

Abraham and Archæology*

GEORGE A. BARTON

BRYN MAWR COLLEGE

THOSE scholars who have been seeking for years to condemn the higher criticism by the verdict of archæology have had much to say of Abraham and his age and of the confirmations which archæology has afforded to the fourteenth chapter of Genesis. For a long time they have been looking for a mention of Abraham on the monuments. Since an Egyptian occurrence of his name has been found, they have been strangely silent about it.

In 1905 Professor Breasted published in his *History of Egypt* a picture of a bit of the inscription on the walls of the temple of Karnak in which Shoshenq (the Biblical Shishak) recorded the names of the places which he had conquered in Palestine. This picture (fig. 180, opposite p. 536, cf. also p. 530) gives the name of a place as *The Field of Abram*, thus giving us what we have long been seeking, one of the names of Abram in an extra-Biblical source. True, it appears as a part of the name of a place (see also Breasted, *Ancient Records*, iv. pp. 352, 353), but it appears in such a way that it implies that the name was borne by a person, or god or eponymous hero.

Possibly there are two reasons why so little has been made of this long-desired discovery of the name of Abram. One

* The following abbreviations are used:

BE = *Babylonian Expedition of the University of Pennsylvania*, edited by H. V. Hilprecht.

JAOS = *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

CT = *Cuneiform Texts from Babylonian Tablets in the British Museum*.

KAT³ = Schrader's *Keilinschriften und das Alte Testament*, 3d ed.

IV R = Rawlinson's *Cuneiform Inscriptions of Western Asia*, vol. iv.

may be, that it is found in so late a document (Shosheng ruled 945-924 B.C.), and so far removed from the Abrahamic age, that it affords no proof of the historicity of Abraham. So far as this inscription is concerned, any of the critical theories of Abraham might be true. A second reason may be that in reality this discovery seems to confirm the critical conclusions. Brugsch and Steindorf had pointed out years ago that the Egyptian names which occur in Genesis, such as Potiphar and Zaphenathpaneah, are not found in Egyptian earlier than XXII dynasty, or the tenth century B.C. (cf. *Old Testament Student*, xi. pp. 180, 181, and Steindorf in *Zeitschr. f. ägyptische Sprache*, 1889, pp. 41 ff., 1892, p. 50 ff.). Professor W. Max Müller informs me that Egyptological research during the last twenty years confirms this statement. So far as this discovery of the name Abram goes, it falls in with other facts, which tend to show that the oldest Penta-teuchal documents reflect the vocabulary of the tenth to the eighth centuries.

Meantime a discovery of the name Abraham, of which probably much more notice will be taken, has been made in some Babylonian letters from Dilbad or Dilmu, the modern Délâm, a few miles southeast of Borsippa. These letters were written in the reign of Ammizaduga, one of the last kings of the dynasty to which Hammurabi belonged.¹ In five of these letters an Abraham is mentioned, who appears to have been a small farmer, and who rented a small tract of land from a certain well-to-do landowner named Sin-iddin. The Babylonian spelling of the name is not uniform; *A-ba-am-ra-am*, *A-ba-ra-ma*, and *A-ba-am-ra-ma* are the forms in which it appears.

The name is certainly the long-looked-for Abraham, but it is equally clear that its bearer does not correspond to the Biblical description of the Patriarch. The Abraham of these letters was the son of Amil-Ishtar (or Awil-Ishtar), and apparently had a brother Iddatum, while the Abraham of

¹ They are published by Ungnad in *Vorderasiatische Schriftdenkmäler*, Heft vii, and are discussed by him in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. vi. Heft 5. He discusses the name Abraham on pp. 60 ff.

the Bible was the son of Terah, and his brother's name was Nahor. The rôle, too, attributed to the Patriarch was impossible apparently for this small farmer, and the date of the farmer does not correspond to either of the Biblical dates for the Patriarch. The value of the discovery of this name consists of the fact that it shows that Abraham was a personal name in Babylonia at the time of the Hammurabi dynasty.

The evidence that Babylonia long dominated Palestine, and that there were close relations between the two, increases. Lugalzaggisi, about 2200 B.C., claims to have subdued the countries as far west as the Mediterranean Sea (*OBI*, No. 87, col. ii). A Babylonian Chronicle now adds details to the testimony of the business documents that Sargon² (cir. 2300 B.C.) subdued the Mediterranean coast, by stating that he overran the country and set up his images (King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, vol. ii. p. 4). Gudea brought cedar-wood from Mount Lebanon (see Statue B); Hammurabi and Ammizadugga, one of his successors, both claim to be kings of MARTU — the Babylonian name for Syria and Palestine (King, *Letters and Inscriptions of Hammurabi*, Nos. 66 and 69). In the reign of Shamsuiluna, Hammurabi's successor, a man in Sippar leased a wagon or a cart for a year, and stipulated in the contract that it should not be driven to *Kittim*.³ *Kittim* is one of the Biblical names for the Mediterranean coastlands, and travel between this part of the world and Babylonia must have been abundant, when a man could not lease a cart for a year without taking into account the possibility that it might make this journey.

During the latter part of this period there was a considerable movement eastward from the Syrian coast into Babylonia (see Ranke in the Introduction to *BE*, vol. vi., and

² Meyer in the second edition of his *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1909, pp. 345 ff., has, I believe, placed these kings too late. He has apparently overlooked some important archaeological data, to which the present writer called attention in the *Churchman*, vol. xvii. pp. 53, 54.

³ The contract was published by Friedrich, in *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, vol. v. pp. 429 ff.

Clay, *JAOS*, xxviii. pp. 135 ff.). The migrations were accordingly reciprocal. They were not all in one direction.

Certain statements of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis are, it may be justly said, rendered more probable by some of these facts. Hammurabi, who is plausibly identified with Amraphel,⁴ claims to be king of the western countries. This does not prove that he invaded the Jordan valley and came into conflict with Abraham, but it makes it possible that he may have done so. Other statements of the same chapter are thought by many to receive confirmation from cuneiform sources also. A certain Kudurmabug, who was "Ad-da," or governor of Emutbal, a district of Elam, also calls himself in several inscriptions "Ad-da," or governor of MARTU (see, e.g., *CT*, xxi. 33). It has been sometimes inferred that Kudurmabug here asserted lordship over Palestine, but as Price points out (*Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, Series i, vol. v. pp. 167 ff.), the term probably designates the western part of Elam, or the westland of Elam. In that case Kudurmabug had no connection with Palestine. Kudurmabug did, however, place a son (and probably two sons in succession) on the throne of Larsa. It has been assumed that there was but one son, and that his name was written indifferently Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin, and that the former of these names was sometimes pronounced Eri-Agu, or Eri-Aku. An extensive literature has grown up since the days of George Smith upon this identification.⁵

Tiele (*Geschichte*, i. p. 124), while admitting that the identification was possible, regarded it as uncertain. Schrader (*Sitzungsberichte*, 1887, p. 602 note) held that the identification was made certain by a text published by Lenormant (*Choix*

⁴ See the discussion of Dhorne in the *Revue Biblique*, 1906, pp. 205-226, and of Ungnad in the *Zeitsch. f. Assyriologie*, xxii. pp. 7-13.

⁵ Cf., e.g., George Smith, *Early History of Babylonia*; *Records of the Past*, v. pp. 64 ff.; Delitzsch, *Sprache der Kossäer*, p. 69, note 1; Sayce, *Verdict of the Monuments*, pp. 102, 165, 533, 552; *Patriarchal Palestine*, pp. 63, 168; *Early History of the Hebrews*, pp. 11, 24, 26, 58, and 128; Schrader, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1887, p. 600 ff.; 1895, pp. 961 ff.; Rogers, *History of Babylonia and Assyria*, i. pp. 391; Clay, *Light on the O. T. from Babel*, pp. 131 ff.; Hommel, *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp. 40 ff., 70, 148, 161, 168 ff., 185 ff., 190, 206.

de textes, pp. 164 ff.) in col. i. 1. 11 of which Rim-Sin's name occurs. An examination of the passage shows, however, that it proves only that Kudurmabug had a son Rim-Sin, who was king of Larsa—a fact which no one doubts. No evidence is found there to show that that son was called Eri-Aku. Winckler (*KAT*,³ p. 867) pronounced the identification of Eri-Aku and Rim-Sin to be extremely uncertain.

The facts, I believe, can be shown to be these: (1) Kudurmabug had two sons who were kings of Larsa, Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin. (2) It is possible, though by no means certain, that Arad-Sin may have been called in Sumerian Iri-Agu. (3) It was Rim-Sin only who, so far as our evidence reveals, came into contact with Hammurabi, and the recorded relations between them were hostile and afford no basis for supposing that the two monarchs made an expedition together into the Westland.

Each of these points should be considered separately.

1. The suggestion that Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were different sons of Kudurmabug is not new. I do not know who first made it, but it was considered by Hommel and rejected, in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, p. 169. His reason for rejecting it is that *rim* (*iri*, *ri*, *irim*) is a Sumerian translation of the Semitic word *ardu*, servant, while *agu* (*aku*) is a frequent epithet of the moon-god, Sin. All this, however, only shows that the two names *might* refer to the same person. Even if these arguments were all probable, absolute identity is not established. The arguments are, however, not convincing. That *iri* is a dialectical variation of the Sumerian URU, "servant," is attested by Rawlinson's *Cun. Ins.* ii. p. 89, l. 70 a, but that the name of an Elamite should pass among Semitic peoples in its Sumerian form, while possible, strikes one as needing proof.

This supposition that Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were two sons of Kudurmabug was revived by Thureau-Dangin in 1905 (*Les inscriptions de Sumer et Akkad*, p. 800, note 3), and has since been reasserted by him (*Die sumerischen und akkadischen Königinschriften*, Leipzig, 1907, p. 210, note k). Mr. L. W. King (*Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*,

vol. i. p. 68) gives this view his unqualified approval, holding that Arad-Sin preceded Rim-Sin on the throne of Larsa. Dhorme, *Rev. Biblique*, 1908, p. 209, heartily concurs in both these points. Meyer also, in the second edition of his *Geschichte des Altertums*, 1909, pp. 550 ff., holds that the two kings were distinct from one another. There are several considerations which convince one of the correctness of this view. (1) In all the inscriptions of Rim-Sin except two, which were written before his father's death and in which he is associated with his father, his name is preceded by the determinative for deity, as though like Naram-Sin and Dungi he claimed to be a god. This determinative is never found before the name of Arad-Sin. (2) In the Chronicle published by King, Rim-Sin's name is spelled with two ideograms, that for "wild ox" (Sumerian AMA, Semitic *rimu*) and that for the moon-god. (See King, *op. cit.*, vol. ii. pp. 17, 18.) This shows that at least in the opinion of later Babylonian scribes the name was not regarded as equivalent to Arad-Sin, "servant of Sin," but to Rim-Sin, "the wild ox of Sin." It is possible, of course, that these scribes were mistaken, but in this matter they were quite as likely to be right as the modern scholar. (3) The titles of the two kings are not quite identical. Arad-Sin is called at the first "king of Larsa," then "king of Larsa, king of Sumir and Akkad," then "king of Larsa, king of Sumir and Akkad and *Ad-da* of Emutbal." Rim-Sin is called first "king of Larsa," then "king of Sumir and Akkad," but not "*Ad-da* of Emutbal." These facts seem to me to establish Thureau-Dangin's claim that Arad-Sin and Rim-Sin were distinct persons, though both sons of Kudurmabug.

Inscriptions of Kudurmabug are extant in which at different times he associates now one of these sons, now the other with him, in each case designating the son mentioned as "king of Larsa." (See Thureau-Dangin, *opera citata.*) These facts when put together lead to the following reconstruction of the history. Kudurmabug was *Ad-da* or governor of Emutbal, a district of western Elam. He aided his son Arad-Sin to capture the throne of Larsa. Arad-Sin after-

ward made other conquests in Babylonia, so that he could assume the ancient title, "king of Sumir and Akkad." He then turned on his father and attempted to add Emutbal to his dominions, meeting at first with such success that he was enabled to add his father's title to his own. Kudurmabug succeeded finally in overthrowing him, and then aided a second son, Rim-Sin, to obtain the throne of Larsa. Rim-Sin, after his father's death, obtained control over most of Babylonia. Some such view of the history is necessary to account for all these facts, and agrees with the views of the scholars referred to above.

2. It is only possible that Arad-Sin may have been called Iri-Agu. The reasons why it is possible have been stated above. In IV R 85, No. 8, l. 1, Ri-im-ilu-A-gam-um occurs as a king's name. This has often been cited as proof that Eri-Aku was a real Babylonian king. It is not quite certain that it is proof of that, but even if it is, it does not prove that he was identical with Arad-Sin. Pinches, Schrader, and Hommel (cf. *op. cit.*, pp. 179 ff.), all find Eri-Aku mentioned in the fragment of an epic dating from the Persian period, but there is nothing in the fragment to connect the name convincingly with Arad-Sin.

Another argument might be advanced. Among proper names from the period of the dynasty of Ur, which preceded a little that of Larsa, some Sumerian names apparently have a divine element written with the Semitic sign *Arad*, perhaps pronounced in Sumerian *Ura* or *Ira* or *Ara*. In these names, however, the sign *Arad* is not preceded by the determinative for deity; we only infer that it stood for a deity by the analogy of other names. For example, we have *Uru-ra-kal*,⁶ in which if the *ra* is a phonetic complement, the meaning might be "Ura is a guardian spirit" (*šedu*). Then there is *Uru-ra-ba-til*,⁷ "Ura gives life," "*Uru-ra-ga-se-ir*,"⁷ "Ura is strong," *Ura-ra-ba-ni-ru-ba-tum*,⁷ "Ura creates the great," *Uru-ra-ba-ni*,⁸ "Ura creates," *Uru-ra-kuš*,⁹ "Ura is protec-

⁶ Reisner, *Tempel Urkunden aus Telloh*, No. 200, l. 9.

⁷ *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, vol. xii. p. 348, ll. 11-13.

⁸ Thureau-Dangin, *Becueil de tablettes chaldéennes*, No. 389, 5, No. 392, rev. 2.

⁹ *Zettsch. f. Assyriologie*, xviii. p. 252, l. 5.

tor," and two or three others in which the meaning is not so clear. It may now be argued that the *Arad* in the name Arad-Sin was to be read Ura and that it stood for a deity, Ura-Sin or Ura-Aga meaning "Ura is Sin." This is certainly possible. The existence of these names shows that it is; but after all, it is only *possible*. It is not proven, and, if it were proven, it does not associate this king with Hammurabi, or bring him into Palestine. Then, too, it must be borne in mind that even if the sign *Arad* stood for a deity, we do not know how it was vocalized. He may quite as likely have been called Girra or Mirra as Ura.¹⁰

8. All the references in our sources to relations between Hammurabi and a king of Larsa mention Rim-Sin as the king concerned, and picture the relations as hostile. (See, e.g., *KB*, III, p. 127, and King, *op. cit.*, ii. p. 17.) We have as yet no evidence from the inscriptions that Arad-Sin, even if he were called Iri-Agu, ever had anything to do with Hammurabi, either as a friend or an enemy. Of course it is possible that he may have had, as their reigns must have overlapped, but that remains to be proved. Rim-Sin, on the other hand, was not entirely subdued by Hammurabi, but lived to make war on Samsu-iluna, Hammurabi's successor (King, *op. cit.*, i. p. 69 and ii. p. 18).

No reference has yet been found in the monuments to Chedorlaomar, king of Elam, nor to Tidal, king of Gouim, unless Tidal be the Tudhal of the late fragment of an epic already referred to (cf. Hommel, *op. cit.*, p. 184), an identification which Dhorme, *Rev. Biblique*, 1908, p. 211, declares to be pure hypothesis.

Archæology, so far from having as yet established the early composition and historical character of Gen. 14, seems, so far as I can see, to furnish a series of facts which are best explained by supposing that that chapter was composed by a late midrashic writer who had, it is true, access to some Babylonian data, partly late and partly early, but did not know how to use them. He lived so far from the times that he had lost in part the correct historical perspective. Archæ-

¹⁰ Cf. Huber, *Personennamen*, p. 58, note 2.

ology thus confirms the critical results reached by Kuenen, Wellhausen, Cornill, Budde, Bacon, Briggs, Wildeboer, Ball, Carpenter, and Harford-Battersby.

In a discussion as to whether archæology has helped to establish the historical character of Abraham, a word ought to be devoted to the Hittites. The twenty-third chapter of Genesis, commonly ascribed by critics to P (cir. 450 B.C.), represents Abraham as buying the cave of Machpelah from Ephron, the Hittite. The chapter says that Ephron "dwelt in the midst of the children of Heth" (v. 10), implying that there was a Hittite colony of some size in Hebron, if the whole city was not in their possession.¹¹ Does archæological discovery confirm this impression?

For an answer we must pass in review the following facts. The discovery of cuneiform tablets at Boghaz-koï in Asia Minor has revealed that that was the center of Hittite power—the home-land of the Hittites.¹² The earliest mention of them which we have in history shows that their activity extended toward the Mesopotamian valley, for they helped to overthrow the first dynasty of Babylon¹³ some eighteen centuries or more before our era. They had apparently not yet gained possession of northern Syria, for when Thothmes III extended his campaigns through that country to the Euphrates, beginning about 1478 B.C., they did not impede his progress. After the triumphant progress of Thothmes to the Euphrates, in the year 1470 B.C., the great Hittite chief sent him presents, apparently from his native seat in Asia Minor.¹⁴ In the years that followed they took possession of a part of northern Syria, for in the El-Amarna letters, written during the reign of Amenophis IV (1375–1358), they are frequently mentioned in letters from Phœnicia and the Amorite country between the Lebanon

¹¹ The latter is the natural inference; see Sulzberger, *Am Ha-Arets*, pp. 20 ff.

¹² See *Mitteilungen der deutschen Orient-Gesellschaft*, No. 35.

¹³ Cf. King, *Chronicles concerning Early Babylonian Kings*, vol. I. pp. 72 ff. and 148 ff., vol. II. p. 22.

¹⁴ Cf. Breasted, *History of Egypt*, 2d ed., p. 304, and *Ancient Records*, vol. II. § 485.

and anti-Lebanon ranges.¹⁵ No mention of them occurs to show that they had pushed to the southern part of Palestine or were in the neighborhood of Hebron.¹⁶ In the time of the nineteenth dynasty Seti I (1818-1292) found his way into the valley between the Lebanon ranges blocked by them;¹⁷ and the great battle of Rameses II (1292-1225) with them at Kadesh, in which the Egyptian king narrowly escaped,¹⁷ is evidence of their presence in the north. Rameses afterward made a treaty with them in which each agreed to respect the territory of the other;¹⁸ and as Egyptian territory extended then to the Lebanon mountains, it is clear that the Hittites were not in southern Palestine. With the reign of Rameses III (1198-1167) the Philistines and other sea-peoples began to attack the coasts of Asia Minor, Palestine, and Egypt,¹⁹ so that by the time of Rameses XII (1118-1090), when Wenamon went to Phœnicia for cedar, on an expedition, the entertaining report of which survives,²⁰ Dor was in the possession of a tribe kindred to the Philistines, and it is probable that the same was true of the whole coast of Palestine.

In the mêlée which brought this about the Hittites did apparently push into Galilee as far as the plain of Esdraëlon, where their king, Sisera, was overcome by Deborah and Barak (Ju. 5). Professor George F. Moore pointed this out some years ago,²¹ and although the discovery of cuneiform Hittite documents shows that his analogies of Hittite names on Egyptian monuments ending in *sira* were fallacious, the Egyptian *r* representing an original *l*, enough of his evidence is valid to prove the point. The coming of the

¹⁵ The reader can easily verify this statement by looking up the references to the Hittites in the geographical index to vol. v. of Schrader's *Keitinschriftliche Bibliothek*, and noting the localities from which the letters come.

¹⁶ Breasted, *History*, p. 412.

¹⁷ See Breasted's discussion of the battle in the *Decennial Publications of the University of Chicago*, vol. v., also his *Ancient Records*, vol. iii. pp. 126-158, and *History*, pp. 427-439.

¹⁸ Breasted, *Records*, iii. pp. 168-174, and *History*, pp. 487-489.

¹⁹ Breasted, *Records*, iv. pp. 38-49, and *History*, pp. 480, 481.

²⁰ Breasted, *Records*, iv. pp. 274-287.

²¹ *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, vol. xix. p. 160.

Hebrews and the sea-peoples apparently crippled the power of the Hittites, and although at places like Hamath and Carchemish their power lingered on, it is improbable that after this they ever conquered Hebron. While, therefore, archæology has much to tell us of the Hittites, it has nothing to tell which brings them into connection with Hebron.

There remains, however, one possibility: the Hyksos kings who invaded Egypt about 1700 B.C. and held that country for a hundred years *may* have been Hittites. The Hyksos formed an extensive empire which covered Palestine, reached, possibly, to Mesopotamia, and may have included Crete.²³ They almost certainly ruled Hebron. Their invasion of Egypt occurred but a century or two later than the Hittite invasion of Babylonia, and contemporaneously with the settling of the Mittani, who are thought to be kindred to the Hittites, on the Euphrates. Possibly the Hyksos were Hittites also. Meyer²³ recognizes this possibility, though he declares it cannot be stated as a historical fact. There are, however, serious objections to an identification of the Hyksos with Hittites. The Egyptian traditions as preserved by Manetho and Josephus refer to the Hyksos as Arabians and Phœnicians.²⁴ A Semitic invasion of Egypt seems much more probable than an invasion by Hittites. The Egyptians under the empire became well acquainted with the Hittites and, as we have seen, mention them frequently. Had they been conscious that the Hyksos belonged to that race, it seems probable that they would have indicated it. The possibility that the Hyksos were Hittite impresses one therefore as improbable.

It must, however, be remembered that Manetho, although he had access to ancient records, lived at a later date than the author of the P document did, and some day, when the Hittite inscriptions are deciphered, archæology *may* prove that Gen. 23 has preserved a correct historical tradition,

²³ See Breasted, *History of Egypt*, pp. 217 ff., and Meyer, *Geschichte des Altertums*, 2d ed., pp. 295 ff.

²³ *Geschichte*, 2d ed., p. 578.

²⁴ See Breasted, *History*, p. 219.

which the Egyptians themselves had lost. It has not done this yet, but we should, in the present state of our knowledge, be prepared for this possibility.

In one respect the recent progress of archæology affords some consolation to the Biblical apologist. If we are right in identifying the Amraphel of Gen. 14 with Hammurabi, the author of that chapter made Abram a contemporary of this Babylonian king. On the basis of the Babylonian dynastic tablets scholars had confidently dated Hammurabi in the twenty-third century B.C. It seemed, therefore, that the author of Gen. 14 placed Abram there. In Gen. 15 13 the E document (cf. Carpenter and Harford-Battersby's *Hexateuch, ad loc.*) said that Abraham's descendants should be afflicted four hundred years. Whether the four hundred years was to be counted from the time of Abraham or from the beginning of the period of affliction was, however, left in doubt. In Ex. 12 40 P^a took it in the latter sense, making the Egyptian sojourn just four hundred and thirty years to a day. St. Paul (Gal. 3 17) took it in the former sense, making the time between the giving of the promise to Abraham and the giving of the law four hundred and thirty years. Most modern chronologists, from Archbishop Ussher to Professor Beecher (*Dated Events of the Old Testament*), have followed St. Paul. On the old view, that the Exodus occurred in 1491, this carried us back only to the twentieth century for Abraham, and when the Exodus was brought down to 1820, Abraham was brought down to the eighteenth century; when the Exodus was put a century later, still Abraham followed. Archæology thus seemed to divide the Bible against itself. Hommel felt this, and in his *Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, ch. iv., he ceased to follow the Pauline interpretation. He thus was able to gain a hundred and thirty years for Abraham. As this did not carry him back to the time of Hammurabi by about three centuries, Hommel proposed to regard the second dynasty of Babylon, which at that time was known to us only through a chronological tablet, as apocryphal. The progress of science has relieved the situation in a less violent way. King and Poebel simultaneously discov-

ered that the first and second dynasties of Babylon overlapped by one hundred and twenty-five years or more (see King, *op. cit.*, i. pp. 70 ff. and ii. pp. 19-21; Poebel in *Zeitsch. f. Assyriologie*, xx. pp. 229 ff.). This fact reveals the possibility that other dynasties which we have been adding end to end may have overlapped; and it is possible, therefore, so far as archæology is concerned, that the author of the fourteenth chapter of Genesis may have had a chronology in mind not so far removed from that of E and P as we had supposed.

This chronology, if we date the Exodus about 1220, in accordance with present-day opinions, would not place Abraham earlier than the seventeenth or eighteenth century B.C. The traditions of E and P would therefore make the Abrahamic migration accord with that great movement of peoples which began when the Kassites pushed into southern Babylonia, the Mittanni into the upper Euphrates valley, and pushed westward a wave of people across Syria, driving the Hyksos into Egypt. It was probably this migration which brought the Canaanites into Palestine; for while we know from many cuneiform sources that the Amorites were in this region several centuries earlier, we have no mention of the Canaanites before this time. By the El-Amarna period, however, they had given their name to a section of the country (see *KB*, v. Nos. 11, 14, 50, 101, 151, 154, and 294). We may from the Biblical point of view, therefore, call this migration Canaanite (see Paton, *Early History of Palestine and Syria*, ch. v.).

The portion of this migration which entered Egypt established a reigning house there which probably covers dynasties XV and XVI of Manetho's chronological scheme. These rulers were powerful, though barbarous, and, as already noted, there is reason to believe that their empire extended far into Asia. This is the age to which all the Biblical references except Gen. 14 point as the age of Abraham. Gen. 14, we must still believe, placed Abram earlier, for the age of Hammurabi must have considerably preceded the Kassite migration. Archæology still is positively a stumbling block to the harmonizing of these chronological data.

If we follow the documents which point to the Hyksos period as the age of Abraham, interesting information as to the type of civilization of this time has recently been found in the great tunnel discovered by Mr. Macalister at Gezer (see *Quarterly Statement*, January, April, and July, 1908). This tunnel was 219 feet long, 12 feet 10 inches wide, and 23 feet high at the entrance, growing gradually smaller further on. It was entered by a staircase, which, like the tunnel itself, was cut out of the solid rock. It led to a spring of water, and was undoubtedly designed to enable the city to withstand a siege. From the nature of the débris with which its mouth was filled, it appears to have fallen into disuse about 1200 B.C. Judging from the wear of feet on the rock-cut stairs, it must have been constructed about 500 years before that. This brings us back to this Hyksos period—a time at which no known occupants of Palestine existed, unless the monarchs who ruled Egypt, who were powerful enough to accomplish such a work. It is true that in the nineteenth century B.C. Sesostris (Usertsen) III, of the XIIth Egyptian dynasty, had invaded Palestine (see Breasted, *Ancient Records*, i. § 680). Had this monarch accomplished such a work, however, he would certainly have celebrated it in an inscription, as he did the cutting of the canal at the first cataract and the conquest of Nubia. Probably, then, the tunnel is Hyksos work. While this tunnel affords us a new basis for an estimate of the civilization of the Abrahamic age, it affords us no evidence for the historical character of the patriarch.

On the other hand, any fair estimate of the bearing of archæology upon the Abrahamic problem must take into account the facts brought to light by archæology which favor the theories of those who believe that Abraham was a moon-god. The name Abram, of which Abraham is but a variant form,²⁶ means, if it is of West-Semitic origin, "Exalted father."²⁵ Biblical traditions connect Abraham with

²⁵ See Briggs, Brown, and Driver's *Lexicon*, p. 4. If the name was imported into Palestine from Babylonia, this explanation will not hold. In the Babylonian form of the name "Father" is an accusative and the name seems to mean "He (i.e. some god) loves the father."

Harran and Ur, seats of the worship of the moon-god, Sin. In Babylonian mythology Sin was the father of Shamash, the sun-god, and of Ishtar. In Babylonian hymns one of the most frequent epithets of Sin is "Father,"²⁶ which in Semitic is "Ab." "The exalted Father," if Abraham's name, fits, it must be confessed, the moon-god theory. Sarah, or Sarai, the name of Abraham's wife, is the Hebrew equivalent of *šarratu*, "Queen," an epithet of the consort of the moon-god at Harran, and Milcah, Abraham's sister-in-law (Gen. 11 29), is the Hebrew equivalent of *Malkatu*, the name of the consort of the sun-god, and perhaps of the moon-god also.²⁷ These facts do not prove Abraham a moon-god; absolute proof that a character is mythical is even more difficult than to prove it historical. We cannot, however, wonder that, in the absence of proof from contemporary sources that Abraham was a person, such facts had great weight. The discovery from an extra-Biblical source that Abraham was in Babylonia the name of a person, even though that person cannot be identified with the Patriarch, breaks in a slight degree, though it by no means nullifies, the weight of these considerations.

The intense interest in the narratives of Abraham, which has led some earnest souls to inaugurate the so-called warfare between archæology and criticism,²⁸ springs, of course, from the part that the conception of Abraham has played in the development of the Jewish and Christian faiths. Abraham as an ideal is, however, a solid part of the history of the world's best religion, and the permanent value of the ideal is inde-

²⁶ See E. G. Perry's *Hymnen und Gebete an Sin in Leipziger semitische Studien*, II. 4 (1907), pp. 17, 20, 24, 35; Langdon, *Sumerian and Babylonian Psalms*, 1909, p. 297, and Vanderburgh, *Sumerian Hymns*, 1908, pp. 11, 42, 48.

²⁷ See *KAT*², pp. 364 ff., and *Zeitschr. f. Assyriologie*, xi. pp. 296-299.

²⁸ One of the curious psychological phases of this artificial warfare is manifested in an article by Wiener on "Pentateuchal Criticism" in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* for January, 1909. This writer argues in substance that the critical analysis rests on an insecure basis, because our sources of knowledge for the text are so late and imperfect that no certain inferences can be drawn from its statements. This argument is apparently published as a defense of faith!

pendent of the results of criticism of the patriarchal narratives or the investigations of archæologists. The ideal was real, whether woven about a mythical, a half legendary, or an historical character. It represented for centuries Israel's conception of her own call and mission. It was not, however, a constant quantity, and the fact that it varied is true, whether Abraham were real or not. To J¹ Abraham was the ideal devout nomad, who was obedient to Yahweh's call (Gen. 12 1 π), who believed in Yahweh and it was accounted to him righteousness (Gen. 15 6); the type of a hospitable host, whom Yahweh deigns to visit (Gen. 18 1 π). To J² Abraham was the intercessor for the innocent, who would shield the Judge of the earth from the suspicion of having done wrong (Gen. 18 25). To E Abraham was an ideal prophet of God, whom God protected, whose intercession he heard (Gen. 20), and whose faith did not waver in the face of the hardest sacrifice (Gen. 22). To P Abraham was the great ancestor of the nation, with whom God confirmed a covenant by the sacred and perpetual rite of circumcision (Gen. 17). Later Jews seem to have regarded Abraham as a man so holy that all his physical descendants were necessarily saints or children of God (cf. Dan. 7 25, John 8 33. 39). Paul regarded Abraham as an ideal exponent of faith, to whom souls of similar faith were akin (Rom. 4 16); the great Johannine author regarded him as a moral ideal, to whom men of a similar moral stamp were related (John 8 39^b), and the idea very likely goes back to Jesus Himself. To the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews Abraham is the type of the ideal world-pilgrim, or Christian, never satisfied with the transitory, who "sought for a city that hath the foundations" (Heb. 11 10). A Jewish tradition embodied in Yalqut²⁰ represents Abraham as the redeeming father, who will one day go to Gehenna and rescue from hell his unfortunate children who have been cast in thither.

One would, of course, prefer to believe that Abraham was an historical character, but some of the sublimest ideals have been enshrined in story and parable, as well as in historic

²⁰ Quoted by Weber, *Jüdische Theologie*, p. 348.

men, and the ideal is as real and as useful for teaching in one case as in the other.

Abraham, as an ideal which represented the best thought of different periods, drew upward the saints of various ages and was a potent influence for good. This ideal is enshrined in the world's most immortal literature; it has become the fiber of the character of unnumbered saints. Neither the ideal nor the character can be touched by the verdict either of criticism or archæology. To Christians Abraham as the embodiment of the highest ideal ceased to be vital after the first century of our era. The separation from Judaism and the influx of Gentile Christians brought other personages to the fore. Christ became the One Leader; His divine character and work overshadowed all others.

In the face of these facts, one cannot but regard the excitement about Abraham and criticism and Abraham and archæology as unnecessary and ill advised. Whatever the truth may be, it will eventually prevail. No real scholar desires to substantiate a position simply because it is old, or to embrace an opinion simply because it is new and revolutionary. He desires the truth and the whole truth, and he welcomes any science which can help him to it. Such men refuse to convict criticism at the bar of archæology or archæology at the bar of criticism, but realize that both sciences are handmaids in the service of the truth.