

2-1-1933

Archeology-the Nemesis

W. A. Maier

Concordia Seminary, St. Louis

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



Part of the [Practical Theology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Maier, W. A. (1933) "Archeology-the Nemesis," *Concordia Theological Monthly*. Vol. 4 , Article 13.
Available at: <https://scholar.csl.edu/ctm/vol4/iss1/13>

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.

zweifellos klar: Das öffentliche Regieren und Lehren ist den Frauen verboten; trotzdem haben sie einen großen und seligen Beruf, der jeder Frau, die ihren Heiland liebhat und ihm dienen will, reichlich Gelegenheit bietet, sich im Reiche Gottes und im Dienste der Christlichen Kirche zu betätigen.*)

A. C. Krüger.

Archeology — the Nemesis.

When, at the middle of the last century, the epoch-making excavations in the Mesopotamian Valley lengthened the historical perspective and pushed back the horizon of the ancient Orient, these archeological discoveries were hailed with mixed feelings. An attitude of doubt and suspicion clashed with an exaggerated credulity. While a wealthy British student of ancient chronology paid a young Assyriologist a retaining-fee for three years, binding him to search for parallels to the Old Testament (with the startling result that detailed, yet utterly spurious accounts of where Paradise was, where the fall of man occurred, where Cain slew Abel, and where the Tower of Babel was built, were given; Budge, *Rise and Progress of Assyriology*, p. 127), the number of scholars who doubted the validity of the transliterations and translations was not inconsiderable.

Notable in the latter group were critical minds that in spite of their characteristic inclination to explore new avenues of departure remained anchored on their old critical basis. The great Noeldeke, prince of Semitists, as late as 1871 declared that the results of Assyriology both in matters of linguistics and history were characterized by "a highly suspicious air." The school of Wellhausen, with its dominant emphasis upon the history of religion, paid scant attention to archeology and dallied with it as a toy of sophisticated Semitism. A perusal of Julius Wellhausen's *History of Israel* shows the pronounced indifference with which he regarded Assyriology.

This neglect has proved fatal to many of the theories which have been set up as canons of criticism. Archeology has convincingly demonstrated its capacities as a nemesis of higher criticism. Scores of hasty judgments and other scores of intricate theories, spun out of critical fancy, now appear as entirely fallacious in the light of archeological research. And while it is a thankless task to enumerate

*) Diese Stimme aus dem Kreise unserer südamerikanischen Brüder bringen wir um so lieber, da der Artitel zeigt, daß auch dort im Geiste der Schrift gelehrt und gearbeitet wird, eben auch in bezug auf diese praktische Frage. Die kirchliche Arbeit christlicher Frauen sollte ganz und gar unter Aufsicht und Leitung der Ortsgemeinde geschehen. Dies schließt keineswegs aus, daß eine größere kirchliche Körperschaft durch eine systematische Ordnung der Arbeit solcher Frauenvereine ein größeres Ziel erreichen kann.

P. C. R.

negatives and to collate errors, the cumulative force of the archeological rejection of higher critical extravagances must react very decidedly in emphasizing the truth of the Scriptures.

Since higher criticism has particularly three methods of attack by which the authenticity and the veracity of the Biblical books are assailed: the arguments based on language, situation, and theology, I have selected the following typical instances in which higher critical dicta have been nullified or reversed by subsequent archeological data in the fields of philological research, historical investigation, and the comparative study of Semitic religions. When the demonstration is completed, I leave to the individual reader the personal verdict on the validity of the British critic's oft-endorsed statement: "The attempt to refute the conclusions of criticism by means of archeology has signally failed. . . . The archeological discoveries of recent years . . . have revealed nothing which is in conflict with the generally accepted conclusions of critics." (Driver, *Introduction to the Literature of the Old Testament*, p. XVIII.) For, while there are few "generally accepted conclusions of critics," it will be shown that one theory after another, definitely accepted and endorsed by higher critical authorities, has receded before the modern advance of scientific Old Testament study.

I. Refuted Arguments from Literary Criticism.

One of the fundamental premises of higher criticism is the *Sprachbeweis*, the arguments from language, literary analysis, stylistic peculiarities, syntactical developments, and the historical and etymological background of individual words. There is a certain validity to the study of language development. In some very obtrusive respects the postexilic Hebrew differs from the Hebrew of Israel's golden age in the early monarchies. There are definite syntactical phenomena which are characteristic of the late language and, just as definitely, certain forms and expressions that are Pentateuchal. We can single out a number of terms that are restricted to Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles and correspondingly call attention to a series of word forms that are limited to a much earlier age.

But higher criticism has drifted widely from these natural and inevitable marks of literary history. It is claimed, on the strength of a long and definite list of words, that these individual terms could not be used by individual authors at the time which the Scriptural account presupposes. There are terms and constructions in Davidic psalms, it is claimed, which must be postexilic and are therefore *prima-facie* evidence that the poetry in question cannot be Davidic. There are marks of foreign influences, critics say, in reputedly early books which show that these writings must date from the later years of foreign contacts. There are documents in

the Old Testament which by their very style repudiate the Scriptural claim for their originality.

Now, some of these higher critical strictures have been repudiated by an examination of word occurrences in the Old Testament itself. The shortened form of the *nota relationis* which occurs in some of the later books cannot be a sign of later Hebrew because it is similarly found in a document which many critics claim to be the oldest original part of the Old Testament, the Song of Deborah, Judg. 5. Similarly the integrity of Isaiah's prophecies is emphasized by the recurrence of demonstrably Isaianic terms in both the "First" Isaiah (1—39) and in the hypothetical "Second" Isaiah (40—66). Until the beginning of the last generation practically all the arguments against literary criticism were internal and idiomatic, drawn from Scriptural usage and occurrence. But with the rise of the archeological sciences external standards of judgment were afforded, and it is here that the very stones have cried out against some of the most ingenious and intricate theories which have been raised up on the basis of language to challenge the Scriptural veracity. Among the noteworthy reversals of higher critical opinion we may note the following typical instances.

A. Critical Arguments Based on Word History.

It is the claim of Max Mueller (*Encyclopedia Biblica*, col. 3,687) in regard to the title "Pharaoh" that "the Hebrews can have received it only after 1000 B. C." He asserts that the term was unknown in Egypt, in the way in which the early Biblical writers know it, until that time. If this statement were true, it would of course wipe out with one stroke the entire Mosaic authorship of those Pentateuchal portions which employ the term. As a matter of fact, however, Mueller's contention was set aside by the archeological light on this title, its meaning, and its abundant use long before 1000 B. C. The occurrence of the term in *The Tale of Two Brothers* shows its common employment several centuries before the time permitted by critical analysis. It is now definitely recognized on all sides that the term "Pharaoh" is the Hebraized "Per'o" (Herodotus: "Pheron"). As early as the fourth dynasty, centuries before Moses' time, several different hieroglyphics preceded the name of the Egyptian king as distinctive titles. Among these there was a drawing of a structure "representing the façade of a building, perhaps a palace." Now Alexandre Moret (*The Nile and Egyptian Civilization*, p. 130) summarizes the meaning of this symbol: "An old term for the royal palace establishment and estate, Per'o, 'the great house,' and this gradually became the personal designation. In the Memphite period this came to designate the king himself."

Similar objections have been raised against the admissibility of Joseph's Egyptian name, Zaphnath-paaneah, as well as against the

name of his Egyptian wife, Asenath. It was argued that these names were unknown in Joseph's time. For instance, Kraal, thirty-five years ago, declared that names of this formation were not found until the XXII dynasty, and he used this as "an important aid for the dating of the Elohist source." Again, Cheyne (*Encyclopedia Biblica*, col. 5,379) originally held that this was an adaptation of Pianhi, a famous Egyptian ruler of the XXV dynasty, suggesting this as an indication of the late date of the Joseph narrative. Later, moved by his Jerahmeel theory, he held Zaphnath as a corruption or alteration of Zarephath, making Joseph's entire name Zarephath-Jerahmeel!

Again archeological evidence has removed these objections. The best identification of Joseph's name is one suggested by Lieblein, in whose *Dictionnaire de Noms*, p. 55, the name is explained as "the one who supplies us the nourishment of life," on a splendid linguistic equation of the Greek and Hebrew, in concordance with Joseph's situation and particularly in the closest harmony with the historical requirements. In the XIV dynasty three kings are directly mentioned with the compound titles featuring the principal element in Joseph's name.

In regard to Asenath and the critical attack upon the history of this word (cf. Hastings, *Bible Dictionary*, col. 2,775), the identification of Kyle (*Moses and the Monuments*, p. 38) shows that archeology is again decisive in removing the unwarranted contention that this name betrays late authorship. It has now been definitely established that the root *snt* is a woman's name, which appears from the early days of the XI dynasty on. In Hebrew, as frequently in the case of proper foreign names, the root is prefixed with a prosthetic *aleph*.

To pass by other similar instances in which higher criticism has created a false historical background for individual Hebrew terms, we may take a concluding example from the last pages of Israel's history. Driver (*op. cit.*, p. 545) attacks the authenticity of the edict of Cyrus in Ezra 1, because of the Jewish phraseology and Jewish point of view. The particular instance of this alleged Jewish phraseology which he urged is the employment of the term "king of Persia." This, he claims, is non-historical, asserting: "Persia was absorbed and lost in the wider empire of which, by Cyrus's conquest of Babylon, the Achaemenidae became the heirs; hence after that date they are in royal inscriptions called regularly not 'king of Persia' but (most commonly) 'the king.' . . . In the extant royal inscription, 'king of Persia' occurs only once, and that in combination with other titles." In thus repeating the argument originally advanced by Ewald and lending to it the appearance of archeological support, which Ewald could not offer, Driver again relieved himself of one of those premature critical contentions which have been proved

as false on the basis of subsequent archeological research. For in addition to the notable work of the late Robert Dick Wilson (*Princeton Theological Review*, 1905—6), in which the wide-spread occurrence of the title “king of Persia” was accurately demonstrated, we now have complete evidence that this title was used in the royal inscriptions by these Achaemenidae. With the discovery of additional inscriptions since the time of Driver’s indictment we have the situation summarized in the contemporaneous *Realenzyklopaedie fuer Keilschriftforschung* (I, 335): Cyrus conquered Babylon in 539. He took into account the kingdom of Babylon and called himself “king of Babylon and of the lands.” Once, within a text, he is designated in an exceptional way as “king of Persia” (*Parsu*). (*Yale Oriental Society*, VII, Plate 8.) His successors, Cambyses and Darius I, retained this designation (*i. e.*, “king of Persia”). Under this light, what becomes of the claim of Driver that the Achaemenidae after 539 are regularly not called “king of Persia” when archeological investigation has now shown us that this is the title which the successors of Cyrus regularly took? What verdict is to be pronounced upon his rejection of the edict of Cyrus when we see that Cyrus himself uses the very name which Driver finds so objectionable in the Hebrew text? It must be apparent that the nemesis of archeology has once more pursued and overtaken the extravagant fictions of the *Sprachbeweis*.

B. Critical Argument Based on Style.

But Driver, as quoted above, finds not only the phrase “king of Persia” contrary to contemporary usage, he also brands the style of the edict of Cyrus as expressive of “a Jewish point of view.” It is significant that Eduard Meyer took issue with this position in 1896, in his *Die Entstehung des Judentums*. He asserted: “An unbiased historical investigation has led many to the conviction that the documents of the Persian period must exactly resemble the traditional documents of the Book of Ezra.” And then he uttered a prophecy which was destined to be fulfilled in a most remarkable manner: “If in the future a larger number of Persian government edicts come to light, these objections will probably vanish entirely.”

Archeological investigation made this supposition of Eduard Meyer a startling reality. In the ruins of the frontier fortress at Elephantine in Egypt, papyri were recovered in 1904 among which, in addition to private papers, there were several official decrees of the Persian government and a number of official reports on the Jewish community at Elephantine. Here at last was an opportunity for the comparison of the official documents preserved in the Scripture and those originating directly in the Persian governmental circles. Meyer, definitely and sometimes radically critical, sums up the result of this comparison and says triumphantly: “These documents, resurrected

from the ruins, agree in style and vocabulary with the documents in the Book of Ezra in such detail that no doubt may be entertained any longer in regard to the authenticity of the latter." (*Der Papyrusfund von Elephantine*, p. 4.)

Similarly another stylistic argument was advanced against the superscriptions of the psalms. It was held that they could not be an authentic and integral part of the original record of the psalms, added by the author himself. Thomas Chalmers Murray, in his *Lectures on the Origin and Growth of the Psalms*, p. 102, says that the first reason why these titles are regarded by all scholars whose opinions carry weight as of editorial origin is that "it is contrary to all we know of Semitic style for the author to add notes or superscriptions such as these to his poems or works." That objection might have had some appeal to skeptical minds in 1880, when Murray published his book; but in the half century that has intervened since then hundreds of Babylonian psalms have been uncovered, literary productions that were written centuries before David's time. They afford a very definite means of checking Murray's statement. And once again archeology repudiates higher criticism. These Babylonian and Sumerian psalms have superscriptions exactly parallel in principle to those of the Hebrew psalms and containing some of the definite annotations (*e. g.*, in regard to musical instruments, purpose, melody, etc.) found in the titles to the various Scriptural psalms. Thus, while higher criticism definitely insisted that the Psalter titles were *sui generis* and later additions, it is now found that they are part of the literary conventions in at least large portions of the Semitic world.

C. Critical Arguments Based on Aramaisms.

One of the commonest objections of literary criticism against the authenticity of many books of the Bible is the alleged presence of Aramaisms, words that were taken over into the Hebrew from the cognate Aramaic. These were regarded as definite marks of late authorship. It is commonly held that these Aramaisms crept in at a time when the Aramaic influence was strongest, *i. e.*, in the exilic and postexilic periods, when the Hebrew was gradually crowded out by the ascendancy of the northern speech. Consequently the claim is made that, whenever an Old Testament book contains these Aramaisms, it betrays its late, postexilic, origin. This use of Aramaisms as age markers has been a standard part of the stock in trade of modern criticism. It pervades commentaries like those of Briggs and Gunkel; it is repeatedly employed by Driver and has been developed into book form, for example, by Kautzsch, *Die Aramaismen im Alten Testament*.

Until the horizon of ancient linguistics was widened by the scientific study of comparative languages which archeological research made possible, the only explanation to which conservative interpreters

could take recourse was to show first that Aramaic is a very ancient language, its early occurrence being endorsed by the Aramaic of Laban in Gen. 31, 47. This, it was correctly inferred, must demonstrate conclusively that Aramaic cannot be employed as an age marker since, with this evidence of early occurrence, Aramaisms could have been adopted by the Hebrews from the patriarchal times.

But when the mounds of Babylonia and Assyria were uncovered and thousands of tablets in the related cuneiform were brought to light, it became possible to use these and other associated discoveries for a systematic and scientific comparison of the various Semitic languages. This collation showed that Old Testament words which were regarded as Aramaisms (chiefly because they were *hapaxlegomena* in Hebrew, while they occurred more frequently in Aramaic) were in reality often part of the common Semitic vocabulary, words which doubtless would have found repeated expression in the Hebrew had an extant literature in that language not been restricted to the relatively small portions preserved for us in the Old Testament Scriptures. By exhaustive comparisons of the Semitic languages and dialects, Wilson shows that according to the laws of consonantal changes that exist among all Semitic nations not more than five or six roots can definitely be said to have been borrowed from the Aramaic by the Hebrew. And such borrowing, the natural and inevitable procedure among neighboring nations (especially among those with such close racial and linguistic relations as existed between the Hebrews and the Arameans), can by no cogent reasons be made evidence of exilic authorship. On the contrary, Hermann Gunkel, who had previously made liberal use of the argument from alleged Aramaisms, now warns: "The task of distinguishing Aramaic words which are to be found in the most ancient texts from those which were not introduced until later times is a problem for the future. In the mean time it is only with the greatest reservation that we should draw the conclusion of a late origin from Aramaisms." (*Old Testament Essays*, 1927: "The Poetry of the Psalms," p. 119.) The discovery of Cappadocian cuneiform tablets dating from before 2000 B. C. show distinct Aramaizing tendencies and give evidence of the early existence of the Aramaic and its wide contacts. Bauer and Leander have thrown a bombshell into the critical camp by asserting that the oldest Hebrew showed Aramaic roots. — All this again demonstrates that the higher critical dating of the Psalms and of other sections of the Scriptures which are assigned to a postexilic age because of alleged Aramaisms must be surrendered.

D. Critical Arguments Based on Word Forms.

This attack of higher criticism is highly technical. It seizes, for example, certain words of particular form or ending and asserts that these peculiarities betray a literary age which contradicts the Biblical

authorship. In the case of Ecclesiastes, for example, the abstract ending *uth* is one of the main philological arguments against the Solomonic authorship, the critical contention alleging that this ending is late. But since these claims have been advanced, new archeological discoveries have enlarged the comparative Semitic vocabulary, and it has become evident that these abstract endings, branded as signs of late authorship, occur in the Assyrian or Babylonian of the Code of Hammurabi and the Tel-el-Amarna letters, in the historical and omen inscriptions of Assyria, and in other records from the time of 2000 B. C.

Even more thoroughly has the similar theory involving nouns ending in *on* and *an* been scouted by the advances of Semitic linguistics. For the Babylonian, Assyrian, Arabic, and Aramaic can now be shown to have contained many words with these terminations.

As the field of literary attacks on the Hebrew of the Old Testament is surveyed from these various angles, one gains the conviction that in the coming years, as the conquest of Semitic philology increases, other assaults of the *Sprachbeweis* will be destined to similar frustration and that indeed the other contentions from comparative history and comparative religion, on which the subsequent article will dwell, are doomed to the same end.

W. A. MAIER.

(To be concluded.)

Studies in Eusebius.

(Concluded.)

Melito, bishop of Sardis, in a letter presented to Aurelius, called Christianity "the philosophy which began under Augustus." (Eusebius, IV, 26.) The narrative about the persecution in Gaul under Marcus Aurelius, in V, is among the most important in the *Church History* of the bishop of Caesarea, untainted by the flattery of his later references to Constantine. This persecution occurred in 177 A. D., especially in Lugdunum and Vienne on the Rhone. The report given by the churches there, sent to the churches in the provinces of Asia and Phrygia, is the longest citation in the whole history of Eusebius, and it seems to have been composed in Greek. One is almost compelled to infer that Greek was still the language in which Scripture was read in the services and perhaps also the language of the sermons. Irenaeus was trained in Asia Minor and wrote Greek. Socially even the Christians (Eusebius, V, 1) had become marked men, being excluded from the public baths and the market-place. The leaders of the Christians were fearless. The report quotes Rom. 8, 18 precisely: "I reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to