

11-1-1944

Geography of the Bible in Relation to Inspiration

Carl Eberhard

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm>



Part of the [History of Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Eberhard, Carl (1944) "Geography of the Bible in Relation to Inspiration," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 15 , Article 62.

Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol15/iss1/62>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Print Publications at Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. It has been accepted for inclusion in Concordia Theological Monthly by an authorized editor of Scholarly Resources from Concordia Seminary. For more information, please contact seitzw@csl.edu.

people must "receive the Kingdom as a little child" (18:17); that "people enter the Kingdom of God" (18:24); that "Joseph of Arimathea . . . waited for the Kingdom of God" (23:51). But we are never told that the Kingdom is in the hearts of men.

It must be remembered, too, that Jesus is speaking to the Pharisees. It seems difficult to assume that Jesus would have said to the Pharisees, "The Kingdom of God is within you, in your hearts," when He had said to them on another occasion, "Your inward part is full of ravening and wickedness" (Luke 11:39). If it is urged that the ἰμῶν need not be limited to the Pharisees, but has a wide meaning and refers specifically to the disciples, then one overlooks v. 22, where Luke, continuing the Savior's discourse on the Kingdom of God, explicitly tells us, "And He said unto His disciples."

To be sure, as has been indicated, the Kingdom of God is not something which can be experienced by our sense organs. It is, as Paul says, "not meat and drink, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Ghost" (Rom. 14:17). Both interpretations considered above guarantee its invisibility. It is a spiritual kingdom. And being a matter of the spirit, of the heart and the mind, of faith, it is indeed invisible, and it is *within* the regenerated Christian. This, however, is not the immediate import of the Savior's word in Luke 17:21, as the above investigation has, so I trust, demonstrated.

PAUL M. BRETSCHER

Geography of the Bible in Relation to Inspiration

(A Conference Paper)

I. Introduction

The connection between geography and the doctrine of inspiration, at least as far as this group is concerned, seems to be the sentence in the first paragraph of the Brief Statement of Missouri, which reads: "Since the Holy Scriptures are the Word of God, it goes without saying that they contain no errors or contradictions, but that they are in all their parts and words the infallible truth, also in those parts which treat of historical, *geographical*, and other secular matters, John 10:35."

This doctrine of verbal inspiration is still mistaken to mean inspiration by dictation, mechanical inspiration. Now, it is true that the Church Fathers and some of the old Lutheran theologians called the sacred writers penmen of the Holy Ghost, His recorders, scribes, amanuenses, and the like. But we make these expressions say more than they were intended to say when we ridicule them as implying a mechanical inspiration. The terms should imply no more and no less than that the writers wrote the Word of God,

were His instruments. Nowhere does Scripture offer an explanation of the process how inspiration took place. It simply states that inspiration is a fact. Missouri does not believe in mechanical inspiration. We believe that the men who wrote the Bible were living instruments, endowed with intelligence and will, employing definite styles and peculiar modes of expression. (The doctrine of verbal inspiration has already been discussed. This statement is made to clarify the position which is assumed throughout this presentation.)

In our study, history will have to accompany geography, and that means that we enter the field of Biblical archaeology for evidence. This is a large field. We can do no more here than to select a few samples from the field. And since the Old Testament seems to present the major difficulties in the way of accepting verbal inspiration, we occupy ourselves with several difficulties from the earlier books of the Bible, grouping our material under four heads: 1. The Flood; 2. Abraham; 3. Moses; 4. Jericho.

II. A Criticism of the Higher Criticism

Before attempting to evaluate the evidence which archaeology has brought to light, it is necessary to give some consideration to the so-called scientific criticism of the Bible, for it has affected almost all Biblical scholarship in the past and present generations. Everything depends upon how we deal with the evidence.

Scientific criticism is divided into two parts, the literary criticism and the historical criticism. Together these are known as the Higher Criticism, the system whose methods and assumptions have led to a great deal of confusion in Bible study. Recent research has shown that the Higher Criticism has been quite unscientific and has presumed to possess knowledge where in reality it could merely offer conjectures. Boasting of its imitation of the scientific method used in other fields, it has failed to apply even the amount of caution which is found there. Scientists working in physics and chemistry could test the truth of their investigations and conclusions at every stage in their work by actual observations in the realm of experience. We see now that even such caution has not produced unity of thought in these more or less exact sciences. Higher Criticism, perhaps in its eagerness to arrive at results in conformity with its theory, seemed able to dispense with such a painstaking device. Lest we be thought of as falsely accusing men of prejudice, let us remind you that when Schliemann uncovered the remains of Troy in 1870, the scholars laughed him to scorn; and when Dr. Hilprecht, on behalf of the University of Pennsylvania, laid bare a great temple platform at Nippur in Mesopotamia, built of bricks inscribed with the name of a monarch

whom the critics had treated as mythical, the excavator was positively accused of perpetrating the forgery of a whole Babylonian temple platform.

But some will say the Higher Criticism has evolved from its infant stage and has come far in the last fifty years. Let us test one of its best-known steps in the literary criticism before taking up the historical side. Because different names for God are used in the earlier books of the Bible and because there is a great deal of repetition in the narratives, it is assumed that these books are made up of different documents, loosely put together in the form of a literary patchwork. J stands for the author who used Jehovah as the name of the Deity, E for him who used Elohim, and P for the man who looked after the interests of the priests and used both names. The books are then divided into the "correct" parts, and we can find out what J, E, and P really wrote or which data they used. Men like Professor Sayce used to warn that such literary criticism would not be recognized in a court of law. He was right. *Case of Deeks vs. Wells, 1931.*

When we come to examine the Higher Criticism on its historical side, we are again forced to the conclusion that it has been hasty and unreliable in its conclusions. The meager knowledge of ancient history which even the past generation possessed should have made men more humble. Until knowledge of remote ages of civilization became more complete, it should have been obvious that history as recorded in the Old Testament was on the whole more likely to be correct than the conclusions based on the other sources available, which were scant. Archaeology is about 150 years old. But the last ten or fifteen years have produced such a mass of evidence that most of the former critical conclusions will have to be abandoned. Marston says, "It has become necessary to scrap most, if not all, of what people have learned or read about the Old Testament, in colleges and seminaries, in textbooks, commentaries and encyclopedias, and to go back to the original books of Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy and Joshua." To substantiate this drastic rejection of erudition he submits the following evidence. Most of what is here submitted is from his book *New Bible Evidence, 1934.*

III. The Flood

Higher Criticism, identifying traditions with myths, has tried to explain away the full significance of the Flood. In the winter of 1928—29 Dr. Langdon at Kish and Dr. Woolley at Ur simultaneously came across the deposits left by a great flood. The excavations at Kish revealed two distinct flood strata, one nineteen

feet below the other. Dr. Langdon associates the Ur deposits with the lower level one at Kish, so let us turn to Dr. Woolley's account of his discovery in his book *Ur of the Chaldees*:

"The shafts went deeper and suddenly the character of the soil changed. Instead of stratified pottery and rubbish we were in perfectly clean clay, uniform throughout, the texture of which showed that it had been laid there by water. The workmen declared we had come to the bottom of everything, to the river silt. . . . I sent the men back to deepen the hole. The clean clay continued without change until it had attained a thickness of a little over eight feet. Then, as suddenly as it had begun, it stopped, and we were once more in layers of rubbish full of stone implements and pottery. . . . The great bed of clay marked, if it did not cause a break in, the continuity of history; above it we had the pure Sumerian civilization slowly developing its own lines; below it there was a mixed culture . . . no ordinary rising of the rivers would leave behind it anything approaching the bulk of this clay bank; eight feet of sediment imply a very great depth of water, and the flood which deposited it must have been of a magnitude unparalleled in local history. That it was so is further proved by the fact that the clay bank marks a definite break in the continuity of the local culture; a whole civilization which existed before it is lacking above it and seems to have been submerged by the waters . . . there could be no doubt that the flood was the Flood of Sumerian history and legend, the flood on which is based the story of Noah."

Here, then, we have actual proof of the reality of the Flood, even though this evidence may not as yet tell us of the extent of it. The disappearance of a "whole civilization" is brought before us.

Cuneiform accounts of the Deluge have often been quoted and compared with the Bible narrative. The oldest found up to the present is on a tablet from Nippur written before 2200 B. C. It is evident that these accounts are related to the Genesis account. But the presumption that the Biblical version is derived from them seems too hasty a conclusion in the light of these recent discoveries. Indeed, since monotheism proves to have been the original religion, the Genesis account of the Flood should be the original one. The polytheistic character of the cuneiform versions stamp them as corrupted versions.

Professor Fessenden of the University of Pittsburgh in 1923 published a book entitled *The Deluged Civilization of the Caucasus Isthmus*, in which he describes the region of the Black Sea as the location of the Flood and then traces the Dispersion.

IV. Abraham

In 1934 two volumes called *The Royal Cemetery* were published by the British Museum. In them are pictures of a golden helmet, some golden bowls and flower vases, a queen's head-dress, etc. Those things, which are as beautiful in design and workmanship as anything modern, were dug up at the site of Ur of the Chaldees, the place where Abraham spent his youth. They had been made a thousand years before his time.

What does this mean for us? It means that Abraham did not live in a primitive and barbarous society, as the critics and evolutionists have tried to make us believe. There was even an eleven-stringed harp found in the royal tombs used 2500 years before David played a ten-stringed harp! Among other things found by Dr. Woolley, grouped around the royal remains, were fully clothed skeletons of soldiers, slaves, and maids of honor, who appear to have poisoned themselves or were poisoned, evidently that they might be with their master and mistress in the next world. Among the cuneiform tablets found in the very substantial houses in Ur were some which were historical records, some hymnbooks, others dealt with mathematics or arithmetic, containing even forms for extracting both square and cube roots. Perhaps it is a bit disconcerting to the critics to discover that Abraham and Sarah in their youth 4,000 years ago may have had to struggle with the same perplexities regarding cube roots as they did just a few years ago.

Although Biblical chronology before Abraham is as yet uncertain, the chronology derived from the Jericho excavations now proves that the original figures as given in the Authorized Version of Genesis and Exodus referring to Abraham's life are correct. Abraham, according to the new calculation, was born in 2160 B. C. and died in 1985 B. C.

Many of the *places mentioned in the early chapters of Genesis* are being verified. Dr. Albright writes: "Practically every town mentioned in the narratives of the Patriarchs was in existence in the Middle Bronze Age (2000—1600 B. C.). Examples are Shechem, Bethel, Ai, Jerusalem (Salem), Gerar, Dothan, Beersheba."

The Plain of the Jordan is now a rather desolate place. The story of Abraham and Lot represents it as a fertile land. Dr. Albright confirms the Biblical account: "The results of this and numerous other expeditions made by the writer into the Jordan Valley have definitely established the correctness of the very early Bible tradition that the valley was very prosperous and densely populated when Abraham came into the country." And again: "These researches, and those of Père Mallon and other scholars have proved that the most prosperous period of history of this valley was in the Early Bronze Age (2500—2000 B. C.)."

Dr. Albright at one time considered the *route of march of the five kings* as given in Genesis 14 as legendary. His excavations of 1929 made him change his mind.

Sir Flinders Petrie's excavations at *Old Gaza*, only eight miles from Gerar where Abraham sojourned, have brought many interesting things to light. However, since the early narrative is silent regarding this city, we pass it by with the reminder that at the time of Abraham and many centuries before him there was in southern Palestine a large seaport doing business with Crete and Phoenicia.

We are familiar with the fact that the *Cave of Machpelah*, Abraham's burying place, is today one of the Mohammedan shrines.

V. Moses

1. One of the revolutionary discoveries is that the art of writing in cuneiform on clay tablets was in general use long before the days of Abraham. Archaeological evidence has gone far to establish the fact that alphabetical writing was in existence in Sinai at the very time that Moses led the Israelites there after the Exodus; and further, that such writing was in use in Palestine immediately after the days of Moses. (1905, Petrie in Peninsula of Sinai; 1931, Ras Shamra tablets; 1932, Lachish Tower [1295—1262 B. C.] connecting Serabit [1850—1800 B. C.] and Ras Shamra [1400—1350 B. C.]) This means that there were available and in use means of writing about events, customs, laws, etc., as we find them recorded in Genesis, etc.

But Canon S. R. Driver, one of the celebrated scholars of a generation ago, dissecting the books of Moses, said: "The two earliest narratives are undoubtedly those by J and E; these are based upon the oral traditions current in the eighth and ninth centuries." Marston (describing the critical position): "So statements that purported to be made by Moses five or six centuries earlier were oral traditions of the eighth and ninth centuries; and, in order to complete the critical diagnosis of dates, were first committed to writing about 621 B. C." Driver claims to have taken into account the fact that writing was in existence in early times, but it made no difference to him. What would we think of a man if he affirmed that although writing was known and practiced in the days of Luther, and, moreover, was superseded by the printing press, yet nevertheless the account of the Reformation only existed in the form of oral tradition at the time of the Revolutionary War and that these oral traditions were first committed to writing during the Civil War? Abraham and his descendants including Moses did not only speak, they wrote, and the written record of their times is being uncovered now.

2. Monotheism. Another mistaken notion of the past generation seems to be doomed by recent investigations, viz., the application of the evolutionary theory to the development of religion. It was assumed, under this hypothesis, that religious belief among early races passed through the stages of animism and polytheism, the Hebrews being no exception to the universal rule. We no longer have to assume anything about the Hebrews in this regard. Ancient cuneiform writings of the Semites testify to the fact that monotheism was their original religion.

Dr. Langdon, Professor of Assyriology at Oxford and one of the excavators of Kish (near Babylon), called by Marston "probably the greatest living authority on cuneiform literature," writes: "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. The evidence and reasons for this conclusion, so contrary to accepted and current views, have been set down with care and with the perception of adverse criticism. It is, I trust, the conclusion of knowledge and not of audacious preconception." As a result of his excavations at Kish, Dr. Langdon writes: "In my opinion, the history of the oldest religion of man is a rapid decline from monotheism to extreme polytheism and wide-spread belief in evil spirits. It is in a very true sense the history of the fall of man."

In *The Origin and Growth of Religion—Facts and Theories*, Methuen, 1931, Professor Schmidt of Vienna, an anthropologist, testifies to a universal belief in one Supreme Being and a universal belief in a future life among the primitive peoples.

W. F. Albright, Professor of Semitic Languages in the Johns Hopkins University, in his *From Stone Age to Christianity*, with subtitle: "Monotheism and the Historical Process," Baltimore, 1940, says at the conclusion of his book: "How does the picture of the history of monotheism which emerges from our study compare with the picture which has been handed down by Biblical tradition? The tradition of Israel represents Moses as a monotheist; the evidence of ancient Oriental religious history, combined with the most rigorous critical treatment of Israelite literary sources, points in exactly the same direction. The tradition of Israel represents the Prophets as preachers and reformers, not as religious innovators; rigid historical and philological exegesis of our sources agree with tradition. Christian tradition represents Jesus of Nazareth as the Christ of faith; historical and literary criticism, assisted by the evidence of Near-Eastern religious history, finds nothing against the tradition—except prejudice. Mosaism is a living tradition, an integrated, organismic pattern, which did not change in fundamentals from the time of Moses until the time of

Christ. Moses was as much a monotheist as was Hillel, though his point of view may have been very different in detail. Christianity is also an integrated organismic pattern; it arose with Jesus of Nazareth, not with Paul or John, and its orthodox branches have modified their basic faith only in detail.

3. Date of the Exodus. On inconclusive evidence it was long assumed that the Exodus occurred in the reign of Mernepthah, about 1220 B. C. And because there was evidence, from Egyptian records, that the tribe of Asher was in its proper place in Palestine as early as 1300 B. C., elaborate theories were evolved to explain that most of the twelve tribes never went down into Egypt at all.

On the basis of recent evidence the date of the exodus can now be placed between 1407 and 1397 B. C.

VI. Jericho

1. A year or two before the First World War the Germans began to excavate Jericho. Their work was thorough and systematic, but it was carried out before the study of ancient pottery had reached a stage when it could be used for chronological purposes. In a roundabout way Professor Garstang (who had proved the critics wrong about Hazor being burned by Joshua) was led to continue the work at Jericho.

The site of ancient Jericho lies half a mile farther back from the river than modern Jericho. The Jericho so often mentioned in the New Testament was the Roman city of that name, located above and outside modern Jericho. As in so many other instances, several cities were built one on top of the other on the same site at ancient Jericho.

Professor Garstang has provisionally dated the earliest occupation from 2500—2100 B. C. That city's single wall consisted of large clay slabs banded with thick layers of bituminous earth, after a Babylonian fashion. The next city above it belonged to the Middle Bronze Age pottery period. Its wall was some ten feet thick, and built of large gray bricks; it has been traced around three sides of the city. On the east side, near the spring, it was supported by a tower, parts of which still remain, then some sixty feet high. Evidence in its strata is again apparent of Babylonian culture and influence, and the explorer assigns a date of 2100—1900 B. C. to it. The third city, according to an Egyptian scarab of the thirteenth dynasty, included the Hyksos period. The city then covered the whole mound, which was entirely surrounded by a stone glacis crowned with a brick parapet at occupation level, and further protected by an outer ditch. The area thus enclosed was about twelve acres, and included the spring. This expansion marked the greatest cultural and material prosperity of the place.

This city was destroyed and its ramparts dismantled at the close of the Hyksos period, probably by the avenging Pharaohs. Its successor, built on the same site in the late Bronze Age (1600 to 1200 B. C.), is the city with which we are concerned.

Traces of a still later occupation are also in evidence, but it was of a partial character. We remember that Joshua, after his destruction, put a curse upon this site, Joshua 6:26: "Cursed be the man before the Lord, that riseth up and buildeth this city Jericho; with the loss of his first-born shall he lay the foundation thereof, and with the loss of his youngest son shall he set up the gates of it." This curse was fulfilled. 1 Kings 16:34: "In his (Ahab's) days did Hiel the Bethelite build Jericho; he laid the foundation thereof with the loss of Abiram his first-born, and set up the gates thereof with the loss of his youngest son Segub." (R. V.) The evidence left of this occupation cannot be assigned to an earlier date than about 900 B. C., which would correspond to the time indicated in the Bible narrative. Thus a period of over five centuries appears to have elapsed before this attempt was made, and its disastrous consequences probably caused the final abandonment of the site. What afterwards became the site of Roman Jericho may have succeeded it.

2. *Bearing on Date of Exodus.* In 1929 Professor Garstang made a preliminary expedition to the site and examined the potsherds. In 1930 he and his wife cleaned and examined sixty thousand fragments from the strata of the burned city. In 1931 another forty thousand fragments were examined. They all attested to the same date, that of the middle of the late Bronze Age (1400 B. C.), before the infiltration of the Mykenean ware.

Now, it had been very generally believed that the Exodus had taken place more than two centuries later than the date supplied by the potsherds. It is not easy for authorities on any subject to change their views, so rather than do so in this case, the system of pottery dating as far as Jericho was concerned was called into question.

Fortunately, in the course of the 1931 excavations another discovery was made, which enabled the excavators to check the date of the potsherds taken from the debris of the burnt city. In that year Prof. Garstang found the cemetery where the inhabitants of Jericho buried their dead from the earliest times. The site lay between the city mounds and the western hills. Covered over and concealed by the sand of the plain, the tombs had escaped the notice of countless generations of plunderers and their contents lay intact.

In 1932 they yielded a rich hoard of fifteen hundred unbroken pottery vessels of all periods of the Bronze Age. Mingled with

them were bronze weapons and trinkets, such as bead necklaces of carnelian, shell, and bone, and a number of bone flutes. There was also a human-headed vase. But far more important than all was the presence, in some of the richer tombs, of scarabs, eighty in all, which served to date the pottery in their particular tombs and which, in turn, could be compared with the broken one found in the burnt city.

As the opening of the tombs proceeded, it was found that the later-dated ones were farther away from the city. Special attention was therefore paid them in order to find the latest interments. In due course a number of tombs were opened that proved to belong to the century 1500—1400 B. C. and included the royal tombs of the period. There were found a succession of eighty scarabs bearing the cartouches of the Hyksos and eighteenth-dynasty Pharaohs. As the series of dated scarabs come to an end with the two seals of Amenhotep III, there is evidence, quite independent of the pottery, that the city ceased to exist during that period. For the two centuries that followed there were no interments; the very distinctive pottery and decoration of the time of Akhenaten and Tutankhamen was not represented at all. Thus everything pointed to the reign of Amenhotep III (1413—1377 B. C.) as marking the approximate period when Jericho fell.

3. *The Walls of Jericho.* The walls of Jericho! They fell down flat, the account in the Bible says. "Bosh!" says a critical commentary (*The New Commentary*). "'The wall fell down flat' is mere literary hyperbole, intended to convey the completeness of the victory; and probably nobody would be more amazed than the actual writer to learn that his words were ever required as a point of faith to be understood literally. . . . Had the walls collapsed entirely Rahab and her household could not have escaped." Let us see.

Excavations reveal that the walls of Jericho consisted of two parallel walls built of sun-dried bricks. The outer wall was six feet thick, and the inner one about double that width. Both appear to have been about thirty feet high, with a fifteen-foot space between them. But careful examination showed that these formidable defenses were somewhat faulty in construction. The bricks were sun-dried and contained no binding straw. Some of them were as much as twenty-two inches in length, while others were much smaller. And though all were about four inches thick, still the variations made it difficult to keep uniformity in the courses; so there were differences of level and occasional gaps. These were filled up with mud mortar, but the work appears to have left much to be desired. The foundations consisted of several layers of stones gathered from the neighborhood, which were of different

sizes, and were not evenly laid. Besides all this, both walls suffered from faulty foundations, the inner one having been built to overhang the remains of a much earlier wall, partly in ruins; and the outer one on debris at the very edge of the mound on which the city stood. Across or astride these great parallel walls, houses had, in places, been built, which thus linked them together. Rahab's house was evidently one of these.

Though the walls seem to indicate formidability, the area which they enclosed measures only seven acres. The whole circumference of the city was about six hundred and fifty yards. (Jerusalem which David captured was about the same size.) It seems that these cities were more in the nature of places of refuge resorted to on approach of an enemy. Under peaceful conditions a large number of the inhabitants would dwell outside the city under the palm trees to the east of the city.

How did these formidable defenses collapse at the sound of Joshua's trumpets? Professor Garstang at first was inclined to believe that the wall was undermined and that timber, used to hold up the foundations, was fired when the Israelites encompassed the city on the seventh day. But he changed his mind about this, too.

The 1932 and 1933 excavations have completely exploded the theory of a pious fraud on the part of Joshua. The walls had fallen outwards quite flat in various places, particularly on the west side of the city, which alone had remained undisturbed by the German excavators. In 1932 a thorough examination of the outer wall disclosed the fact that it had either slipped or been pushed over the brink of the slope on which it stood. The debris on the surface, which has suggested possible undermining, was cleared away. It was then found that the striations of the natural soil both under the foundations and under the surface on which the walls fell, were unbroken and undisturbed from below; but that these lines had been deflected downwards by the great weight of the wall falling on the surface above. Professor Garstang therefore concluded that the catastrophe was due to an earthquake.

This conclusion is supported by other data. In 1927 there was an earthquake which shook the country and ran across the Jordan Valley from east to west leaving evidence similar to that found at Jericho. This explanation also is given credit by Marston for the crossing of the Jordan by the Israelites. Joshua 3:16 says: "The waters which came down from above stood and rose up in one heap, a great way off at Adam, the city that is beside Zarethan." The site of Adam is the modern El Damieh, some sixteen miles above Jericho. Opposite El Damieh, on the other side of the river, is a place called Zarthan, which is undoubtedly the Zarethan

mentioned in the Joshua account. There the Jordan flows rapidly through forty-foot-high clay banks, which even in normal times are subject to landslides. During the earthquakes of 1927, these banks collapsed, and so dammed the river that no water flowed down for more than twenty-one hours.

Marsten thinks that there is reference to this phenomenon in Psalm 114:1-7: "When Israel went out of Egypt, the house of Jacob from a people of strange language; Judah was his sanctuary, and Israel his dominion. The sea saw it and fled; Jordan was driven back. The mountains skipped like rams, and the little hills like lambs. . . Tremble, thou earth, at the presence of the Lord."

"There is a popular impression that when incidents like the drying up of Jordan and the fall of Jericho's walls can be traced to 'natural causes,' there is an end of miracle. Such a belief is surely a superficial one. Science now openly confesses that we know little or nothing of the nature of natural causes; they may very well, therefore, be due to the action of the Deity. Indeed, the position today appears to be that, while the Bible represents God as working through 'natural causes,' leading scientists now affirm that simple actions of everyday life partake of the nature of miracles. If the Jordan was dried up at the moment when Israel reached its brim, if the wall of Jericho fell just when the trumpets sounded, these 'coincidences' testify to the direct action of the Deity although working through natural causes."

4. *The Devoted City.* The further fact was revealed that Jericho had been most systematically burnt, although it had not first been systematically plundered. There, in the houses, were found foodstuffs, such as wheat, barley, lentils, onions, dates, and pieces of dough, all reduced to charcoal by the intense heat of conflagration, and so preserved for more than three thousand years—mute witnesses to the course of events attending the destruction of Jericho. Why had these foodstuffs been untouched and uneaten by the captors? The sacred narrative furnishes the answer, Joshua 6:17 R. V.: "The city shall be devoted, even it and all that is therein, to Jehovah." The A. V. has: "The city shall be accursed," etc., which does not bring out the full sense of the Hebrew original. The expression "devoted to the Lord" signifies "set apart for sacrifice." Then we read: "And ye in any wise keep yourselves from the devoted thing, lest when ye have devoted it, ye take of the devoted thing; so would ye make the camp of Israel accursed and trouble it." Joshua 6:18. (R. V.) "And they burnt the city with fire and all that was therein." Joshua 6:24.

Louisville, Kentucky

CARL EBERHARD