

[p.35]

2. EARLY HEBREW CHRONOLOGY

I. BEFORE ABRAHAM

For the period before Abraham, the Old Testament data are very limited and concise.¹ From the chronological point of view, they raise questions which cannot be fully answered from our present knowledge. But comparative Ancient Near Eastern data can perhaps throw a little light on the Old Testament material.

(a) *The Old Testament Data*

The genealogies of Genesis 5 and 11 are the principal sources. These serve as formal connecting links between earliest Man and the Flood (the first great crisis), and between the Flood and Abraham as ancestor of the Hebrews and of the line of promise. Such genealogies were not intended to serve just a narrowly chronological purpose in the modern sense; like those in Matthew I or Luke 3, their main purpose was theological, but this does not necessarily mean that they are without any factual basis at all. One may compare the primarily religious purpose of some Egyptian King Lists. The Table of Kings at Abydos was related to the cult of the royal ancestors,² but this does not affect the chronological order or historicity of the kings that it lists; and certain groups of kings are omitted deliber-

[p.36]

ately but without stating the fact.³ The royal offering-lists of the Hittite monarchy are also cultic documents, but their historical and chronological value is beyond all real doubt.⁴ The Sumerian King List expresses a certain concept of kingship in early Mesopotamia, but contains data of great value.⁵

(b) *Problems and External Evidence*

I. *Degree of Continuity*. From earliest Man (Adam) to Abraham, the time covered by the genealogies (if taken to be continuous throughout) is far too short when compared with external data. Thus, if the birth of Abraham were to be set at about 2000 BC,⁶ then on the Hebrew figures⁷

¹ On possible historical relationships of Genesis 1-11 with early antiquity, cf. T. C. Mitchell, *F/T* 91 (1959), pp. 28-49, and Kitchen, *ibid.*, pp. 195-197. On historical status of Genesis 1-11, theologically viewed, cf. K. Cramer, *Genesis 1-11: Urgeschichte? Zur Problem der Geschichte im Alten Testament*, 1959; also J. B. Bauer, *Die biblische Urgeschichte, Vorgeschichte des Heils, Genesis 1-11²*, 1964. On genealogies, cf. Mitchell and Bruce, *NBD*, pp. 456-459 and references.

² On which, see H. W. Fairman in S. H. Hooke (ed.), *Myth, Ritual and Kingship*, 1958, pp. 77, 98-104.

³ On the lists, cf. Sir A. H. Gardiner, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, 1961, pp. 429-453, and W. Helck, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho and den Ägyptischen Königlisten*, 1956.

⁴ See H. Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951), pp. 47-71; A. Goetze, *JCS* 11 (1957), pp. 53-55, 58; Kitchen, *Suppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs*, 1962, pp. 1, 52-55 (Excursus II).

⁵ Cf. T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 1939 (repr. 1964), esp. pp. 138-140, 165 ff.

⁶ It would hardly be much earlier on any calculation, cf. Section II, pp. 41-56, below.

the Flood would occur some ego years earlier, about 2300 BC. This date is excluded by the Mesopotamian evidence, because it would fall some 300 or 400 years *after* the period of Gilgamesh of Uruk⁸ for whom (in both Epic and Sumerian King List) the Flood was already an event of the distant past.⁹ Likewise, the appearing of earliest Man (Adam) some 1,947 years or so before Abraham on the Hebrew figures, in about 4.000 BC, would seem to clash rather

[p.37]

badly with not just centuries but whole millennia of preliterate civilization throughout the Ancient Near East¹⁰ prior to the occurrence of the first written documents just before the First Dynasty in Egypt, *c.* 3000 BC, and rather earlier in Mesopotamia.¹¹ One may well question therefore whether these genealogies are really to be understood as being continuous throughout. There are several indications which may suggest that this is not the case.

First, there is the symmetry of ten generations before the Flood and ten generations after the Flood. With this, one may compare the three series of fourteen generations in Matthew's genealogy of Christ (Mt. 1:1-17, esp. 17), which is *known* to be selective, and not wholly continuous, from the evidence of the Old Testament. Thus Matthew 1:8 says Joram begat Uzziah', but from the Old Testament (2 Ki. 8:25; 11: 2; 14:1, 21) it is clear that in fact Joram fathered Ahaziah, father of Joash, father

[p.38]

⁷ Some variant figures in the LXX and Samaritan versions do not affect the main point at issue here; *cf.* *WBD*, p. 103.

⁸ So also M. E. L. Mallowan, *Iraq* 26 (1964), pp. 67-68, with whose paper, *cf.* R. L. Raikes, *Iraq* 28 (1966), pp. 52-63. Rowton, *CAH*², I:6 (*Chronology*), 1962, pp. 64-67, *cf.* 54-56, offers a date of roughly 2700 BC for Gilgamesh; Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 1963, pp. 49-50, suggests about 2600 BC; somewhere in the twenty-seventh century BC seems safe enough.

⁹ Gilgamesh Epic, Tablet XI; translations by A. Heidel, *The Gilgamesh Epic and Old Testament Parallels*², 1949 (paperback, 1963), and E. A. Speiser in *ANET*², 1955, pp. 72-99, 514-515=*ANE*, pp. 40-75. Studies on Gilgamesh and his Epic with rich bibliography are to be found in P. Garelli (ed.), *Gilgameš et sa Légende*, 1960.

¹⁰ Examples: For Palestine, we have Jericho as a walled town with towers by *c.* 7000 BC (K. M. Kenyon, *PEQ* 92 (1960), pp. 97-98; Kenyon, *Archaeology in the Holy Land*², 1965 (also paperback), p. 44) For Syria, *cf.* traces of a similar fortified settlement in level V at Ugarit (C. F. A. Schaeffer *et al.*, *Ugaritica IV*, 1962, pp. 153-160, 317-322 (esp. 319-321)). For Mesopotamia, *cf.* Jarmo with settlements from roughly 9000 to 4500 BC (G. E. Wright in *BANE*, pp. 76, 77 and n. 13). For Asia Minor, note the remarkable settlements at Qatal Hüyük (shrines with paintings and plasterwork, *c.* 6200-5800 BC), Can Hasan and Hacilar. For Çatal Hüyük and Hacilar, see J. Mellaart's reports in *Anatolian Studies* 12-14 (1962-4) and 8-11 (1958-61) respectively; for Can Hasan, *cf.* D. H. French, *ibid.*, 12-15 (1962-5); in general, see Mellaart, *CAH*², I:7 (§§ xi-xiv), *Anatolia Before c. 4000 BC*, 1964. The amazingly early evidence for metalworking *c.* 6500-5800 BC at Çatal Hüyük (levels IX-VI, *cf.* Mellaart, *Anatolian Studies* 14 (1964), pp. 111, 114) reminds one of Tubal-cain in Gn. 4:22 (but *cf.* Mitchell, *F/T* 91 (1959), p. 42).

The above dates are based on Carbon-14, but find some measure of support in the long stratigraphic sequences in these sites and regions. For Near Eastern C-14 dates, see: Wright, *BANE*, 76-77; E. L. Kohler and E. K. Ralph, *American Journal of Archaeology* 65 (1961), pp. 357-367; H. S. Smith, *Antiquity* 38 (1964), pp. 32-37 (Egypt); J. G. D. Clark, *Antiquity* 39 (1965), pp. 45-48; R. W. Ehrich (ed.), *Chronologies in Old World Archaeology*, 1965.

¹¹ *Cf.* S. Schott, *Hieroglyphen*, Abh. Akad. Mainz, 1950, and in *HdO*, I: I (1), *Ägyptologie*, 1959, pp. 18-36, for Egypt. For Mesopotamia, *cf.* references in C. J. Gadd, *CAH*², I:13 (*Cities of Babylonia*), 1962, pp. 3-6, and Rowton in *CAH*², I: 6 (*Chronology*), 1962, pp. 56-57.

of Amaziah, father of Uzziah; *i.e.*, we must understand ‘Joram begat (the line culminating in) Uzziah’ as far as chronology is concerned. A much earlier parallel is provided by the eight, nine or ten rulers¹² who reigned from the beginning of kingship until the Flood according to an old Mesopotamian tradition prefixed to the Sumerian King List about 1800 BC.¹³ And after the Flood at least, the Sumerian King List itself is known to have sometimes omitted both individual kings and whole dynasties.¹⁴

Secondly, the terminology of the genealogies does not prove that they are continuous throughout. Sometimes the adjoining narrative would suggest that certain parts of the genealogies are continuous (so: Adam to Enosh; Lamech to Shem; Nahor(?) to Terah; Terah to Abraham). Everywhere else, a continuous sequence cannot be automatically assumed without proof. Such a mixture of continuous and selective genealogy is in no way abnormal. Besides the obvious example of Matthew 1:1-17, the Abydos King List in Egypt silently omits three entire groups of kings (Ninth to early Eleventh, Thirteenth to Seventeenth Dynasties and the Amarna pharaohs) at three separate points in an otherwise continuous series; other sources enable us to know this. Or compare Jacobsen,¹⁵ who derived from other sources the procedure of arrangement probably followed by the ancient author of the Sumerian King List and not obvious from its structure, as well as from certain King List statements.

The phrase ‘A begat B’ does not always imply direct parenthood. This is shown by its use in Matthew I in cases where

[p.39]

links are known (from the Old Testament) to have been omitted (*cf.* pp. 37-38, above). Likewise, in Genesis 46:18, the children that ‘Zilpah bare to Jacob’ are known to include great-grandsons. Terms like ‘son’ and ‘father’ can mean not only ‘(grand)son’ and ‘(grand)father’ but also ‘descendant’ and ‘ancestor’ respectively. The noted charioteer Jehu ‘son’ of Nimshi (1 Ki. 19:15; 2 Ki. 9:20) was strictly son of a Jehoshaphat, and so *grandson* of Nimshi (2 Ki. 9:2). Likewise in Amarna Letter No. 9, Burnaburiash III, King of Babylon, calls Kurigalzu I his ‘father’; but ‘(grand) father’ is to be understood, because he is more precisely entitled ‘eldest son’ of an intervening king.¹⁶ Ramesses II is called ‘father’ of Sethos II in Pap. Gurob 2:7, although he could not be closer than grandfather;¹⁷ *cf.* the address to Belshazzar in Daniel 5:11 where ‘father’=‘predecessor’ in both cases. An extreme example from Egypt is that of King Tirhakah (Twenty-fifth Dynasty, *c.* 680 BC) who honours¹⁸ ‘*it. f.* ‘his father’, Sesostri III (Twelfth Dynasty, *c.* 1880 BC) - who lived 1,200 years earlier! One thinks also of Christ called ‘Son of David’ (*e.g.*, Mt. 9:27).

¹² *Cf.* W. G. Lambert, *JSS* 5 (1960), p. 115.

¹³ On date and composition of this King List, see T. Jacobsen, *The Sumerian King List*, 1939, pp. 55-68, 128 ff.; F. R. Kraus, *ZA* 50 (1952), pp. 49 ff.; Rowton, *JNES* 19 (1960), pp. 156-162 and in *CAH*², I: 6 (*Chronology*), 1962, pp. 30-31; Gadd, *CAH*², I:13 (*Cities of Babylonia*), 1962, pp. 15-17. Translations of the King List, Jacobsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 71-127; A. L. Oppenheim, *ANET*, pp. 265-266 (partial), and Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 1963, pp. 328-331.

¹⁴ Gadd, *op. cit.*, p. 16; *cf.* Jacobsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 180-183 (dynasties of Lagash, Umma and elsewhere; reasons for this).

¹⁵ *The Sumerian King List*, 1939, p. 160.

¹⁶ Knudtzon, *Die El Amarna Tafeln*, I, No. 9. *Cf.* K. Jaritz, *MIO* 6 (1958), pp. 212 n. 89, 241 No. 81; Kitchen, *Suppiluliuma and the Amarna Pharaohs*, 1962, p. 10 n. 5.

¹⁷ Gardiner, *JNES* 12 (1953), p. 146.

¹⁸ Altar-inscription in a temple of Tirhakah at Semna West; Sir E. A. W. Budge, *The Egyptian Sudan*, I, 1907, p. 483 and figure.

So in Genesis 5 and 11, 'A begat B' may often mean simply that 'A begat (the line culminating in) B';¹⁹ in this case, one cannot use these genealogies to fix the date of the Flood or of earliest Man.

2. *High Numbers and Historicity*. The figures for the life-spans in the genealogies seem much too high, and suggest to the superficial observer that the individuals concerned may be purely legendary.

These high figures may be puzzling but they are not unique,

[p.40]

and probably have no direct bearing on the possible historicity of the characters concerned.

First, the figures in Genesis 5 and 11 cannot in both cases be scaled down to 'natural' proportions by some arbitrary mathematical formula. In Genesis 5, all the figures are large; but in Genesis 11, each individual begets the next generation at a 'reasonable' age (at twenty-nine to thirty-five years of age; only Terah begets late in life at seventy),²⁰ even if his total lifespan is very long.

Secondly, however bizarre they seem in themselves, the Hebrew figures are much more modest and precise than the tens of thousands of years' reign attributed to the antediluvian kings of Mesopotamian tradition, varying from 43,200 years (En-men-lu-anna) to 18,600 years (Ubaratutu).²¹ After the Flood and before Gilgamesh, the longest reign is that of Etana of Kish (1560 or 1,500 years), and the shortest that of Dumuzi of Uruk (100 years).²²

Thirdly, incredibly large figures for lives or reigns (especially after the Flood) have, in fact, no necessary bearing on historicity. Thus, we may reject in its present form the 100 years' reign attributed to Enmebaragisi, king of Kish, as pure myth, but the stubborn fact remains that this king was real enough to leave behind him early Sumerian inscriptions, so he himself must be counted as historical, regardless of how one accounts for the Sumerian King List figure.²³ Scholars are now beginning to recognize as originally historical various early figures who were once considered to be purely mythical heroes because of later legends that became attached to them; these include such famous names as Dumuzi (deified to become later Tammuz) and

[p.41]

¹⁹ Precisely the same approach (Sumerian DUMU, 'son', as 'descendant') is adopted for Gilgamesh and Ur-lugal in the Sumerian King List by Rowton, *CAH*², I:6 (*Chronology*), 1962, p. 55.

²⁰ As probably did the father of the Egyptian vizier Nesimeqashuty, referred to p. 34, above.

²¹ See *ANET*, pp. 265-266, or Jacobsen, *Sumerian King List*, pp. 71/73, 75/77 or Kramer, *The Sumerians*, p. 328.

²² Cf. *ANET*, pp. 265-266, Jacobsen, *op. cit.*, pp. 81, 89, or Kramer, *op. cit.*, pp. 328, 329. Cf. also J. J. Finkelstein, *JCS* 17 (1963), pp. 39-51.

²³ Gadd, *CAH*², I:13 (*Cities of Babylonia*), 1962, p. 17, and Rowton, *CAH*², I:6 (*Chronology*), 1962, pp. 54-55, after D. O. Edzard, *ZA* 53 (1959), pp. 9-26.

Gilgamesh of Uruk.²⁴ Thus, whatever one may make of the large figures in Genesis 5 and 11, the names themselves - on the closest Ancient Oriental analogy - are not necessarily to be considered as unhistorical merely because these figures are attached to them.

(c) *The Literary Structure of Early Genesis (1-9)*

This now finds early parallels. New evidence bearing on the Atrakhasis Epic shows that in Mesopotamia there also existed the literary schema: creation, development and degeneration of man, list of names before the Flood, then the Flood itself.²⁵ As various fragments indicate that the Atrakhasis Epic certainly goes back as far as the Old Babylonian period,²⁶ this literary pattern had its *floruit* at least as early as Abraham, an interesting point in regard to the antiquity of this form of the tradition. This is also true of the Sumerian King List, composed not later than the Third Dynasty of Ur, c. 2000 BC, and embodying the antediluvian tradition in its final form, c. 1800 BC.²⁷

II. THE DATE OF THE PATRIARCHAL AGE²⁸

As Noth has recently pointed out,²⁹ scholars are not all agreed upon the date of the Patriarchal Age. Does Abraham belong

[p.42]

²⁴ Cf. Gadd, *op. cit.*, pp. 19-22; Rowton, *loc. cit.*; and W. G. Lambert in P. Garelli (ed.), *Gilgameš et sa Légende*, 1960, pp. 39-56, esp. 46-52. Note that in the Tummal building-chronicle, Gilgamesh is included on the same level as, and in the midst of, such historically attested kings as Enmebaragisi, Mesannepadda, etc.; translation, cf. Kramer, *The Sumerians*, 1963, pp. 48-49, 47. Kingship in Gn. 6:1-4, cf. Kline, *WTJ* 24 (1962), 187-204.

²⁵ See W. G. Lambert, *JSS* 5 (1960), pp. 113-123, esp. 115-116; for the reconstructed cuneiform text of Atrakhasis, cf. W. G. Lambert and A. R. Millard, *Cuneiform Texts... (British Museum)*, XLVI, 1965. See also references in A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 1964) p. 372, n. 45.

²⁶ Lambert, *JSS* 5 (1960), p. 114 and references.

²⁷ See p. 38, above, and references in note 13.

²⁸ The literature on the Patriarchs grows constantly; only a selection can be cited here. Best over-all survey is (in French) R. de Vaux, *RB* 53 (1946) pp. 321-348; *RB* 55 (1948) pp. 321-347; *RB* 56 (1949), pp. 5-36 (in book-form collected in German as R. de Vaux, *Die hebräischen Patriarchen und die modernen Entdeckungen*, 1961), supplemented by de Vaux in *RB* 72 (1965), pp. 5-28 (as German booklet, *Die Patriarchenerzählungen und die Geschichte*, 1965). Elementary books include C. F. Pfeiffer, *The Patriarchal Age*, 1961 (good outline, but bibliography is too generalized) and J. M. Holt, *The Patriarchs of Israel*, 1964 (readable, but diffuse, too often neglects primary data in favour of secondary sources, and is partly obsolete, e.g. ignores Vergote, *Joseph en Égypte*, 1959). For Abraham, see D. J. Wiseman, *The Word of God for Abraham and Today*, 1959, and A. Parrot, *Abraham et son temps*, 1962. Recent studies of varying value include H. Cazelles, 'Patriarches' in H. Cazelles and A. Feuillet (eds.), *Supplément au Dictionnaire de la Bible*, VII/ Fasc. 36, 1961, cols. 81-156 (valuable survey, good bibliography to 1959); W. F. Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 36-54 (valuable material); and three papers by J. C. L. Gibson, *JSS* 7 (1962), pp. 44-62, S. Yeivin, *RSO* 38 (1963) pp. 277-302, and F. Vattioni, *Augustinianum* 4 (1964), pp. 331-357 all with useful points but unsatisfactory in various details. Very inadequate is O. Eissfeldt, *CAH*², II:26a (*Palestine in the Nineteenth Dynasty: Exodus and Wanderings*), 1965, pp. 5-16; cf. my review-article, *THB* 17 (1966), pp. 63-97, on the nature and possible historicity of the Patriarchs. 29 *VTS*, VII, 1960, pp. 265-271.

²⁹ *VTS*, VII, 1960, pp. 265-271.

to c. 2000-1700 BC (so Albright,³⁰ Glueck,³¹ de Vaux,³² Wright,³³ *etc.*)? Or to the seventeenth century BC (so Rowley³⁴ and Cornelius³⁵)? Or to the fourteenth century BC (so C. H. Gordon³⁶ and Eissfeldt³⁷)? Which date, if any, is correct? Is the evidence really so ambiguous? In point of fact, the divergences are more apparent than real, and a positive approach yields a reasonable solution when all the main data are taken into proper consideration. There are three independent 'main lines' of approach:

[p.43]

First, we must look to see if any major events in the Patriarchal narratives can be linked with external history.

Secondly, we must note evidences of date preserved in details of the narratives (personal names, legal usages, *etc.*) in Near Eastern context.

Thirdly, we must consider possible chronological links between the Patriarchal and later epochs.

(a) Major Events and External History

The main event of this kind is the raid of the four Eastern kings recorded in Genesis 14. Three lines of evidence are available. First, during his archaeological surveys in Transjordan, Glueck found evidence of a sharp decrease in the density of occupation there for the period between the nineteenth and thirteenth centuries BC,³⁸ and he would link this with the destructive campaign mentioned in Genesis 14.³⁹ Harding's discovery of remains of the intervening period near Ammān⁴⁰ does not affect the general picture for the rest of Transjordan. This suggests a date for Abraham before c. 1800 BC.

³⁰ Most recently in *BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 49-52.

³¹ *BA* 18 (1955) pp. 4, 6-9; *BASOR* 152 (1958), p. 20; *Rivers in the Desert*, 1959, pp. 68-76.

³² *RB* 55 (1948) pp. 326-337 (= *Die hebräischen Patriarchen...*, 1961, pp. 33-44) and *RB* 72 (1965), pp. 26-27.

³³ *Biblical Archaeology*, 1957, p. 50 (and 42-43, 44-45); *BA* 22 (1959) p. 99.

³⁴ *Cf. BJRL* 32 (1949), p. 63; *From Joseph to Joshua*, 1950, pp. 113-114, *cf.* p. 164 (Appendix).

³⁵ *ZAW* 72 (1960), pp. 1-7, by setting Gn. 14 in the seventeenth century BC.

³⁶ *Journal of Bible and Religion* 21 (1953), pp. 238-243; *JNES* 13 (1954) pp. 56-59; *JNES* 17 (1958), pp. 28-31 (implicit on parallels); *The World of the Old Testament*, 1960, ch. 8, esp. pp. 115-117; in A. Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies*, 1963, pp.4-5. *Cf.* L. R. Fisher, *JBL* 81 (1962), pp. 264-270.

³⁷ *CAH*², II: 26a (*Palestine in the Nineteenth Dynasty...*), 1965, p. 8.

³⁸ Full reports of the surveys in N. Glueck, *Explorations in Eastern Palestine*, I-IV (= *AASOR*, Vols. 14, 15, 18/19, 25/28), 1934-51.

³⁹ See Glueck, *The Other Side of the Jordan*, 1940, pp. 114-125 (esp. 114, 121, 124-5), and *his Rivers in the Desert*, 1959, pp. 71-74. *Cf.* Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961), p. 50 n. 68 (to eighteenth century BC).

⁴⁰ G. L. Harding, *PEF Annual*, VI, 1953, pp. 14-15; *PEQ* 90 (1958), pp. 10-12; plus Albright, *BASOR* 90 (1943), pp. 17-18 n. 77a (but referring to the main Jordan valley). *Cf.* Albright, *BASOR* 68 (1937), p. 21 n. 21; Glueck, *BASOR* 75 (1939), p. 28; *ibid.*, 142 (1956), p. 35 n. 40; *ibid.*, 159 (1960), p. 3. On Dibon, *cf.* F. V. Winnett, *BASOR* 125 (1952), pp. 18, 20; W. H. Morton, *ibid.*, 140 (1955), p. 6; also G. E. Wright, *BA* 22 (1959), pp. 99, 100, and F. V. Winnett and W. L. Reed, *AASOR* 36/37 (1964), p. 66.

Secondly, the names of the four Eastern kings fit the period *c.* 2000-1700 BC (and some also later periods). Arioch is an Arriyuk or Arriwuk (*cf.* Mari archives, eighteenth century BC)⁴¹ or Ariukki (*cf.* Nuzi archives, fifteenth century BC);⁴²

[p.44]

Tid'al is a Tudkhalia, a Hittite name known from the nineteenth century BC onwards,⁴³ and borne by four or five Hittite kings in the eighteenth to thirteenth centuries BC.⁴⁴ Chedor-la'omer is typically Elamite (Kutir + x)⁴⁵ of the Old Babylonian period (2000-1700 BC) and later. Amraphel is uncertain, but is most unlikely to be Hammurapi.⁴⁶ The individuals themselves have not yet been identified in extra-biblical documents, but this is not surprising when one considers the gaps in our knowledge of the period.⁴⁷

[p.45]

⁴¹ C. F. Jean, *ARMT*, II, Letters 63 and 64 (see *ARMT*, XV, p. 142); J.-R. Kupper, *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des Rois de Mari*, 1957, p. 232 n. 1.

⁴² I. J. Gelb, P. M. Purves, A. A. MacRae, *Nuzi Personal Names*, 1943, p. 30a. Over a millennium later, perhaps *cf.* an Arioch in Dn. 2: 14, 15.

⁴³ Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961), p. 49, n. 66a (no references); see J. Lewy, *ZA* 35 (1924), p. 148 n. 2; F. J. Stephens, *Personal Names from Cuneiform Inscriptions of Cappadocia*, 1928, p. 33; I. J. Gelb, *Inscriptions from Alishar and Vicinity*, 1935, p. 34. Tudkhalia is a name derived from topography (*cf.* E. Laroche, *Les Hiéroglyphes Hittites*, I, 1960, No. 4, and P. Garelli, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*, 1963, p. 160, both with references), and is perhaps (proto-) Hattian rather than strictly Hittite (*cf.* E. Bilgiç, *AfO* 15 (1945-51), p. 16, No. 4); also Laroche, *Les Noms des Hittites*, 1966, pp. 191, 276, 283.

⁴⁴ It may occur at Ugarit as *Tdġl(m)*, *cf.* C. Virolleaud, *Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, II, 1957, p. 65, No. 39: 21; *ibid.*, V, 1965, pp. 18, 20, No. 11: 21; *cf.* Gordon, *UM*, III, 1955, No. 1923a. Dietrich and Loretz, *Welt des Orients* 3:3 (1966), 201, take this as a word denoting an occupation.

⁴⁵ *Cf.* the Elamite royal names Kudur or Kutir-Nahhunte, Kutir-Shilhaha (W. Hinz, *CAH*², II: 7 (*Persia, c. 1800-1550 BC*), 1964, p. 19); Kudur-mabug of Larsa (Schmökel, *HdO*, II: 3, pp. 75, 77, 79; Gadd, *CAH*², I:22 (*Babylonia, c. 2120-1800 BC*), 1965, pp. 46-48). For *-la'omer/Lagamar/l*, *cf.* de Vaux, *RB* 55 (1948), p. 334 n. 2 (= *Die hebr. Patr.*, p. 41, n. 2). For the goddess Lagamal or Lakamar at Mari, *cf.* Kupper, *ARMT*, XIII, 1964, Letter 111: 5; in third millennium and later, *cf.* W. Hinz, *CAH*², I: 23 (*Persia, c. 2400-1800 BC*), 1963, p. 25, and esp. I. J. Gelb, *A Glossary of Old Akkadian*, 1957, p. 118 (seal in Legrain, *Publications of Babyl. Section, Univ. Mus., Univ. of Pennsylvania*, XIV, No. 138); Scheil, *Revue d'Assyriologie* 25 (1928), 46. In general, *cf.* W. Hinz, *Das Reich Elam*, 1964, Index, s.v.

⁴⁶ *Cf.* Albright, *op. cit.*, p. 49 n. 67, and earlier studies (n. 66); K. Jaritz, *ZAW* 70 (1958), pp. 255-256; favouring Hammurapi, F. Cornelius, *ZAW* 72 (1960), p. 2 n. 4. Against the equation, note (i) the initial 'aleph-sound in 'Amraphel as opposed to the underlying initial 'ayin in Hammurapi shown by 'mrpi (= 'Ammurapi) at Ugarit (Virolleaud, *Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, V, 1965, pp. 84, 85, No. 60: 2); *cf.* also Speiser, *Genesis* (Anchor Bible), 1964, pp. 106-107; and (ii) element *-l* in Amraphel and not in Hammurapi. Some would compare Amraphel with names like Amud-pi- (or pa-) ila (reading Heb. *r* as *d*); on latter name, *cf.* H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*, 1965, pp. 128-129.

⁴⁷ On the irrelevance of such negative evidence, *cf.* above, pp. 30 f. and notes 37-38 with the example of the Egyptian Fourteenth Dynasty. For gaps elsewhere, compare the four empty centuries in the known history of Ugarit between the 'dynastic founders' Niqmad I and Yaqarum (eighteenth century BC) and the line of Ammistamru I in the fourteenth century BC. Only two doubtful names, Ibira (J. Nougayrol, *Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, III, 1955, pp. xxxvi-xxxvii, xli) and Puruqu (H. Klengel, *OLZ* 57 (1962), col. 454) could be attributed to this whole period, until the recent discovery of a list of former kings of Ugarit (some fourteen names preserved out of about thirty), *cf.* Virolleaud, *CRAIBL: 1962*, 1963, p. 95; Schaeffer/Weidner, *AfO* 20 (1963), p. 215, and in Schaeffer (ed.), *Ugaritica* V: 1, 1966, alphabetic text No. 5. Even now, nothing is known of most of these kings. Gordon's remarks about 'dark ages' (in Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies*, 1963, p. 5) are wide of the mark. And from Mesopotamia, we know of hardly any names of kings of the Second Dynasty of Ur - a major Sumerian city-state - from either king lists or monuments (*cf.* Gadd, *CAH*², I: 13 (*Cities of Babylonia*), 1962, p. 23).

Thirdly, the system of power-alliances (four kings against five) is typical in Mesopotamian politics within the period *c.* 2000-1750 BC, but not before or after this general period when different political patterns prevailed.⁴⁸ In the eighteenth century BC, for example, a famous Mari letter mentions alliances of ten, fifteen and twenty kings.⁴⁹ At least five other Mesopotamian coalitions are known from the nineteenth/eighteenth centuries BC.⁵⁰ One may also note the role of Elam in the

[p.46]

eighteenth century BC (even exchanging envoys with Qatna in Syria),⁵¹ and perhaps earlier. 'Tid'al, king of nations' resembles the federal great chiefs in Asia Minor of the nineteenth to eighteenth centuries BC (*e.g.*, Anittas). At this period, Assyrian merchant archives in Cappadocia mention almost a dozen different cities each under its own *rubā'um* or ruler.⁵² From time to time, one of these rulers would, by subduing his neighbours, become a paramount chief (*rubā'um rabium*) or Great King; so Anittas of Kussara supplanted the ruler of Burushkhatum as chief ruler.⁵³ Tid'al could well have been just such an overlord, or else a commander of warrior-groups like those known as Umman-manda from at least *c.* 1700 BC onwards.⁵⁴

⁴⁸ The upper limit is the hegemony of the Third Dynasty of Ur; the lower limit, the ephemeral supremacy of Hammurabi of Babylon; *cf.* D. O. Edzard, *Die 'Zweite Zwischenzeit' Babyloniers*, 1957) pp. 1-2, 9-10, 44-49, 180-184. After his day, Mesopotamia was temporarily divided between the 'Sea-land', Babylon, the Kassites, Assyria and a brief Khana-dynasty (*cf.* Gadd, *CAH*², II: 5 (*Hammurabi and the End of his Dynasty*), 1965, pp. 47-54), but these in due time were reduced to Assyria and Kassite rule in Babylonia (*cf.* Schmökel, *HdO*, II:3, pp. 172-174). Likewise, in Asia Minor the Old Hittite state became the main power from the seventeenth century onwards (*cf.* Schmökel, *op. cit.*, pp. 123-124; O. R. Gurney, *The Hittites*, 1961, pp. 22-24; H. Otten, *Saeculum* 15 (1964), 115-124). In Upper Mesopotamia, in the great west bend of the Euphrates, there arose the Mitanni-kingdom from *c.* 1600 BC (*cf.* R. T. O'Callaghan, *Aram Naharaim*, 1948, p. 81, Table; I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, 1944, pp. 70 ff; Schmökel, *op. cit.*, pp. 159-160; A. Goetze, *JCS* 11 (1957), pp. 67, 72).

⁴⁹ G. Dossin, *Syria* 19 (1938), pp. 117-118; S. Smith, *Alalakh and Chronology*, 1940, p. 11.

⁵⁰ First, an alliance of Belakum of Eshnunna with Akkad and three tribal peoples (Edzard, *op. cit.*, pp. 105, 106, 108, 121). Second, Rimatum (of Malgium?) defeated a four-power alliance (*ibid.*, pp. 157, 160). Third, Rim-Sin of Larsa defeated a coalition of five powers (*ibid.*, pp. 108, 155, 157). Fourth, Hammurabi did so in his twenty-ninth year (*ibid.*, p. 181); and fifth, defeated an alliance of four groups in his thirty-first year (*ibid.*, p. 182).

⁵¹ For Elam and Qatna, *cf.* J. R. Kupper, *ARMT*, VI, Letters 19, 22; Hinz, *CAH*², II: 7 (*Persia, c. 1800-1550 BC*), 1964, p. 10. Power of Elam more generally at this time: J. Bottéro and A. Finet, *ARMT*, XV, 1954, p. 124 sub *Elamum*; Kupper, *ARMT*, VI, 1954, Letters 27, 51, 66; Hinz, *op. cit.*, pp. 10-13; Dossin, *Syria* 20 (1939), p. 109: 1-3, and *Orientalia* 19 (1950), p. 509.

⁵² A. Goetze, *Kleinasiens*², 1957, p. 75 and references; P. Garelli, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*, 1963, p. 206 and n. 4, and pp. 205-215 on these rulers.

⁵³ Cappadocian tablets, Goetze, *loc. cit.*; Deeds of Anittas, Otten, *MDOG* 83 (1951), pp. 42, 43; Garelli, *op. cit.*, pp. 63-65.

⁵⁴ Note Zaluti, 'Chief of the Umman-manda', *c.* 1700 BC (before or after Labarnas I of Hatti), Otten, *MDOG* 86 (1953), pp. 61, 63, and Albright, *BASOR* 146 (1957), p. 31 and n. 15. In fifteenth century BC, *Cf.* S. Smith, *Statue of Idrimi*, 1949, p. 58, and Albright, *BASOR* 118 (1950), p. 18 and n. 28; in the Hittite Laws §54, *cf.* F. Sommer, *Hethiter and Hethitisch*, 1947, pp. 5-6, Goetze, *op. cit.*, p. 109, and *ANET*, p. 192, and J. Friedrich, *Die hethitischen Gesetze*, 1959, p. 35. In thirteenth century BC, *cf.* Nougayrol, *Palais Royal d'Ugarit*, IV, 1956, p. 180. Literary reference in Legend of Naram-Sin, *cf.* O. R. Gurney, *Anatolian Studies* 5 (1955), pp. 97, 101; military character of Umman-manda (with dubious 'Indo-germanisch' speculations), F. Cornelius, *Iraq* 25 (1963), pp. 167-170. Later, *cf.* D. J. Wiseman, *Chronicles of Chaldaean Kings*, 1956, pp. 15, 16, 18, 81, and S. Smith, *Isaiah XL-LV*, 1944, pp. 127-128. For the word *goyim*, 'nations', *cf.* E. A. Speiser, *JBL* 79 (1960), pp. 157-163, and *Genesis (Anchor Bible)*, 1964, pp. 107-108; *JAOS* 72 (1952), pp. 100-101 and n. 36.

[p.47]

For early Mesopotamian expeditions into the Westland like that of Genesis 14, one may in some measure compare the texts about Sargon of Akkad and Naram-Sin (c. twenty-fourth to twenty-third centuries BC) invading to Amanus in Syria and possibly further north-west,⁵⁵ mention of relations with Didanum (between Euphrates and Syria?)⁵⁶ during the Third Dynasty of Ur (c. twenty-second to twenty-first centuries BC),⁵⁷ and the expedition of Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria to Lebanon (nineteenth or eighteenth century BC).⁵⁸

The overthrow of the cities of the plain (including particularly Sodom and Gomorrah) by seismic movement and conflagration (Gn. 19)⁵⁹ cannot be independently dated at present; their ruins are apparently under the Dead Sea, and the neighbouring site of Bab-edh-Dhra may have come to an end in the twenty-first century BC before they did.⁶⁰

(b) Indications of Date in the Narratives

I. Power-alliances between Mesopotamian states (Gn. 14) are typical for c. 2000-1750 BC (see above, pp. 45 f.).

[p.48]

2. The personal names of the Patriarchs and their families can be directly compared with identical or similarly formed names in Mesopotamian and Egyptian⁶¹ documents of the twentieth to eighteenth centuries BC and occasionally later. Thus, one may compare Abram with Aba(m)rama in tablets from Dilbat,⁶² Abraham with Aburahana (execration-texts),⁶³ Jacob with

⁵⁵ See Gadd, *CAH*², I: 19 (*Dynasty of Agade and Gutian Invasion*), 1963, pp. 10-16, 27-29. From a still earlier period, note the discovery of archaic Sumerian tablets in a Neolithic site in S. Rumania(!), although probably not brought by Sumerians so far (N. Vlassa, *Dacia*, (NF), 7 (1963), pp. 485-494, esp. 490); my thanks go to Frau I. Fuhr for this reference.

⁵⁶ So I. J. Gelb, *JCS* 15 (1960), p. 30. For Sargon of Akkad and Iahdun-Lim of Mari in the West, cf. Malamat in *Studies in Honor of Benno Landsberger*, 1965 (*Assyriological Studies*, 16), pp. 365-373.

⁵⁷ Gelb, *loc. cit.*; Albright, in *Geschichte and Alles Testament (FS Alt)*, 1953, pp. 11-12. For links between Byblos and the Third Dynasty of Ur, cf. E. Sollberger, *AfO* 19 (1960), pp. 120 ff.

⁵⁸ *ANET*, p. 274b; Kupper, *CAH*², II: I (*N. Mesopotamia and Syria*), 1963, p. 5. On the realism of the expedition in Gn. 14, cf. de Vaux, *RB* 55 (1948) pp. 328, 330-331 (= *Die hebr. Patr.*, 1961, pp. 35, 37-38). The opinion of some Old Testament scholars that Gn. 14 is merely a late midrash (e.g., *ZAW* 74 (1962), p. 116) wholly fails to account for the authentic early detail of power-alliances pointed out above.

⁵⁹ See J. P. Harland, *BA* 5 (1942), pp. 17-32, and esp. *BA* 6 (1943), pp. 41-54. Popular presentation in W. Keller, *The Bible as History*, 1956, pp. 93-97.

⁶⁰ Cf. earlier Albright, *BASOR* 14 (1924), pp. 5-9, *AASOR*, Vol. 6, 1926, pp. 58-62, 66; and now, *BASOR* 163 (1961), p. 51 n. 73 with *BASOR* 95 (1944) p. 9 n. 18.

⁶¹ The so-called Execration Texts. Earlier series in K. Sethe, *Die Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten, Volker and Dinge auf altägyptischen Tongefässscherben des mittleren Reichs*, 1926; cf. Albright, *JPOS* 8 (1928), pp. 223-256 and references. Later series in G. Posener, *Princes et Pays d'Asie et de Nubie*, 1940, cf. Albright, *BASOR* 81 (1941), pp. 16-21, and *BASOR* 83 (1941), pp. 30-36 and references. Cf. also W. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.*, 1962, pp. 49-68, and further references in H. B. Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*, 1965, p. 12 n. 68. New such texts have just been found in Nubia, cf. J. Vercoutter, *CRAIBL*: 1963, 1964, pp. 97-102.

⁶² A. Ungnad, 'Urkunden aus Dilbat', *Beiträge zur Assyriologie*, VI: 5, 1909, p. 82; cf. de Vaux, *RB* 53 (1946), p. 323 (= *Die hebr. Patr.*, p. 3). Disputed by Speiser, *Genesis (Anchor Bible)*, 1964, p. 124: 5, overlooking the possibility that an Akkadian name may have been assimilated to a similar-sounding W. Semitic name in Palestine. De Vaux, *RB* 72 (1965), p. 8, also compares from Ugarit (fourteenth-thirteenth centuries BC) the

Ya‘qub-il (Chagar-Bazar, *etc.*),⁶⁴ Zebulun with Zabilanu (Egyptian⁶⁵ and Old Babylonian⁶⁶ sources), Asher with Ashra, *etc.*⁶⁷ The (Marē-) Yamina of the Mari texts may be

[p.49]

semantically parallel in name with Hebrew Benjamin.⁶⁸ All these parallels fit well into the nineteenth to seventeenth centuries BC.

3. Seasonal occupation⁶⁹ of the Negeb region on the south-west borders of Palestine is archaeologically attested⁷⁰ for the twenty-first to nineteenth centuries BC (Middle Bronze Age I) - but *not* for a thousand years earlier or for eight hundred years afterwards. Abraham and Isaac spent time in this area (Gn. 20:1; 24:62) ; as they were keepers of flocks and herds⁷¹ and occasionally grew crops of grain (Gn. 26:12; 37:7), their activities there would best fit the Middle Bronze Age I period, c. 2100-1800 BC,⁷² considering their need of assured water sup-

[p.50]

name Abiramu (Nougayrol, *Palais Royal d’Ugarit*, III, 1955, p. 20) or *Abrm* (Virolleaud, *ibid.*, V, 1965, pp. 117-118, No. 95: 2, 4), an equation tacitly accepted by Speiser, *loc. cit.*, but rejected by Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1962), p. 50 n. 69, perhaps overlooking the possibility of *i* being a connecting-vowel, not always 1st pers. sing. suffix.

⁶³ Posener, *Princes et Pays...*, E.55; see Albright, *BASOR* 83 (1941), p. 34; *n* alternating with *m*.

⁶⁴ References, Albright, *JAOS* 74 (1954) p. 231: 37, and de Vaux, *RB* 72 (1965) p. 9; S. Yeivin, *JEA* 45 (1959) pp. 16-18; Huffmon, *op. cit.*, 203-204. Cf. A. R. Millard, *Archaeology and the Life of Jacob* (forthcoming).

⁶⁵ Sethe, *Ächtung feindlicher Fürsten* p. 47, and Albright, *JPOS* 8 (1928), p. 239; Posener, *Princes et Pays* p. 73 (E. 16) and Albright, *BASOR* 83 (1941), p. 34.

⁶⁶ A. Goetze, *BASOR* 95 (1944), pp. 23-24; W. L. Moran, *Orientalia* 26 (1957) p. 342.

⁶⁷ Albright, *JAOS* 74 (1954), pp. 229, 231 (for Asher) and 227-228 (for Issachar); comparisons for Gad and Dan (Mari), cf. M. Noth, *Geschichte and Altes Testament (FS Alt)*, 1953, pp. 145-146, and for Dan, cf. Dani-AN, Huffmon, *Amorite Personal Names in the Mari Texts*, 1965, pp. 88, 183. For Levi, cf. Moran, *op. cit.*, pp. 342-343, but note Goetze, *BASOR* 151 (1958), pp. 31-32, and now Huffmon, *op. cit.*, pp. 225-226.

⁶⁸ On the reading of DUMU.MES-Yamina in the Mari texts (formerly read as ‘Binu-Yamina’), see Dossin, *Revue d’Assyriologie* 52 (1958), pp. 60-62, but cf. also Gelb, *JCS* 15 (1961), pp. 37-38, and H. Tadmor, *JNES* 17 (1958), p. 130 n. 12. Contrast Albright, *The Biblical Period*⁴, 1963, p. 101, n. 70.

⁶⁹ For the probably mainly seasonal nature of this occupation, cf. Albright, *BASOR* 142 (1956), p. 31 n. 35, and *BASOR* 163 (1961), p. 50 n. 68.

⁷⁰ Further work by Glueck; see *BA* 18 (1955), pp. 1-9; *BA* 22 (1959), pp. 81-97; *Rivers in the Desert*, 1959; reports in *BASOR* 131 (1953), pp. 6-15; *ibid.*, 137 (1955) pp. 10-22; *ibid.*, 138 (1955) pp. 7-29; *ibid.*, 142 (1956), pp. 17-35; *ibid.*, 145 (1957) pp. 11-25; *ibid.*, 149 (1958), pp. 8-17; *ibid.*, 152 (1958) pp. 18-38; *ibid.*, 159 (1960), pp. 3-14.

⁷¹ It is going far beyond the biblical evidence to turn Abraham into a full-time donkey caravaner or a professional merchant (-prince) as suggested by Albright (*BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 26-54 *passim*) on the one hand and by Gordon *JNES* 17 (1958), pp. 28-31 and Fisher (*JBL* 81 (1962), pp. 264-270) on the other. The verb *šhr* in Hebrew can as easily be ‘to move around’ as ‘to trade’ (cf. Speiser, *BASOR* 164 (1961), pp. 23-28, plus note by Albright); in any case, opportunity to trade (simply, buy and sell) does not necessarily make one a professional merchant. We await with interest Albright’s promised evidence for ‘Apiru = donkeyman, caravaner, but share the misgivings of de Vaux (*RB* 72 (1965), p. 20), in view of the many contexts of H/‘apiru that would not fit this interpretation.

⁷² On the date, see Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 38-40 (in agreement with Glueck, e.g. in *BASOR* 152 (1958), p. 20, or *Rivers in the Desert*, 1959, p. 68). Noth’s date of the twenty-first-twentieth centuries BC (*VT*, VII, p. 266) thus ends a century too early, and hence he exaggerates unwittingly the supposed divergence between this and other data, e.g. *Nuzi*.

plies and pasture or fodder for their livestock (especially as sojourners and not just passing straight through the area).

4. Freedom and wide scope of travel is particularly evident in the Old Babylonian period.⁷³ In the Mari archives, envoys and others cross-cross the whole Near East from Hazor in Palestine to Elam in the far south-east,⁷⁴ while earlier still we have record not only of innumerable merchant caravans but also of detailed 'itineraries' all the way from Babylon or Assur into the heart of Asia Minor.⁷⁵ And as Abraham in Palestine was prepared to send all the way for his son's wife to North Mesopotamian Harran, so similarly we find Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria sending to the King of Qatna in Syria for the same purpose.⁷⁶ Semi-nomadic tribes ranged far and wide⁷⁷, and sometimes took to crop-cultivation and more settled life.⁷⁸

5. The religion of the Patriarchs included prominently the concept of the 'God of the fathers', first stressed by Alt.⁷⁹ However, the best parallels for this come not from his Nabataean examples (about 2,000 years later) but, as Albright and Cross have pointed out,⁸⁰ from the Old Assyrian tablets of the nine-

[p.51]

teenth century BC from Cappadocia as noted by Lewy.⁸¹ There is no evidence that the different designations, 'the God of Abraham', 'the Fear⁸² of Isaac', 'the Mighty One of Jacob', were applied to separate minor deities as Alt suggested; as so often in the Ancient Near East, they are but multiple epithets of a single God.⁸³

6. Patriarchal customs of inheritance find close parallels in the Nuzi archives from Mesopotamia, c. 1500 BC.⁸⁴ These parallels do not necessarily imply a date for the

⁷³ Cf. latterly the remark by A. L. Oppenheim, *Ancient Mesopotamia*, 1964, p. 120, top.

⁷⁴ *ARMT*, I-VI, *passim*; e.g., *ARMT*, VI, Letters 14, 15, 23, 78, *ARMT*, XIII, Letter 46, On Elam and the West, cf. pp. 45 f. and note 51, above, plus *ARMT*, XIII, Letters 31, 32.

⁷⁵ For the itineraries, see A. Goetze, *JCS* 7 (1953), pp. 51-72; M. Falkner, *AfO* 18 (1957-8), pp. 1-37; W. W. Hallo and Goetze, *JCS* 18 (1964), pp. 57-88 114-119; P. Garelli, *Les Assyriens en Cappadoce*, 1963, pp. 81-125. Cf. also E. Weidner, *AfO* 21 (1966), 42-46, for later such data.

⁷⁶ See Albright, *BASOR* 78 (1940), p. 25, being Letter 77 in G. Dossin, *ARMT*, I, 1950. For other inter-dynastic marriages of Shamshi-Adad's social level, cf. J. M. Munn-Rankin, *Iraq* 18 (1956), pp. 94-95.

⁷⁷ Cf. Kupper, *Les Nomades en Mésopotamie au temps des Rois de Mari*, 1957, *passim*, e.g. pp. 47 ff., 71, 74 f., 78-81, 90 f., 96 f.

⁷⁸ E.g., Kupper, *op. cit.*, p. 31; cf. G. Posener in *CAH*², I:21 (*Syria and Palestine*), 1965, pp. 24-29.

⁷⁹ A. Alt, *Der Gott der Väter*, 1929; now in *KS*, I, 1953, pp. 1-78.

⁸⁰ Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 48-49, and F. M. Cross, *HTR* 55 (1962) pp. 225-259. Cf. H. Hirsch, *AfO* 21 (1966), 56-58.

⁸¹ J. Lewy, *Revue de l'Histoire des Religions* 110 (1934), pp. 50-55, 64-65 A similar reference occurs in *ARMT*, V, Letter 20, line 16, in the eighteenth century BC, as noted by J. P. Hyatt, *VT* 5 (1955), p. 131 and n. 4 (note that the eighth-century Hittite Hieroglyphic example from Topada (after Del Medico) is illusory; cf. my *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions*, forthcoming).

⁸² Or possibly 'Kinsman'? So Albright, *From the Stone Age to Christianity*, 1957 ed., p. 248 and n. 71.

⁸³ Interchangeability of names and epithets in the Old-Assyrian data was long ago demonstrated by Lewy, *op. cit.*; cf. also Cross, *op. cit.*, pp. 228 ff. Alt's plurality of deities is also rejected by Parrot, *Abraham et son temps*, 1962, p. 101, n. 7 end. Last full survey of El Shaddai is by M. Weippert, *ZDMG* 111 (1961), pp. 42-62. On patriarchal religion, cf. also M. Segal, *Jewish Quarterly Review* 53 (1962-3), pp. 226-256. An Egyptian example of multiple names, p. 121, below.

⁸⁴ See references, p. 154, note 2, below.

Patriarchs as late as 1500 BC,⁸⁵ because Old Babylonian tablets from Ur (nineteenth to eighteenth centuries BC) would afford equally good parallels,⁸⁶ a point unknown to most Old Testament scholars. Also the parallel with the Hittite laws⁸⁷ in Genesis 23 may likewise go back long before the date of the extant copies of these laws (fourteenth to thirteenth centuries BC).⁸⁸

[p.52]

There is no positive reason why there should not be some Hittites in Palestine in the nineteenth to eighteenth centuries BC. They intervened politically in Syria in the eighteenth to seventeenth centuries BC.⁸⁹ As early as c. 1800 BC, a Lycian from West Asia Minor - 'Kukun's son Lugg(a)' (= 'the Lycian') - is attested at Byblos in Phoenicia;⁹⁰ limited Anatolian penetration of Phoenicia and Palestine can be found quite early.⁹¹

The parallels in social themes between the Patriarchal narratives and the Ugaritic epics on tablets of the fourteenth to thirteenth centuries BC do not prove a late date either,⁹² for it is known on clear linguistic evidence that those epics originated in the twentieth to sixteenth centuries BC.⁹³

Finally, the price of twenty shekels of silver paid for Joseph in Genesis 37:28 is the correct average price for a slave in about the

[p.53]

⁸⁵ As is assumed by Gordon, *JNES* 13 (1954), pp. 56-57; cf. discussion by Noth, *VTS*, VII, pp. 266-267, 270.

⁸⁶ Cf. briefly D. J. Wiseman, *JTVI* 88 (1956), p. 124, with reference to H. H. Figulla and W. J. Martin, *Ur Excavations Texts*, V, 1953.

⁸⁷ See below, pp. 154-156, and note 7.

⁸⁸ Cf. J. Friedrich and H. Zimmern, *Hethitische Gesetze*, 1922 (= *Der Alte Orient* 23:2), p. 4; and for older fragments, H. G. Güterbock, *JCS* 15 (1961), pp. 64-65 (Old Hittite ductus). Early date, cf. Goetze in Walser, *op. cit.* (p. 21, n. 14, above), p. 27 and n. 23; Gurney, *CAH²*, II: 15a (*Anatolia, c. 1600-1380 BC*), 1966, p. 12, and H. Otten and V. Soucek, *AfO* 21 (1966), 1-12 *passim*; O. Carruba, *Kratylos* 7 (1962), p. 159.

⁸⁹ Note Albright, *BASOR* 14.6 (1957), pp. 30-31 (Zukrasi, etc.) and H. Otten, *MDOG* 86 (1953), pp. 61, 63; cf. Kupper, *CAH²*, II:I (*N. Mesopotamia and Syria*), 1963, pp. 32-35; Wiseman, *NBD*, p. 66b. For non-documentary data, cf. note 91 below.

⁹⁰ See Albright, *BASOR* 155 (1959), pp. 33-34 along with *BASOR* 176 (1964), p. 42 n. 17 (on order of names); on date of Luqqa's obelisk, cf. Helck, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien...* 1962, p. 646 to p. 64; S. H. Horn, *AUSS* 1 (1963), pp. 58-59, and Kitchen, 'Byblos, Egypt and Mari in Early 2nd Millennium BC', *Orientalia* 36 (1967), in press. Helck's doubts on the Asianic linguistic affiliation of the names are not justified.

⁹¹ As a parallel for Hittites being plainly in Anatolia and just a few in Palestine (the sons of Heth in Genesis), one may note not only the similar penetration by Horites or Hurrians (cf. I. J. Gelb, *Hurrians and Subarians*, 1944, pp. 52-62, 69-70; Wiseman, *Alalakh Tablets*, 1953, p. 9, for Syria), but also the earlier examples of northern newcomers to Syria-Palestine (not all Amorites) with distinctive metalwork (cf. K. M. Kenyon, in *CAH²*, I: 21 (*Syria and Palestine, c. 2160-1780 BC*), 1965, pp. 52-53 and refs.), and of penetration of Syria-Palestine by the bearers of Khirbet Kerak pottery and material culture in the twenty-fourth century BC (cf. C. A. Burney, *Anatolian Studies* 8 (1958), pp. 173-174, and references p. 165 n. 21, plus K. Bittel, *Prähistorische Zeitschrift* 34/35: 2 (1953) pp. 142-143. For early Hittites and Horites, see my *Hittite Hieroglyphs, Aramaeans and Hebrew Traditions* (forthcoming), chapter II: I.

⁹² So, contra Gordon, *JNES* 13 (1954) pp. 56-57.

⁹³ Cf. Albright, in Rowley (ed.), *Old Testament and Modern Study*, 1951, pp. 31-32, *BASOR* 150 (1958), pp. 36, 38, and especially M. Held, *JAOS* 79 (1959) pp. 171 n. 49 (phases of Ugaritic), 174-175 and nn. 93-107 (linguistic differences).

eighteenth century BC:⁹⁴ earlier than this, slaves were cheaper (average, ten to fifteen shekels), and later they became steadily dearer.⁹⁵ This is one more little detail true to its period in cultural history.

(c) Links with Later Periods

Genesis 15, Exodus 12:40 and certain genealogies link the Patriarchs to the period of the Exodus.

First, Abraham was warned that his descendants should dwell in an alien land for 400 years (Gn. 15:13). (There is no reason why the figure '400 years' should not refer to the whole of verse 13: *i.e.*, to the sojourn as a whole, *culminating* in enslavement and oppression, rather than be forced unnecessarily to mean that the Hebrews were to be slaves for four centuries against the evidence of Genesis 41 to 50.) In due course, it is recorded that the Israelites left Egypt on the 430th anniversary of their ancestor's entry into Egypt.⁹⁶ The 400 years is a round figure in prospect, while the 430 years is more precise in retrospect;⁹⁷ there is no contradiction in this.

[p.54]

Secondly, Abraham is told that his descendants will re-enter Canaan in 'the fourth generation' (Gn. 15:16, Hebrew *dôr*). The simplest explanation is that the four *dôr* correspond to the 400 years, not to 'generations' in the modern sense. This is suggested not by a mere wish for harmonization but by perfectly clear evidence from Ugaritic⁹⁸ and early Assyrian sources that *dôr* or *dāru* can mean a 'span' or 'cycle of time' of eighty years or more.⁹⁹

⁹⁴ So in the 'Laws' of Hammurapi, §§116, 214, 252 (1/3 mina = 20 shekels), *ANET*, pp. 170, 175, 176; and in Mari legal documents, *cf.* G. Boyer, *ARMT*, VIII, 1958, p. 23, No. 10, lines 1-4.

⁹⁵ *E.g.*, in fifteenth century BC and later, 30 or even 40 shekels; in the first millennium BC, the general price rose to 50 shekels and even to go or 120 shekels by Persian times. See I. Mendelsohn, *Slavery in the Ancient Near East*, 1949, pp. 117-155, and in *IEJ* 5 (1955), p. 68; Kitchen in *NBD*, pp. 1195-1196.

⁹⁶ The LXX interpretation of 430 years in Egypt and Canaan, *i.e.* 215 years in each land, is excluded because of (i) Ex. 12: 41 (the 430 years are counted from entering Egypt), and (ii) Abraham and Isaac were not 'children of Israel' but ancestors of Israel, and so their time in Canaan could not be included in the sojourn of Israel and his descendants.

⁹⁷ Paul in Gal. 3:17 is concerned to establish one single point: that the Law came long after God's covenant with Abraham. He therefore makes his point, not by laboriously calculating the actual interval between these events, but simply and incisively by citing the one well-known figure - the 430 years - included within that interval. That Paul made use of the LXX interpretation of the 430 years is a gratuitous and unnecessary assumption, where the wish of the modern commentator is perhaps too often father to the thought.

⁹⁸ See Albright, *BASOR* 163 (1961), pp. 50-51; C. H. Gordon, *UM*, III, 1955, p. 256, No. 506 (= *UT*, p. 386 f., No. 697); F. J. Neuberg, *JNES* 9 (1950), pp. 215-217; *cf.* Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, 1950, pp. 69 (with n. 2), 70.

⁹⁹ Albright, *loc. cit.*, also noting eighty years in Syriac; R. C. Thompson, *LAAA* 19 (1932), pp. 105-106: in the eighteenth century BC, Shamshi-Adad I of Assyria spoke of 7 *dāru* having elapsed between the end of the kingdom of Akkad and his own reign, which would work out at *c.* 70 years in practice (*cf.* *Chicago Assyrian Dictionary*, 3/D, 1959, p. 115b), allowing five centuries to have elapsed (*cf.* Albright, *The Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*⁴, 1963, p. 9, for dates; or *CAH*² dates sixty years earlier). But, like later; Assyrian kings, Shamshi-Adad may have considered the period longer than it really was, and so his *dāru* may be longer. The Hebrew *dôr* certainly was (*cf.* *WBD*, p. 153a, 2).

Thirdly, we have the genealogies. Some scholars¹⁰⁰ dismiss the figure of four centuries between the Patriarchs and the Exodus by appealing to Exodus 6:16-20, a 'genealogy' of Moses and Aaron, which they interpret as four literal generations lasting only a century or more.¹⁰¹ In doing so, they overlook the following facts.

1. Exodus 6:16-20 is not a full genealogy, but only gives the tribe (Levi), clan (Kohath) and family-group (Amram by Jochebed) to which Moses and Aaron belonged, and not their actual parents (also not named in Exodus 2). The Amramites are shown as being already numerous at the Exodus (*cf.* Nu. 3:27, 28), so Amram must be considered as having lived much earlier.¹⁰²

[p.55]

2. The statement that 'Jochebed bore to (Amram) Aaron and Moses' in Exodus 6:20 does not prove immediate descent: in Genesis 46:16-18, the children that Zilpah 'bore' to Jacob include great-grandsons.¹⁰³

3. As we have already noted, Ancient Near Eastern genealogies were often selective, not continuous. From Egypt, in the eighth century BC, we have a statue (Cairo 42,212) which would appear to give its owner the priest Tjaenhesret a continuous ancestry of six generations. But the fuller genealogy of Cairo statue 42,211 shows that six generations are omitted at one point and three more at another on the first statue. Likewise, several generations are missing between Ramesses II and the Twenty-first Dynasty in the Berlin genealogy published by Borchardt.¹⁰⁴ In other genealogies for our period, Bezalel is in the seventh generation from Jacob (*cf.* 1 Ch. 2:1, 4, 5, 9, 18-21); Elishama (Nu. 1:10) is in the ninth generation from Jacob with Joshua (younger contemporary of Moses) in the eleventh (*cf.* series Jacob – Joseph - Ephraim, plus 1 Chronicles 7:22-27). And there is no guarantee that these and others are wholly continuous. Compare, for example, that of Nahshon, head of the tribe of Judah (Nu. 1:7), who in 1 Chronicles 2:1, 4, 5, 9, 10, is in the sixth generation after Jacob.

The genealogies cannot, therefore, be used to contradict the 430-Year period of the other references. In cases like this, continuity of genealogies has to be proved, not assumed. Four centuries from Jacob in about the late eighteenth century BC would bring us to the thirteenth century BC for the date of the Exodus, a date known to be suitable on independent grounds now to be considered.

[p.55]

¹⁰⁰ Latterly, Gordon, *JNES* 13 (1954), p. 58: *The World of the Old Testament*, 1960, pp. 116-117; in A. Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies*, 1963, p. 4.

¹⁰¹ So Rowley, *From Joseph to Joshua*, pp. 70-73; Gordon, *loc. cit.*

¹⁰² *Cf.* already, *WBD*, p. 153b, top; the classification tribe - clan - family group is also partly seen by D. N. Freedman, *BANE*, pp. 206-207 (mixed with some unnecessary speculation). This classification also applies to Jos. 7:1 and entries in Nu. 26, cited by Gordon, in Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies*, 1963, p. 4 and n. 4.

¹⁰³ See also the material on genealogies and lists noted above, pp. 38 f. with notes 15-19. Nu. 26:59 and 1 Ch. 6:3 merely follow Ex. 6.20 and have no separate evidential value.

¹⁰⁴ For these, *cf.* Kitchen, *The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt* (forthcoming) and recent parallels quoted by Albright, *Biblical Period from Abraham to Ezra*, 1963, p. 9 and n. 26.

The total evidence, therefore, accords very well with a date for the Patriarchs in the twentieth to eighteenth centuries BC, and shows a reasonable degree of consistency when properly interpreted.¹⁰⁵

¹⁰⁵ Contrast O. Eissfeldt, *CAH*², II:26a (*Palestine in the Nineteenth Dynasty, Exodus and Wanderings*), 1965, pp. 8, 10, whose treatment of this topic is superficial and misleading; cf. my review article in *THB* 17 (1966), pp. 63-97.