

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>

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php

“Higher” Archaeology and the Verdict of Criticism

GEORGE A. BARTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

BIBLICAL archaeologists are divided into two classes, those who are advocates of some special theory, and those who are ready to follow the evidence whithersoever it may lead. The present paper deals only with the work of the conservative members of the first of these classes.

An American scholar¹ in a book recently published has done me the honor to invite me in his preface to criticise his work. If I take this book of my friend as an example of the inadequacy of the methods of this reactionary school of “higher” archaeology, it is because the interests of truth demand a discussion of the misleading claims of this and similar books. The invitation is accepted, accordingly, in the spirit in which it was given.

Professor Kyle has made an earnest effort to appreciate the fact that different points of view are possible, and to express himself with that consideration which becomes a scholar who is conscious that he himself sees facts through the medium of his own presuppositions. This effort has enabled him to produce a work written in excellent spirit, but has not preserved him from the pitfalls which inevitably beset his class. Too high praise cannot, however, be given him for the elevated spirit of his work, a quality too often painfully lacking in books of this kind.

There are certain fallacies of assumption which underly his methods, as they do those of many writers of this school. It is

¹ M. G. Kyle, *The Deciding Voice of the Monuments in Biblical Criticism*, Oberlin, Ohio, 1912.

assumed that if it can be proved that a thing may have happened, it is thereby proved that it did happen. Considerable space is expended to show that the world of the time of Abraham was a civilized world, and that it was easy and natural for Abraham and Jacob to go to Egypt, when it was ruled by Hyksos kings, who are thought to be Semitic. This is knowledge which we had before, and which no one has a disposition to deny; but if archaeology is to have any deciding voice between the theories of critics and those of the traditionalists, evidence must be forthcoming concerning this particular Abraham and this particular Jacob. As yet there is no such evidence, and such as there is, as will be indicated below, points in a different direction.

Again Professor Kyle is at considerable pains to show that the age of Abraham and Moses was a literary period, when such a work as the Pentateuch might well have been written, and he seems to think that such evidence is of prime importance in deciding the question. In reality such evidence has nothing to do with the question, *unless the internal evidence of the Pentateuch fits the age which is so constructed*. With this question the book nowhere comes into close quarters. There are a few dogmatic assertions, but the vital questions are never touched. To prove that writing was known in the time of Moses and the Patriarchs does not prove that they could write. Probably there were never so many schools in Palestine, thanks to missionary effort, as there are today, and yet it would be precarious to argue that the Bedu chiefs who wander into the country can write. All who know the land would hold the presumption to be that they cannot. Again, if it were archaeologically proven that Moses could write, that would not prove that he wrote the Pentateuch. Many of us who can write never produced a Pentateuch and never will. The decisive point is: *does the Pentateuch we have furnish internal marks that it came from the age of Moses?* External evidence can pronounce no decisive verdict apart from internal evidence.

In treating of this matter of writing Professor Kyle falls into an error, which illustrates how insecure many of his archaeological conclusions are. At Telloh some clay labels from the time of

Naram-Sin, Shargani-sharri, and Bingani-sharri were found. Heuzey first published them in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*, 1897, and afterwards in Sarzec's *Découvertes en Chaldée*, pp. 280—288. Just after their first publication, Sayce in his *Archaeology and Cuneiform Inscriptions*, p. 143, made one of his brilliant, but unfounded generalizations. His words are: "There was an excellent postal service connecting Canaan with Babylonia, which went back to the days of Naram-Sin, and some of the clay *bullae* which served as stamps for the official correspondence at that period are now in the Museum of the Louvre." Professor Kyle in his book, p. 84 ff., enlarges upon this, saying that the sending of a few government dispatches would not necessitate a postal system, that it is only some four centuries since the demands of the modern world called the Post Office into existence, and implying that the people of Babylonia were much further advanced than those of Mediaeval Europe in the matter of general letter writing.

In reality this whole conception is a creation of the imagination. The Babylonians had no general post office, and these *bullae* were not postage stamps. We know that the Babylonians did sometimes write letters, but they addressed them on a clay envelope and not on a ball tied to the letter. If the letter was that of a private person, it was sent by a private messenger. These *bullae* were labels or baggage tags, which were attached to packages of one sort or another. Several of them which were attached to packages of provisions sent by Barnamtarra, the wife of Lugalanda as gifts for certain feasts, are now known.² Another which was apparently attached to a package of wool sent from a royal flock to a king of Ur has recently been published.³ Many such clay labels are now known. They were attached to packages of flour,⁴ to sheep,⁵ cattle, and to all sorts of merchandise which might be shipped on the canals of Babylonia.

² See Allotte de la Fuye, *Documents présargoniques*, 11—30, 79, 80.

³ *AJSL*, XXIX, 137 and plate.

⁴ See Barton, *Haverford Library Collection of Cuneiform Tablets*, II, p. 9 ff.

⁵ See Hilprecht, *Explorations in Bible Lands*, 414—416.

In the time of the dynasty of Ur there was a regular system of government messengers, who were provisioned by the temples. About 170 of the monthly accounts of these supplies are known to the writer, of which he has himself edited about seventy. These tablets show that messengers, tax collectors, and soldiers travelled about in accordance with a regular system. They were not always engaged in postal service. One text states of a messenger: "for the skin of the wild ox he went,"⁶ while it is said of another that he went for a certain kind of fish.⁷ There is no evidence that a postal system for private correspondence existed in ancient Babylonia any more than in ancient Persia. Darius I established a system which is described by Herodotus⁸ and Xenophon,⁹ and which gave to our New Testament the Persian word ἀγγαρεύω, "to compel to go" (Mt. 5 41), but this was a postal system for government use only, and in no sense for private correspondence. The ancient world was unacquainted with the modern Post Office, and all inferences based on the opposite supposition are of no value whatever. The "higher" archaeologists of the traditional type, like other writers of the traditional school, have a tendency to seize upon side remarks of critics, upon which nothing has ever depended, and to think the whole critical structure falls if they can disprove such remarks. My archaeological friend makes this error with reference to the antiquity of writing.

Like all similar writers Professor Kyle has much to say of Genesis 14. He tries to refute the statement of Driver that the discoveries of Archaeology have never touched the core of Nöldeke's criticisms of that chapter. He has to admit that the kind of evidence which Driver says would be necessary to overthrow Nöldeke's view, is not forthcoming, but endeavors (p. 202 ff.) to state such evidence as we have. He admits that the name of Chedorlaomar has not been found, but beyond this misstates most of the evidence, calling Amraphel "the great Elamite lawgiver!" Such evidence as we have will be treated below, where it will be seen to have quite other bearings than those claimed for it.

⁶ *AJSL*, XXIX, p. 127, No. 1, rev. 13.

⁷ Cf. Barton, *op. cit.* III. Pl. 110, No. 233, 12.

⁸ Herodotus, VIII, 98.

⁹ *Cyropædæa*, VIII, 6, 17.

Professor Kyle tells us on p. 52 that the statement of Gen. 10 8, "Cush begat Nimrod," is confirmed by the fact, recognized by all scholars, that there was in Babylonia a non-Semitic people which they call Sumerian. A few lines later another reference to "Cush" from Gen. 10 6 is taken to refer to Hamites, and the reader is left to infer, what Gen. 10 really assumes, that the two Cushes were one and the same and that Assyria was founded by Hamites. Kyle, then, claims by implication that the Sumerians were Hamites. He says, "archaeology confirms the statement, that Assyrian civilization, so distinctly Semitic, is said to have come out of the non-Semitic civilization of Babylonia." If the Bible is here vindicated, as claimed, the writer must believe the Sumerians to be Hamites. With reference to this remarkable claim three things should be said: 1. The implication that the Sumerians were Hamitic is diametrically opposed by the evidence. Professor Kyle, as an Egyptologist, should know that the Hamitic languages are a well defined group, consisting of Egyptian and Coptic, the languages of the Berbers and of the tribes of Somaliland. Their characteristics are well defined, and are well known. The characteristics of Sumerian are also well known and exclude definitely and forever the idea that the Sumerians were related to the Hamitic race. 2. The archaeological evidence clearly shows that Babylonia was not non-Semitic, but that a non-Semitic people settled there after the Semites entered it. This view, for which the writer argued in 1901 from the character of the mythology,¹⁰ has since been strikingly confirmed by Eduard Meyer from the side of the art.¹¹ The gods of the beardless Sumerians wore Semitic beards!—a striking evidence that the Sumerians had taken over Semitic gods which were there before them. It cannot truthfully be said, therefore, that the Assyrian civilization came entirely out of a non-Semitic civilization. 3. Archaeological evidence supplies the clue to the statement of the compiler of Genesis, and shows us where he went astray. His "Cush" of verse 6 is the Egyptian *Kesh*, the name of Nubia. His "Cush" of verse 8 is the Babylonian *Kash*,

¹⁰ *Semitic Origins* ch. V.

¹¹ *Sumerier und Semiten in Babylonien*, Berlin 1906. See Ward, *Seal Cylinders of Western Asia*, *passim*.

the name of the Cassites, who conquered Babylon about 1750 B.C., and founded a dynasty which lasted for 576 years. The Biblical compiler, finding these in the J and P documents, respectively, had not the historical knowledge, to distinguish either these from the older Sumerian civilization, or each from the other. The archaeological evidence, so far from confirming his statement, reveals the striking limitations of his knowledge. We now know his sources, and we know how inadequate was his ability to use them, and how erroneous his statement. To recognize this frankly is by no means to condemn his work as of no religious value. To suppose that inspiration implies infallible knowledge is a figment of the imagination of theologians, the baneful influence of which in modern religion it would be hard to overestimate.

The book under discussion attempts two positive arguments for the refutation of critical views, which deserve a moment's attention: its argument from Egyptian words, and its argument from the high place at Gezer. The author cites as evidence (p. 164) of the Mosaic origin of the Pentateuch a number of Egyptian words. Several of these words are, however, inappropriate to the argument, for, as he admits, they are used in Job, which most scholars now regard as post exilic. A good deal is made in the book of the Egyptian name Asenath, which occurs from the 18th dynasty on, but my friend has little to say of Potiphar and Zaphenathpaneah, which belong to a type found mainly in the 22nd dynasty and later. Asenath may of course have been used at any time after it was introduced, whether in the 9th century or the 13th. The name on which most is staked is, however, the name Rameses, applied to a part of Egypt in Gen. 47 11 and to a city in Ex. 12 37, Nu. 33 3, 5. Kyle claims that the region was not called by this name before the time of Moses, and was not so called afterward, so that we have here a decisive indication that these passages could have been written only in the time of Moses. Professor Kyle has in this argument failed to apply a knowledge of the East, of which it is difficult to suppose him ignorant. Names once employed there are blotted from popular usage with the greatest difficulty, and one cannot safely say from the non-mention of a

name in literary sources that it has gone out of use. The conservative peasant may still employ it. Bethshean was called **Scythopolis** for some centuries, but its old name never died out; it still lives in Beisan. The same is true of many another name. Moreover one can never predict what name will survive and what will not. The St. Giles of the Crusaders still survives in the Palestinian place name, Singil. All that this name **Rameses** in the Pentateuch shows is that the documents which contain it could not have been written earlier than the time of **Rameses II**. It has no bearing whatever upon a later date.

In treating of the high place at Gezer, my friend endeavors to show (pp. 118 ff. and 259), that there is no ground for the claim that the discoveries at Gezer sustain the statement of the J document (Josh. 16 10, Jud. 1 29) and prove the unhistorical character of the statement of the P document (Josh. 21 21), that Joshua gave Gezer to the Kohathites as a Levitical city. To establish his contention Professor Kyle quotes Macalister to the effect that just at the time when the Hebrew conquest occurred a new influx of population came into Gezer, which so crowded the city that the area of the high place was encroached upon by dwelling houses. Kyle says: "This encroachment upon the sacred place, as well as the rapid decline of some of the horrible heathen rites of human sacrifice together with the introduction of milder and more spiritual Jewish ideas, certainly does seem to point toward a rather radical change in religious ideas That the book [Joshua] as it stands should be thus vindicated by archaeological evidence goes far toward vindicating the unity and trustworthiness of the book. It would seem a most remarkable coincidence, to say the least, if the critical analysis of Joshua be correct, that a document so independent of the archaeological evidence as the 'P document' is claimed to be should have been combined with other material in such fashion that the book thus formed would be exactly in harmony with the archaeological remains to be preserved for millenniums and dug up in these latter days!" With reference to this argument (which is the strongest point against criticism that Kyle makes in his book) three things should be noted:—

1. The archaeological evidence is not correctly reported.
2. It

is not interpreted in accordance with ancient analogies. 3. Even if the facts and interpretation were such as my friend represents them, they do not vindicate or harmonize the contradictory statements of Josh. 16 10 and Josh. 21 21.

1. The archaeological evidence does not show that there was any radical change in religious ideas with the incoming of the Hebrews. Human sacrifice continued all through the Hebrew period at Gezer, and did not become even sporadic until the Hellenistic period.¹² The introduction of "the beautiful symbolism of the bowl and lamp deposits" in place of human sacrifices, was due in no degree to the coming of the Hebrews; it began in the second Semitic stratum, was common in the third, while the Hebrews belong to the fourth.¹³ It triumphed in the end only because all Semitic people were becoming so civilized that human sacrifice was revolting to them. To regard the encroachment upon the high place as due in any measure to Jewish ideas, is a misinterpretation of the evidence, for it involves the notion that the high place lost something of its sacredness in the eyes of the people. This was not the case. Macalister definitely says:—"The sanctuary did not thereby lose its holiness."¹⁴

2. There are ancient Semitic analogies which explain this encroachment upon the high place, and the facts must be interpreted in accordance with them. When an alien or a group of aliens came into a new community, it was necessary, if they would be at peace with the natives, or have any standing at all in the new community, to put themselves under the protection of the deity of the place. Such persons attached themselves to the sanctuary, and were known as גֵּרִים. A Phoenician inscription from Kition in Cyprus (*CIS*, I, 86) shows that such *gerim* received portions from the temple revenues on festal days just as the regular attachés of the temple did. This was a custom which the Hebrews shared with their Semitic kindred in general.¹⁵ There is, then, one and only one correct interpretation to be

¹² Macalister. *The Excavation of Gezer*, 1912, II. 431.

¹³ Macalister, *ibid.* 434.

¹⁴ Macalister, *ibid.* 406.

¹⁵ W. R. Smith, *Rel. of Sem.*, 76ff.; also Ps. 5 4, 15 1, 61 4.

placed upon the facts at Gezer. Whether the people who crowded into Gezer and encroached upon the high place were Hebrews or not, they placed themselves under the protection of the deities of the sanctuary, and were permitted to build houses on the sacred precincts because they as *gerîm* had become in a sense sacred to the goddess. It is only thus that such encroachment can be reconciled with the undiminished holiness of the high place. That the high place lost none of its old time sanctity until the days of the Babylonian exile, can never be doubted by one who was present, as the writer was, while its excavation was going on, and saw the multitude of primitive religious symbols employed during all the Semitic periods, not excepting the Hebrew. If there were one element needed in the excavation of Gezer to show that the monotheistic and moral ideas of the P document were not influential at the time of the Hebrew conquest, it would be just this encroachment upon the high place without diminution of the holiness of the sanctuary in popular regard.

3. Even if Professor Kyle had correctly understood the archaeological evidence, his conclusion would not follow. Joshua 21 21 demands more than a mild and gradual exertion of Jewish moral ideas. It presupposes the extinction of Canaanitish institutions and the planting in their stead of Levitical institutions. Archaeology offers no evidence that such a change occurred at Gezer before the Maccabaeon period. The J and P parts of the narrative are directly opposed to each other here. How the evidence, even as my friend presents it, can show that a thing both did and did not occur, the reader finds it hard to understand.

This last point illustrates the fact that all those who seek by means of archaeology to overthrow criticism are following an *ignis fatuus*. The most decisive criteria in favor of the critical theory are the contradictions in the codes, and the fact that the history shows that the codes came into actual effect as moulding forces in the life of the people at widely different periods in their career. These results archaeology cannot touch until it can show how it can possibly be right to build a multiplicity of altars (Ex. 20 24-26), and yet wrong to build more than

one (Dt. 12); how it can be right to make a Hebrew a slave for six years (Ex. 21 2-8, Dt. 15 12-18), but wrong to make a Hebrew a slave at all (Lev. 25 39-46); how it is more divine for the laws to be revealed to Moses in the tangled and contradictory form in which they lie in our Pentateuch nearly a millennium before some of them were effective, than for God to guide prophets, priests, and sages, to meet the crises of the life of an advancing nation with new and appropriate legislation. Not until archaeology can accomplish this impossible task can it have any "deciding voice" in Old Testament criticism.

The book of my friend claims that it is in conservative seminaries only that scholars are found who take into account *all* the facts. Whether that is or is not true, the reader of his book and of this article must judge. Kyle also makes much of the fact that critics do not often cite archaeological evidence in support of their views, claiming that there is no such evidence.

With reference to this last claim it should be said, that archaeological evidence in favor of critical views exists, and, if it is not cited, it is because critics have a keener sense of what is relevant and decisive than the archaeological advocates of tradition have. That such evidence exists, the following five instances will prove. They are by no means the only ones that could be cited, but are chosen because they lie within easy reach of the writer.

1. The critics claim that there are two accounts of the creation in Genesis, one in Gen. 1 1—2 4a, the other in Gen. 2 4b ff. The first of these accounts assumes as a primeval chaos a mass of waters, tells how these were divided by a firmament, and makes the periods of creation seven in number. The second assumes the existence of the earth, and goes on to explain the creation of man, animals and the beginnings of civilization. Among the religious texts of Babylonia two similar accounts of the creation have been found; one begins with a primeval chaos of water, which is divided by a firmament for the creation of heaven and earth, and makes the epochs of creation seven;¹⁶ the other begins by assuming the earth, and goes on to tell of

¹⁶ Among the many translations, see that of Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament*, 1912, pp. 3—44.

the creation of living things and of the rise of civilization.¹⁷ These Babylonian and Biblical accounts differ in their religious aspects, but the existence of the Babylonian myths, and their agreement with the Biblical accounts in the points mentioned, is a striking confirmation of the critical view. I am far from saying that it is decisive; I am only saying that in so far as it goes it is confirmatory. I am sure that if our archaeological advocates had a point nearly as strong, they would never be weary of ringing the changes upon it.

2. Another point in which archaeology confirms criticism is the instance of the 14th chapter of Genesis. In spite of all that has been written to the contrary, the kings who are said to have fought with Abraham, have not been brought to light by archaeology in a way to confirm that chapter. The facts are as follows:

Hammurapi, the great Babylonian lawgiver, one of the most important of all the Babylonian kings, reigned from 2123 to 2081 B.C., and claimed sovereignty of MAR-TU, or the Westland, probably Syria and Palestine. Many scholars have held that Hammurapi was the same as Amraphel of Gen. 14 1. The names would exactly correspond were it not for the *l* at the end of Amraphel. By no known philological equivalence does that letter belong there, and if Hammurapi is intended by Amraphel, Gen. 14 must have been written so late that the name had become corrupted in a way similar to the corruption from which good Hebrew names have suffered in the angelic lists of the Ethiopic Enoch.¹⁸

Arioch, king of Elassar (Gen. 14 1), has been identified with Rim-Sin, king of Larsa, a contemporary to Hammurapi in the latter part of his reign. But the fact is the name of Rim-Sin could not even in Sumerian possibly be read Ari-aku. That of his brother, Arad-Sin, might be so read, but there is nothing to lead us to suppose that it was, and there is no evidence that either Arad-Sin or Rim-Sin were ever in friendly alliance with Hammurapi.¹⁹

¹⁷ See Rogers, *op. cit.*, pp. 47—50.

¹⁸ See the writer's article, "Origin of the names of Angels and Demons in the Extra-Canonical Apocalyptic Literature to 100 A.D." in this *JOURNAL*, XXXI, 156 ff.

¹⁹ Cf. this *JOURNAL*, XXVIII, 158 ff.

Again, much has been made of the fact that Kudur-Mabug, the father of Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin, who was the AD-DA or ruler of Emutbal, a district of western Elam, calls himself AD-DA of MAR-TU,²⁰ which has been supposed to be Palestine. MAR-TU, however, simply meant the place of sunset, and probably in this inscription refers to the western part of Elam.²¹ There is really nothing whatever to connect Kudur-Mabug with Palestine at all. And even if there were, his name is not Chedorlaomer, so that again the inscription would be evidence of the lack of information on the part of the Biblical writer.

Much has been made by Professors Sayce²² and Hommel of four documents published by Pinches in the *Transactions of the Victoria Institute*, XXIX, 82 ff., which, according to Sayce and Pinches, contain the names of Arioch, Chedorlaomer, and Tidal, the three kings, who in Gen. 14:1 are associated with Amraphel. The documents are written in Semitic and are from the Persian period, not earlier than the fourth century B.C. In reality neither the names Chedorlaomer nor Arioch appear in the text. The name read Kudurlakhmal is really *Ku-ku-ku-mal* or *Ku-dur-ku-mal*. The other reading is only obtained by giving to the sign KU in its third occurrence a value, *lakh*, altogether unattested by the cuneiform literature. The name read Eri-eaku and identified with Arioch is spelled in two ways. If read as Sumerian, it might be Eri-eaku. The text in which it occurs is, however, Semitic, and it is probable that the name is to be read here in Semitic fashion. So read it becomes Arad-malkua, or Arad-malaku. Tudkhula, the supposed Tidal, is not called in the document a king at all. To identify him with "Tidal, king of the nations," is a purely fanciful procedure.

It should be noted that in the documents which record these names Arad-malaku, the supposed Eri-aku, takes no part in the wars described; it is his son, Dursil-ilâni (who, by the way, has a good Semitic name) who is represented as the contemporary

²⁰ "Cuneiform Texts," XXI, 33.

²¹ See Price, *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, V, 167 ff.

²² Cf. PSBA. XXVIII, 203—218, 241—251; XXIX, 7—17. Cf. also King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, I, p. 11 ff.

of Kukukumal, the supposed Chedorlaomer. It should be further noted, that these documents represent a complete conquest of Babylon by Elam—a conquest so complete that:

“In their faithful counsel unto Kukukumal, king of Elam,
They [the gods] established the fixed advance, which to them seemed good.

In Babylon, the city of the gods, Marduk set his [Kukukumal's] throne,

All, even the Sodomites of the plundered temples, obeyed him.

Ravens build their nests; birds dwell [therein];

The ravens croak (?), shrieking they hatch their young [in it].

To the dog crunching the bone the Lady is favorable.

The snake hisses, the evil one spits poison.”

This quotation from the second of the documents published by Pinches describes a complete subjugation and desolation of Babylon by Kukukumal, king of Elam. This definitely excludes the possibility that Kukukumal could have acted in harmony with Hammurapi, as Chedorlaomar is said to have done. Indeed, it shows that he was not a contemporary of Hammurapi at all, for during his powerful reign there was no such conquest of Babylon by Elam. There were many conquests of Babylonia by the Elamites, and this must refer to some other period. In the documents themselves there is evidence that another period is intended, for Babylon is called by its Cassite name, Karduniash, a name that it did not bear until three or four hundred years after Hammurapi.

If the 14th chapter of Genesis was influenced at all by these documents, it is only another proof that the critics have been right, and that the chapter is not an authority as history. Indeed the history as reconstructed from the monuments shows Hammurapi in such sincere rivalry with the king of Larsa, that a joint invasion of Palestine by them, while not impossible, is most improbable.

3. The excavations at Gezer and at Taanach confirm the critical view of the late date of the D and P legislation and narratives. The D legislation (Dt. 12) prohibits all altars but one, and makes it a religious duty to break down the “pillars” of the high places. The P legislation (Lev. 17) takes the existence of but one altar for granted, while the P narrative

(Josh. 21 21, 25) makes Gezer and Taanach Levitical cities. The excavations at Gezer show not only that the "pillars" were never broken down there, but that the worship at the high place was not interrupted between the Hebrew conquest and the Babylonian exile. This evidence has been discussed above, and definitely excludes such interruption of the worship there as would surely have occurred, if the religious ideas embodied in either D or P had been introduced there. The evidence at Taanach as gathered by Sellin²³ is not so complete, but it shows the worship of Astarte as present there from the time of the Canaanites to the destruction of the northern kingdom. The archaeological evidence is so strong that, when the writer was on the ground, he was convinced by it alone that the account of the Levitical cities in Joshua must be a post-exilic writer's explanation of the fact that there were large families of priests connected with these cities, and that they possessed considerable estates there.²⁴ So far as the evidence has been recovered, no other conclusion seems justified. The archaeological evidence shows no trace of the existence of the Deuteronomic and Priestly institutions, but on the contrary seems definitely to exclude them.

4. Another point in which archaeology confirms the critical view may be found in the Aramaic papyri discovered at Elephantine in Egypt. One of these papyri²⁵ consists of a letter written by Hananiah (possibly a brother of Nehemiah) to the Jewish community at Elephantine in the year 419 B.C. Although the papyrus is but a fragment of the original letter, it is clear that its author is explaining to his brethren in detail the Levitical requirements for the observance of the Passover. He states the requirement as given by P in Lev. 23 and Ex. 12, that the feast shall be kept from the 14th of Nisan at sunset until the 21st of Nisan. The prohibitions against doing any work, and against leaven are also set forth. If these requirements

²³ See Sellin, *Tell-Ta'aneh*, Vienna, 1904, Ch. XII, XIX, XX.

²⁴ See the writer's article "The Levitical Cities of Israel in the Light of the Excavation at Gezer," *Biblical World*, XXIV, 167—179.

²⁵ See Sachau, *Aramäische Papyrus und Ostraka aus einer jüdischen Militär-Kolonie zu Elephantine*, 1911, No. 6; cf. also Arnold, in *JBL*, XXXI, 1 ff.

of the priestly code had been set forth by Moses and had been in force for nearly a thousand years, it is inconceivable that it should have been necessary to inform the Jewish community in Egypt concerning them in this way. An American today might conceivably write to a company of American missionaries in China about a sane and safe Fourth of July, but at no time since the early days of the republic would it be necessary to write to a company of Americans abroad, "the Fourth of July is properly observed by setting off fire-crackers from dusk of the 3rd onward." Such detailed information in the letter of Hananiah is readily explicable, if the Levitical law had been introduced into Jerusalem some 25 years before, and the distant community on the Nile had never before had its details. Another of these papyri confirms the critical view of the date of Deuteronomy. It is a letter to Bagoses, the Persian governor,²⁶ which sets forth that the writers represent a community possessing a temple of Yahweh at Elephantine, which had existed there from the days of the native kings of Egypt, and which Cambyses found when he conquered Egypt, but which an official named Waidrang had now destroyed. The letter goes on to relate that the temple had been in ruins for three years, that formerly they had written to the high priest at Jerusalem to intercede in their behalf, but that nothing had come of it. They appeal in the letter under discussion to Bagoses directly, saying that they were also writing to the two sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria. A second papyrus²⁷ contains the rescript of Bagoses, which granted them permission to rebuild their temple. How did these Jews come to live at Elephantine, and how are these various facts to be explained? Scholars are pretty well agreed that these Jews were a part of a garrison, placed at Elephantine by Psammetik of Egypt, to protect his frontier against the Nubians. Opinion differs as to whether it was Psammetik I, 663—609 B.C., or Psammetik II, 593—588 B.C. Even if we assume that it was Psammetik II, at that time the struggle for the general observance of the Deuteronomic law, which had begun in 621, had not yet reached a successful issue. Not all

²⁶ Sachau, *op. cit.*, No. 1.

²⁷ Sachau, *op. cit.*, No. 3.

Jews believed in Deuteronomy, so these Jews built themselves in Egypt a temple to Yahweh. By the year 410, however, when Waidrang destroyed the temple at Elephantine, the Levitical law had been in force for more than thirty years. Naturally, therefore, the high priest at Jerusalem ignored the request of his Egyptian brethren. It was not until they appealed to the schismatic Samaritans, that they obtained influence enough on the part of influential Hebrews, who stood near the governor, to secure the granting of their request. If the critical view is true, the facts are explicable, otherwise they are not.

5. Another point in which the discoveries of archaeology strikingly confirm the results of criticism has to do with the book of Daniel. Critics with great unanimity date Daniel 168—165 B.C., and regard it, not as history, but as an apocalypse, some of the historical statements of which are not in accordance with facts. We now have business documents from the whole period from which the book of Daniel is supposed by tradition to come,²⁸ and we have some historical inscriptions also.²⁹ The business documents are dated in practically every year of every king of the period. We know from this evidence, not only that Belshazzar was never king, as he is said to have been in Daniel 5, but that he was not a son of Nebuchadnezzar. We also know that there was no such king as Darius the Mede, who is said to have come in between Belshazzar and Cyrus. Every year is full, and there is no room for him. Archaeology here unequivocally casts its influence on the side of criticism.

These instances are cited, not because the critical views need the support of such arguments, but simply in the interest of truth. Those who assert that the evidence of archaeology is always on the side of traditional views clearly do not have adequate knowledge of the subject of which they presume to be authoritative exponents.

In conclusion the fact should be noted that it is not the function of archaeology to deal with criticism at all, and it is but rarely that an archaeological fact has any vital bearing upon a critical theory. Any attempt to reconstruct ancient

²⁸ See the various Hefte of Strassmaier's *Babylonische Texte*.

²⁹ See *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*, III², 120—137.

history must take into account both the facts of archaeology and of criticism, if the reconstruction is to have any hope of accurately representing the facts of ancient life. Both external and internal evidence must be taken into account. Archaeological objects and ancient documents must both be put upon the witness stand. One must crossquestion them both, and not blindly accept the first impressions given by either one. It is as necessary to criticise the archaeological data, i. e. to seek to understand them from every point of view, as it is to criticise documents, i. e. really to understand them.

In this work, it is well that we have an army of eager minds, each anxious to discover the mistakes of all the others, for only so can we hope to reach secure results. The ablest scholar may unaccountably trip at any moment. Wellhausen affords an example of this. No investigator is more able; three different fields of inquiry, Arabian history, the Old Testament, and the New Testament, have been enriched by him. Nevertheless, when in his *Einleitung in die drei ersten Evangelien*, p. 56 (ed. 1), he says of Mk. 11 23, that the saying about removing this mountain and casting it into the sea cannot have been spoken on Olivet near Jerusalem, because no sea is visible there, but must have been uttered near the Sea of Galilee, he reveals the fact that he has never been in Jerusalem. Had he ever stood upon the Mount of Olives, or upon any high building in Jerusalem itself, and looked at the Dead Sea, which one, as he looks, naturally thinks he can reach by a short walk, the remark never would have been made.

So far from discrediting Wellhausen's work, this instance only shows in the case of a most illustrious scholar, how difficult it is to take everything into account.

No critic can be fully equipped who does not know the external facts which are relevant. No Biblical archaeologist is fully equipped who has not first-hand knowledge of the critical facts. When the critic takes into account all the facts of external evidence, and the archaeologist takes into account all the facts of internal evidence, it will not make much difference whether a man calls himself a critic or an archaeologist, provided he has adequate learning and a trained judgment.