

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](https://paypal.me/robbradshaw)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_evangelical\\_quarterly.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php)

## THE BIBLE IN THE LIGHT OF THE LATEST SCIENCE

(GARSTANG'S JOSHUA AND JUDGES)

Rationalism . . . assumed that the Bible was only and altogether a human Book. An unintelligent Orthodoxy maintained that it was only and altogether a divine Book. And both these extremes . . . forget its unity. And the segments that remain lie open to attack.—Sir Robert Anderson, *The Bible and Modern Criticism*, pp. 11, 25; Hodder & Stoughton, 1903.

Any one who knows any thing at all about the general trend of expert criticism as it is applied to the New Testament knows that the historical trustworthiness of that collection of books is daily being established on even firmer foundations. But it is the general impression that the Old Testament narratives are historically untrustworthy. That impression as it applies to Joshua's times Professor Garstang authoritatively lays to rest.—*Fortnightly Review*, September, 1931.

BENJAMIN JOWETT once prophesied at Oxford that Christianity was only at the beginning of her greatest triumphs. At the time those words were spoken no one believed them. The Higher Criticism had captured the strongholds of Old Testament study and it was seriously believed that the Hebrew narratives of Patriarch and Prophet were written up long after the supposed events had taken place. The theory of Evolution had in the same way captured the citadels of philosophy and science and it was seriously thought that the universe was a machine which could be explained along the lines of matter and motion and that man himself was but the evolved product of a semi-human creature evolving or evolved at only a lower stage than himself. Today Jowett's prophecy has come true. In the strong language of one of our foremost Assyrian professors, Higher Criticism is already "bankrupt."<sup>1</sup> And the evolution of man from some "ape-like ancestor" is announced by the foremost scientist of America and the pupil of Huxley to be "a myth and a bogey"!<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> A. H. Sayce, letter to present writer, September 14th, 1929.

<sup>2</sup> "The myth of our ape-ancestry still lingers on the stage, in the 'movies,' in certain anti-naturalistic literature. . . . Our . . . purpose . . . is . . . to banish the myth and bogey of ape-man ancestry" (Fairfield Osborn, *Man Rises to Parnassus*, p. 74n. Princeton, 1927). Cp. Wood Jones, *Man's Place among Mammals*, pp. 67, 326, 330; Arnold, 1930. Cp. Huxley: "I adopt Mr. Darwin's hypothesis subject to . . . proof, convinced . . . of the vastness of the gulf between man and the brute, . . . certain that . . . man is not of them" (*Essays*, "Man's Relation to Lower Animals"). Russel Wallace quotes Huxley's opinion that "the fossil remains of man . . . do not . . . take us appreciably nearer to that lower pithecoïd form" (*Darwinism*, c. xv., pp. 450). So, too, Prof. Sir W. Bateson, Presidential Address, British Association, 1914, frontally assails the whole Darwinian position as destitute of all proof.

Indeed, all the "missing links" of all the transitional forms are missing. And, as Professor Duckworth has shown, if Galley Hill man is the oldest surviving specimen of man as he was he was in no way different (though in brain-case superior) from ourselves. Even Pekin Man, the latest discovery points by universal consent in the same direction.<sup>1</sup> Continuity was the key word of the older Science. Today the key word is "Dis-Continuity."<sup>2</sup> So that now in every department of science the recurring key note is "re-action to tradition"! Tradition is a new word in this connection.

I do not hesitate to use the word "re-action," for things ought to be called by their right names. And in the criticism of the sources of primitive Christianity we are beyond question in the course of a movement of REACTION toward TRADITION. . . . The chronological frame within which TRADITION has arranged the original documents is correct in all essential points (Harnack, *Chron. Anc. Chr. Lit.*, p. ix. ; 1897).

Thus both in *data* and chronology New Testament criticism has returned to Tradition. But is that equally true of the Old Testament? Take the books of Genesis, of Exodus, of Joshua or Judges or Kings or Daniel and it is as true of them. Of these Daniel is supposed to have suffered most from the Higher Criticism and these are the words of a leading Higher Critic on Daniel :

There still remain excellent modern scholars who defend the TRADITIONAL position. . . . Archæology has inspired a considerable revival of the defence of the authenticity of the Book. . . . (There is) a REACTION toward recognition of a far greater amount of historical TRADITION in the Book than the elder criticism had allowed (Jas. Montgomery, *International Critical Commentary on Daniel*, pp. 59, 109).

The Assyriologist, Jeremias of Leipsic, held the traditional date of Daniel as far back as 1904 ; *O.T. in Light of Anc. East : "Daniel."* Dougherty's *Nabonidus and Belsazzar*, Yale and Oxford, 1929, has proved the traditional date of Daniel for at least the first six chapters. The Maccabean date, accepted as one of the "assured results" of criticism, was given up even by Driver!

At the Oriental Congress, which met at Oxford in August of 1928, confirmation of these general positions led to individual members of that Congress supplying the *Daily Telegraph* with

<sup>1</sup> *The Times*, November 4th and 5th, 1931, citing the authority of Andersson, de Chardin, Breuil and Elliott Smith, which Sir A. Keith subsequently endorsed. Haeckel admitted that he not only "faked" the embryological proofs of man's twenty-two stages in his supposed ascent from the amoeba but added that "the great majority of all . . . embryological diagrams . . . are not true to Nature but are more or less . . . reconstructed" (*Munichner Allgemeine Zeitung*, Jan., 1909. Cp. Depéret, *Transformation du Monde Animal*, c. viii.).

<sup>2</sup> Sir O. Lodge, *Modern Scientific Ideas : Discontinuity*; Benn, 1927.

striking contributions on the truth of the Old Testament narratives.<sup>1</sup> But from the first Sir Gaston Maspero, one of the foremost of all Assyrian and Egyptian scholars in Europe, had held that "from the outset Assyriologists never doubted the *historical accuracy* of Genesis xiv. and they have connected the *facts* which it contains with those which *seem* to be revealed by the Assyrian monuments!"<sup>2</sup> In short, as Dr. Sanday has said, "Back to Tradition" is the most inspiring of latest slogans.

But would the "historical accuracy" of the Old Testament books include two other factors which no one today accepts:—namely, the MIRACLES and the CHRONOLOGY of the Old Testament books? It would. Science today is no longer adverse to "the possibility of the miraculous." That is the recurrent phrase in scientific circles. Let us take two instances. We begin with Huxley. In a famous letter to the *Spectator* he wrote:

Atheism is as absurd, logically speaking, as polytheism. . . . Denying *the possibility of miracles* seems to me quite as unjustifiable as speculative atheism (*Spectator*, February 10th, 1866).

The phrase recurs in the writings of one of the most distinguished scientists of our own times, who is still fortunately present with us! He is writing of the Resurrection:

If the historical evidence is strong and definite for the disappearance, not of bodies from tombs but of that one Body from its tomb—the exception being justified on the ground of its having been inhabited by an exceptionally mighty Spirit—I am not one to seek to deny *the possibility* on scientific grounds (Oliver Lodge, *Man and the Universe*, Chap. viii.).

In other words, to use the language of Kelvin, "Science positively affirms Creative power. . . . Creating and directing power Science compels us to accept as an article of belief."<sup>3</sup> And Sir James Jeans says the same. "Nature frowns upon perpetual motion. . . . Mechanics has shot its bolt." The origin of light is told "with perfect accuracy in the first chapter of Genesis: God said, Let there be light and there was light." Creation demands the presence of a "Creator," Whose will can intervene as "free will" in His "loose-jointed" universe.<sup>4</sup>

Miracles, then, are possible as interpositions of the "will" of Him Who "controls" and "directs" the electrically

<sup>1</sup> *The Times*, August 28th-30th, 1928; *Daily Telegraph*, March 18th (Langdon's discovery of Noah's Flood) and August 15th onwards for the other members of the Congress.

<sup>2</sup> Maspero, *The Struggle of the Nations*, p. 47n; ed. Sayce (S.P.C.K.).

<sup>3</sup> *The Times*, May 2nd, 1903.

<sup>4</sup> Jeans, *Mysterious Universe*, pp. 78, 142-4-6-9. So Weismann had long ago admitted "forces behind Nature" controlled by "a divine Power exercising will" (*Studies in Theories of Descent*, vol. ii., pp. 710-3; Eng. trans.).

constituted phenomena of which the universe is composed and which has hitherto in our ignorance been called "matter." Of such miraculous events are there any proofs? And, if so, what constitutes a miracle? A miracle cannot be wholly a divine phenomenon suddenly introduced as something new into the phenomena of the universe without partaking of the local environment in which it occurs. This obvious fact was seized by Calvin in his commentary on Jonah's "whale" (or the "great fish") which took him into its capacious mouth. Calvin correctly writes:

God approaches Nature when He does anything beyond Nature. This is not indeed always the case, but generally we find that God so works as that He exceeds the measure of Nature and yet from Nature does not wholly depart (Calvin, *Jonah*, Chap. iv.).

We will accept his definition and proceed to illustrate it. *How* did the children of Israel escape from the Egyptians across the Red Sea? This region has been so thoroughly explored that the answer can now be satisfactorily given. North of Suez<sup>1</sup> there is a barrier of sand which forms at low water a visible barrier across the mouth of the strait. A "strong East wind" blowing all night is mentioned (Exod. xiv. 21) as passing on the waters over the lagoons till they were out of sight. The Egyptians followed suit, confident that with their light-horse two-wheeled chariots, they could in event of a return of the waters escape all the more easily to the opposite shore. But something prevented. The Angel of the Lord in "a pillar of fire by night," which became a "pillar of cloud by day," intervened "between" the two hosts till the morning dawn and then the storm cloud burst so as to effectively damp the sands in which the chariot wheels were finally entangled by the wet: "so that they drave them heavily." Now what was this mysterious pillar of cloud and of fire? It has been seen this very year and described by the Governor of Sinai:

In Sinai when heavy weather is impending there is a most remarkable *cloud* formation—namely, a huge *column* of cumulus, black in the centre with hard white edges. The *column* which begins at the sky-line . . . . extends to the zenith, constantly emitting lightning, and *at night* is an intermittent blaze of *fire*. . . . Exodus xiv. 20 also mentions that the *cloud* was "between" the Israelites and the Egyptians and that it was white and shining on the Israelites' side and dark to the Egyptians. This is a very good description of a violent cloud-burst such as is peculiar to the Sinai desert (Major Jarvis, Governor of Sinai, *Blackwood's Magazine*: "The Forty Years' Wanderings," February, 1931).

<sup>1</sup> Flinders Petrie, *Egypt and Israel*, p. 39; S.P.C.K., 1911.

At Rephidim a second illustration of the Mosaic miracles occurred under the very eye of the Governor.

At Rephidim . . . some of the Camel Corps . . . were digging . . . to obtain water. . . . The colour-sergeant, . . . seizing a shovel from one of the men, . . . began to dig with great vigour. . . . One of the lusty blows hit the *rock* when the polished hard face that forms on the weathered lime-stone cracked and fell away. And out of the porous rock came a great gush of clear *water*. . . . These Soudanese Camel Corps . . . hailed their N.C.O. with shouts of "What ho! The Prophet Moses!" (*id. ib.*)

It is clear, then, that the miracles of the Old Testament were each of them peculiar to the environment to which they belong and that they form part of the original narrative in which they appear and must have been written, as Garstang admits of the Joshua episodes, "almost contemporaneously."<sup>1</sup>

Now what about the more secular side of the truth of the accounts—the CHRONOLOGY of the Old Testament? Is that confirmed by archæological discovery? It is. And here is the greatest miracle of all! Take one single instance which has baffled the labours of all the casuists, whether believers in the longer or the shorter schemes of chronology—the date of 480 years from the Exodus to the building of Solomon's Temple, given at 1 Kings vi. 1. If we accept that then we are at once involved (apparently but not, as it now is evident, really) in two difficulties. Did Israel spend 430 full years as slaves in Egypt? Or must we (as the LXX correcting Exod. xii. 40 have done) suppose that the 215 years between Abraham's first visit to Egypt to Joseph's must be counted in as forming one half of the whole period of 430 years? This has been the usual view since the Fathers. This yields the following result for the date of the Exodus, subtracting 215 years each time:—

- B.C. (*circ.*) 2000. Abraham's visit to Canaan, Gen. xiv.
- B.C. 1885. Joseph in Egypt before Pharaoh, Gen. xli.
- B.C. 1670. The Exodus under Moses from Egypt to the Desert, Exod. xiv.

<sup>1</sup> The exact transliterations of old Egyptian words into their corresponding equivalents in Hebrew prove the extreme antiquity of these old records of Genesis xxxviii.-1. and Exodus, both of which must have been written by contemporaries! (Canon Cook, Yahuda). *E.g.* at Gen. xli. 2 *achu* (LXX ἀχεῖ and ἀχι) has no meaning in Hebrew; while at verse 43 *abrech* defies interpretation except as an Assyrian equivalent of "seer." Translate: "and they cried before Joseph: (Behold, the Grand) Vizier (comes!)" So Delitzsch *ad loc.* and Sayce, *Higher Crit. and Mon.*, pp. 214 seq. At verse 45 "Zaphenathpaaneah" is obvious Egyptian for *zaf-nt-pa-anch* ("food of the life"). It is varied by the LXX Alexandrian version into ψονθομφανήχ, equivalent to the Egyptian *pesont-mn-anch* ("who gives joy to the living-world"), and again by the Vulgate's *salvator mundi* from the Egyptian *zaf-NET-pa-anch* ("food-saviour-the-living-world"). At Exod. ii. 10 there is an obvious play on the name Moses in the two languages from Egyptian *mesu* ("son") and Hebrew *mo-sheb* ("who draws out of water"). The editor of these books was an "Egyptian" (Exod. ii. 19)—Moses himself!

The other alternative takes the Hebrew account at Exodus xii. 40 as correct and renders: "Now the sojourning of the children of Israel *which they sojourned in Egypt*, was four hundred and thirty years." If we accept this then we get the following chart of times, subtracting 430 from the middle figure:—

B.C. ( <i>circ.</i> )	2000.	Abraham (Gen. xiv.).
B.C.	1885.	Joseph (Gen. xli.).
B.C.	1455.	Exodus (Ex. xiv.).

Now, strangely enough, this last figure is so nearly correct and would be entirely correct if we could get the exact date of Abraham's entry into Canaan instead of a *circiter*, that Garstang has actually fixed the date of the Exodus at precisely the year 1447 B.C. It is interesting to compare this date with the conjectures of the past. Clinton had fixed about 1660 as the year; whereas the whole school of Higher Critics from Bunsen to Flinders Petrie, including Sayce, Budge, Breasted, had required anything from 1207 to 1328. About 1220 B.C. had been the reckoning of the Rabbis. *The new chronology agrees precisely with all the Old Testament dates*, such as "300" years for the period of the Judges from Othniel to Jephtha (Judg. xi. 26) and "480" years from the Exodus under Moses to the Temple founded by Solomon (1 Kings vi. 1). But it entirely differs from the popular estimate, current in the days of S. Paul, adopted by Josephus (*Ant.* viii. 3. 1; X. 10; *c. Apion.* 2. 2), and still popular with such ingenious critics as Sir Robert Anderson in his *Bible and Modern Criticism* and Mr. Martin Anstey in his *Romance of Biblical Criticism*, but really dating back to Perizonius (*Orig. Aeg.*, p. 321),<sup>1</sup> by which "592" years are reckoned from the Exodus to the Temple. It was this reckoning which S. Paul accepts as the popular and "authorised version" in Acts xiii. 20, where in the course of a sermon to the general public he would hardly be expected to challenge the accepted figures. So too in Galatians iii. 17 he speaks of the Law as being given "430" years after the promise to Abraham; whereas we know that "430" years was the whole time of the affliction in Egypt alone (Gen. xv. 13 with Exod. xii. 40). All that modern criticism is engaged in proving is the "historical accuracy" of the books of the Old Testament. This question is totally unaffected by the Septuagint translation or the *midrash* and *targum* and popular

<sup>1</sup> They dishonestly withdraw some 114 years from the reckoning as years of defeat for Israel which are therefore not to be included in the historical list of happenings!

comment or oral tradition that accompanied the sacred text in the period of the later decline of the Chosen People. Garstang's chronological table almost exactly tallies with those of Lange in his Commentary on Joshua and Judges, with the Speaker's, with Wordsworth's and with Ussher's chronology. It is as follows :—

B.C. 1447. The Exodus to Joshua's leadership (B.C. 1407)	.. .. .	40 years.
B.C. 1407 to Eli, the last of the Judges (B.C. 1065) (see Judg. xi. 26).		342 „
B.C. 1065. From Eli to Samuel, first of the Prophets (B.C. 1045) (see I Sam. iv. 18).	.. .. .	40 „
B.C. 1045 (Samuel) to Solomon's accession (B.C. 967) (see I Kings ii. 11).		55 „
B.C. 967 (Solomon) to the foundations of the Temple (B.C. 964) (see I Kings vi. 1, 38).	.. .. .	4 „
		————— 481 „

Now we have to ask : *How* can these meticulously accurate results be obtained ? To this there are two answers. Apart from the discovery of the Tell-el-Amarna tablets covering in the Assyro-Babylonian script the whole of the then civilised world, archæology by excavation has been able to identify from pottery, mineralogy and such remains, the ages during which these cities flourished, whether Stone Age, Iron Age, Bronze Age and so forth. For example, Sisera's " nine hundred chariots of *iron* " introduces the Iron Age, to which (according to I Sam. xiii. 19-21) the Israelites, living their own life, were not accustomed and so had to " go down to the Philistines to sharpen their plough-share or coulter or pitch-fork or adze or goad " for " there was no smith found throughout all the land of Israel." The *débris*, therefore, disclosed in the *tell* (by which most of the old villages of ancient Canaan have been identified with the help of the spade) give a certain indication of the times in which their walls were built or their civilisation flourished. Alongside this there are parallel indications which, if they can be made to agree with other dates, practically furnish the clue required. Thus *papyri* of Egyptian kings speaking of their contemporaries' doings complete the clue. Tothmes III (probably the Pharaoh of the

Augustus Hyde Tredway Clarke [1877-?]. "The Bible in the Light of the Latest Science." The Evangelical Quarterly 4.1 (Jan. 1932): 39-49.



Oppression) names *Joseph-el* and *Jacob-el* as place-names. The *stèle* of Minephtah (*Merenptah*) at the much later times of the Judges mentions Israel (*Israïlu*). Shamgar the son of Anath, who appears in the book of Judges as a "saviour" or deliverer of Israel from the Philistines with his "ox-goad" (Judg. iii. 31 and v. 6), strangely enough reappears as a naval officer at the court of the contemporary Egyptian king, Rameses II (*circ.* 1230 B.C.). On this "Syrian sea-captain" the King of Egypt seems to have bestowed the honour of a royal alliance (Garstang, pp. 287, 8). Thus from every point of view Garstang sums up:—

We find no reason to doubt that the *historical narrative* contained in the books of Joshua and Judges . . . was founded upon *fact*. Further, in view of the remarkable *accuracy* and fulness of topographical detail . . . and the parallelism . . . with *contemporary* Egyptian archives it is difficult to believe that these records were not written down in any form until the ninth or eighth century B.C. The old text we have found in all . . . respects so trustworthy. . . . Remarkable as may appear the *proved historical reliability* of the documents upon which is based the *oldest connected narrative in the history of human and national endeavour*, the conclusion is not altogether astonishing in view of the fact that both the Egyptians and Hittites . . . had already established a system of State archives (Garstang, *Foundations of Bible History*: "Joshua and Judges," pp. 341-2; Constable, 1931).

In other words, while accepting the popular critical supposition of a J and an E and a P as the supposed redactors of the "legends" of early Israel, the author of this latest book on the subject is driven by the evidence to admit that there is nothing whatever to substantiate their existence. If they wrote as late as the Higher Criticism requires after the supposed events then they must by some miracle yet to be explained have had in their hands "almost contemporary" documents! Which makes the whole theory absurd on the face of the facts. The same absurd theory governed Europe throughout the nineteenth century with regard to Homer. Homer, according to Professor J. B. Bury in his famous *History of Greece*, was written up by a syndicate of poets whose respective dates can with sound conjecture be placed in the eleventh, the ninth and the seventh centuries respectively. Such were the astonishing (and impossible) conclusions of the leading scholars of the world in their deductions from Wolf's anti-traditional hypothesis of Homer's Poems. No man recanted so strongly as Bury lived to recant his belief in German theorisings. "All German historians are liars," he said to the present writer. "On Homer I am a convinced unitarian."

Two further points of interest emerge: the miracle of the Jordan's arrest "thirty miles above" Jericho "far off at Adam, a city near Zarethan." How was that miracle accomplished? And how did Jericho's wall "fall under itself"? What too is the answer to the age-long puzzle of Joshua's "sun" which "stood still"? "Adam" has been identified as Fort *El-Damieh*. It is exactly "thirty miles off" the fords of Jericho, where Joshua crossed dry-shod over Jordan and left in the bed of the channel twelve stones as a memento of the fact (Josh. iii. 16). At this very spot (photographed with so many other recovered sites of Joshua's age in this book) in A.D. 1267 the torrent of Jordan, descending with its usual rapidity from the Sea of Galilee, carried away one of its banks in the "over-flood" of "harvest time" and thus set up a natural dam, which held up the descent of the waters till they had fretted their way through the obstruction. It has been well said that God uses means as well as miracle. Now no miracle could be effected supernaturally without accommodating itself to its environment of natural ways and means. Again by what *natural* agency did the *supernaturally* caused miracle of Jericho's capture and downfall of its outer wall take place? Again the evidence is before our eyes. Jericho has two (strictly three) walls, one of stone and one of brick. Of all its walls only one "fell under" as the army of Joshua surrounded the city "devoted to the Lord" for destruction as the first stronghold of heathenism. (Popular comment has forgotten the fact of "armed men" acting as a vanguard in preparation for the final assault: see vi. 7.) An earthquake seems to have done the rest (Garstang, pp. 144, 404), timed to a nicety when Joshua "bade the people shout" and invest the city.

Evidence all points . . . towards the year 1400 B.C. for the fall of Jericho (p. 147).

Of the "sun standing still" Professor Garstang says nothing, for the fact is not one that could come by archæological exploration. But the difficulty of explanation has had new light thrown upon it and upon the "star" of the Magi as well as upon the "shadow" that "returned backward on Ahaz' dial." Three times in Homer the hero prays for the lengthening of the daylight. And by refraction of the departing rays of the setting sun condensed in a luminiferous ether the sun-light seems to be prolonged long after the sun's ball has disappeared below the horizon. So too Prior Rumbold of Metz explained in the year

1703 how on his dial he noticed the sun's shadow go back about the space of one hour and a half owing to an intercepting mist-cloud, which obstructed for the time part only of the rays of the sun and seemed to make the shadow retire. In the contemporary records of Egyptian astronomicals dating from the year 17 B.C. to the year A.D. 10 a conjunction of the planets Jupiter with Saturn in the Zodiacal Sign of Pisces is noted for April 15th, 6 B.C. just as it reappeared on December 17th, 1603, when Kepler remarked it as the unusual but auspicious prelude to our Saviour's birth. It was in fact regarded by the Jews at the time as Messiah's sign!<sup>1</sup>

But let us return to Garstang. What is the background of Israel's history under Joshua and the Judges? How could a comparatively small and hardly armed people have exterminated the kings of the land of the Amorites (*Amurru*)? It is here that the newly devised parallel chronological scheme has thrown unexpected light. Egypt had been since the days of Melchizedek lord paramount of the Eastern lands which included Palestine (Canaan). But she could not maintain her hold. Both leaders and troops were wanting and could not be spared. From the time of Joshua to that of the invasion of Cushanrishathaim the Egyptian rule was weak enough to allow a general revolt of the Habiru (*Khabiri*) and the temporary domination of the Hittites, on whose empire Garstang is an expert. Egypt a second time weakened her hold about the time of Gideon, withdrawing all her forces at the time of Jephthah. *These dates exactly correspond with the movements of forces in the narratives of Joshua and Judges.*<sup>2</sup> And what is as wonderful is the exact correspondence in the identification of innumerable sites and the result of their excavation. On Garstang's second visit to them, especially to Jericho, Ai and Hazor he writes:

The historic sites . . . impressed (me) deeply with a sense of material reality underlying the historical narrative. . . . The impression

<sup>1</sup> For the last see Dr. Elwood Worcester's *Allies of Religion*, pp. 148-158; Skeffington, 1929. For Isaiah's "shadow going back" see Edersheim, *Hist. Isr. and Judah*, vi. 65n; Vitringa and Delitzsch and Speaker's Commentaries on Isa. xxxviii.; Bosanquet, *Fourn. Asiatic Soc.*, vol. xv., p. 286. So, too, the destruction of Sodom was due to lightning touching the "bitumen wells" (A.V. "slime pits") which abounded near what is now the Dead Sea; just as the storm which threw up the salt of "the salt pits of Siddim" encrusted Lot's wife till "she became a pillar of salt." Tacitus, who went to visit the spot, came to the same conclusion: "incluytas quondam urbes igne caelesti flagrasse concesserim" (Tac., *Hist.*, v. 7).

<sup>2</sup> Garstang makes two improbable conjectures, that the Philistines were Homer's Greeks (*Achivi*), pp. 293, 311, and that the "hornet" which God "sent before" Joshua (xxiv. 12) was the hieroglyph of the Egyptian Kings of Lower Egypt, pp. 258 seq. with plate 1. Not the least valuable part of the book is the *onomasticon* of place-names at the end, with a record of excavations and their results. Here conjecture is confirmed by fact. Garstang proves that *Habiru* is not equivalent to Hebrew, though phonetically similar (pp. 253-8).

now became positive. No radical flaw was found at all in the topography and archæology of these documents. . . . Study . . . shows that these old portions of the Books (of Joshua and Judges) contain after all the core of the historical narrative and are relatively free from discrepancies, giving a straightforward and fairly continuous account of the sequence of events. . . . The difficulties of the chronology are eliminated as . . . the chronological outline will be seen to fit into the known history of the period as derived from the records of Egypt . . . almost throughout the whole time covered by the narrative (Garstang, *Foundations of Bible History*: "Joshua and Judges"; pref.).

R. A. S. Macalister had in his *Century of Excavations in Palestine* complained of the definite lack of precisely those clues to the truth of the narrative which were wanting in 1925. They have all been since discovered. And now has come the vindication. As *The Times* reviewer has said, this book of Garstang's will never be superseded. Whatever else science has in store this work will have laid well and truly the foundations of a scientific witness to that inner harmony which has always been and must always be between the Word and works of God.

A. H. T. CLARKE.

The Rectory, Devizes.