeeded by Babylonians, 126
- SUN-GOD, Egyptian hymn to, 33
- SYNTAX, of numerals, a hundred of, 49
- SYRIAC, translation of four gospels, 218
- SWIFT, Prof F. H., 278
- TABERNACLE, threefold division of, 40; Egyptian style of, 40
- TACITUS, classical writings of, 29
- TALES of Magicians, ancient book, 124f
- TALMAI, daughter of, 71
- TAMMUZ, worship of, 176f
- TANIS, Biblical Zoan, 131
- TATIAN, his Diatessaron found in Vatican, 222f; commentary on by Ephraeim Syrus, 222
- TAYLOR, J. E., at Ur of Chaldees, 164
- TEL-EL-AMARNA Tablets, contain explanations in Hebrew, 51f; discovery of, 133; nomenclature of period of, 182; Canaanite nomenclature of, 184
- TEN kings before flood, 126

- TESTIMONY of Jesus and the apostles, 81
- THEBES, as No or No Ammon, 131
- TIDAL, king of Goim, identified with Tudghula, king of Gutium, 178f
- TISCHENDORF, Dr Constantine, discovers Codex Sinaiticus, 217; discovers epistle of Barnabas and Bishop of Hermas, 218f
- TIY, queen of Egypt, 133
- TRILINGUAL inscription, Egyptian, 121f; cuneiform, 150
- TRINITY and Incarnation, 223; functions of Father, Son and Holy Spirit, 223f
- TUOU, wife of Yuua of Egypt, 133
- TUTANKHAMEN, restored polytheism to Egypt, 133
- TYNDALE, testimony of, 257
- UNITARIANS, school of infidelity, 21; active in propaganda of unbelief, 204; their aim and purpose, 204; zeal for spreading unbelief, 204; doctrine of, 223
- UPUWER, Egyptian writer, 280
- UR of the Chaldees, explored by Wooley, 119; by J E Taylor, 164
- UR-GUR, king of Ur of Chaldees, 164
- UTH, ut, on, an, Hebrew endings, 47
- VARIATION, limited, 229, 235; a fact, 235; selected, 236f
- VARIATIONS, in Bible manuscripts, 283
- VATICAN Greek Bible, omits last verses of Mark, 217
- VIRCHOW, Rudolph, on spontaneous generation, 248, 257; Father of Modern Medicine, 257; opposed evolution and missing link, 260
- VIRGIL, quoted on pagan religious rites, 200
- VIRGIN birth, of Buddha and Confucius, 208; Wood and Grant on, 278
- VIRGIN Mary, worship of, 199; not mentioned in Didache, 221
- VOLTAIRE, atheist, 204; admission of, 211
- WARD, Rev Harry F, President of American Civil Liberties Union, 277
- WARKA, Erech of Bible, 121
- WALLACE, Alfred Russell, co-worker with Darwin, deserted theory, 255
- WATERMARKINGS, in paper, 27, 60
- WELLESLEY College, effect of negative teaching at, 284
- WELLHAUSEN, J, notes on book of Psalms, 58; "no legend so well knit as Bible one," 60; his analysis of Pentateuch, 62; refused to credit David with any of the Psalms, 81
- WELLS, H. G., suit against, 110; his Outline of History, 203
- WERNER, A. G., originator of science of geology, 246
- WHITE, H. A., notes on Leviticus, 58

- WILSON, Robert Dick, 37, 46-53  
WIZARDS, that chirp and mutter, 80  
WOOD, Prof Irving F, 278; on Isa 7:14, 278  
WOOLEY, C Leonard, at Ur of the Chaldees, 119  
WORDS, alleged to be late, as proof, 50  
WORK of evolutionists, 241  
WRIGHT, Dr G Frederick, on documentary theory, 32  
YAHWEH, Hebrew, always rendered Jehovah in ARV, 23; found in E passages, 24; "by my name," 25f; freely used with Elohim in same sentence, 58; burnt offerings to, 74; in mount where Yahweh appears, 84; Sellin on, 90; Hommel on, 181  
YUAA, of Egypt, thought to be Semitic, 133  
ZADEKITE fragments, 48  
ZAHN, defender of references to Christ in Josephus, 29  
ZOROASTER, Avesta of, 150; religion of, 272