

given in the manner of a lawyer determined to prove a particular point, rather than of a researcher seeking for light in order to determine something that is not yet known. Some new discovery may make the matter absolutely final, but up to the present it must be considered a question on which we do not yet have sufficient light.

#### 1. General conclusions regarding Old Testament Archeology.

Palestinian archeology, like that from Egypt and Mesopotamia, had done much to show the accuracy of individual Biblical statements, and has done much more to show the general accuracy of the historical background. As a result, even unbelieving scholars tend more and more to accept the Bible as a prime historical source for the reconstruction of ancient history. No evidence from archeology has proven any Biblical statement to be false. Occasionally, as in the case of the former attitude toward the presence of camels in Egypt, or toward the existence of King Belshazzar of Babylon, evidence in hand is utilized by anti-Biblical scholars to try to show that the Bible is inaccurate on a particular point. Many such problems have disappeared in the light of advancing knowledge, and it is safe to say that all of them will be ironed out as more is learned about the history and culture of ancient times. Many a problem in Old Testament interpretation that seemed very puzzling at the beginning of this century has been solved by archeological evidence, and we can confidently recognize that the book that God has inspired and kept from error for the presentation to us of vital spiritual and ethical truths is equally dependable whenever it touches upon material facts of history or of culture.

#### VI. Palestine in New Testament Times.

##### A. Comparison with the archeology of Palestine in Old Testament times.

The principles that we have already observed in connection with Palestinian archeology are just as valid for the New Testament period. We meet