

Prove all things: hold fast that which is good.

220.05
B58
C45

The Bible Student and Teacher

Continuing the "Bible Student," formerly published in Columbia, S. C.—Old series, Volume XI. No. 2

Issued by the Education Committee of The American Bible League:

Willis J. Beecher, D.D.

Henry A. Buttz, D.D., LL.D.

Robert Mackenzie, D.D.

J. P. Sheraton, D.D., LL.D.

G. Frederick Wright, D.D., LL.D.

David James Burrell, D.D., LL.D.

William M. McPheeters, D.D.

Howard Osgood, D.D., LL.D.

Edmund J. Wolf, D.D., LL.D.

The General Secretary, *ex-officio*.

Managing Editor

DANIEL S. GREGORY, D.D., LL.D.

Associate Editor

WILLIAM M. MCPHEETERS, D.D.

Editorial Contributors

Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D., LL.D., Archibald T. Robertson, D.D., Elmer F. Krauss, D.D., Henry O. Dwight, LL.D., George H. Schodde, Ph.D., Winstead Paine Bone, M.A., John D. Irons, D.D., LL.D., J. W. Beardslee, D.D.

OFFICE OF PUBLICATION 53 SENECA ST.

GENEVA, N. Y.

The American Bible League

39 Bible House, New York

Entered as Second-class Matter, March 24, 1905, at the Post-office, Geneva, N. Y., under the Act of Congress of March 3, 1879.

Subscription \$1.00 a year in advance.

Digitized by Google 15 Cents a Copy

The Bible Student and Teacher

Volume III

AUGUST, 1905

Number 2

The Conference in New York==Continued

"The Bible the Inspired Word of God"

In the June issue were printed the Addresses of Rev. Drs. Luther T. Townsend and G. Frederick Wright, of the Topic of the First Session of the Conference: "Inspiration, Its Explanation and Confirmation". In the July number appeared the Addresses of Rev. John Urquhart and Rev. Dr. Wright, on "Confirmation of the Bible from Prophecy and Science", the Topic of the Second Session. In the present issue we print the Addresses on the Topics of the Third and Fourth Sessions.

Owing to a misunderstanding no stenographic report was taken of the exceedingly interesting and luminous Address of Professor Albert T. Clay, Ph.D., of the University of Pennsylvania, on "Babylonian Testimony to the Bible". This is greatly regretted, as it was one of the most valuable of the Conference. The subject was presented without notes, and Professor Clay is not able to furnish at present even the substance of what was said. Later in the year he expects to publish an extended discussion of the same theme.

Topic 111. — Confirmation of the Old Testament from Archaeology

Wednesday Afternoon Session, May 17, 1905

"SOME GEMS RECOVERED FROM AN OLD EGYPTIAN LAPIDIST'S WORKSHOP"

Rev. M. G. Kyle, D. D., Philadelphia, Pa.

My theme is, "Some Gems recovered from an Old Egyptian Lapidist's Work-Shop ; or Egyptian Testimony to the Historical Trustworthiness of the Old Testament."

I once obtained from the Towara Bedouin of the Sinai Peninsula, the coveted privilege of visiting their turquoise mines in the Sinai Mountains, where, in the most primitive manner surreptitiously, for it is an illicit business, they carry on the search for the gems which was begun by their Egyptian neighbors thousands of years ago.

Amidst all the novelties of a visit to a mine of precious stones, I marveled most at the way in which the beautiful blue gems are picked out of the solid rock, not from crevices between layers, nor out of cracks, but from the very

out this narrative of the patriarchal stories, and so catch all these nice peculiarities of language that not in a single instance does his speech bewray him? To me, such a view of the case is incredible, and the only alternative is that these peculiar linguistic correspondences between the Hebrew and the Egyptian accredit the Hebrew records to the age of the events recorded.

The conclusion of all this may be very briefly stated thus: The demands of a Court of Justice concerning historical trustworthiness of a narrative is, that such events did take place, and that the documents submitted date from the time of the events, and were not written up afterwards to support a case. The great argument of Harnack for the trustworthiness of the Acts of the Apostles, is the same: that the events did take place as recorded and that the records are from the time of the events. So in the case before us, the events recorded are attested as belonging to their time, and the authorship of the records to the same age as the events; and the historical trustworthiness of the records is thus established. These things attest to us for the authors of the books under discussion, the sentiment of Peter in his Second Epistle when he wrote, "We did not follow cunningly devised fables when we made known unto you".

Topic IV.—Confirmation of the Old Testament from Criticism

Wednesday Evening Session

"WAS ABRAHAM A MYTH?"

**Professor Robert Dick Wilson, D. D., Theological Seminary,
Princeton, N. J.**

This subject, as originally stated, was not of my own choosing, nor was it suggested by the discourse to which the President has referred, delivered in the City of New York about a week ago.¹ But our good friend, Dr. Gregory, rather forced this subject upon me in view of what he considered to be the emergencies and necessities of the case today with reference to the historicity of the Old Testament. The subject as first suggested and published was, "Abraham Demonstrated a Historical Character from Geography, History and Archæology," or something to that effect. Now, I am not going to attempt to prove that Abraham ever lived. In all probability, no proof of that, outside of the Scriptures, will ever be found. Abraham, so far as we know, left no records of himself; and it was not the custom in those days for the kings of Egypt and of Babylon and of Elam and of other nations to leave records of any but themselves, least of all of sheiks, like Abraham, and those who had

¹The address referred to is that of Rev. John P. Peters, Ph. D., at the so-called Episcopal Conference or Congress,

defeated them in battle. No more in ancient times than in modern do you find recorded on a Vendome Column or on an Arc de Triomphe the defeats of Leipsic and Waterloo, and the defeats in the destruction of Moscow and in the retreat therefrom.

But what I do attempt is this: To show from records outside the Scriptures that no man today can deny the possibility of the existence of a man like Abraham, who may have lived his life in the places and in the midst of the countries and circumstances in which, according to the Scriptures, Abraham did live. And I claim that this is as much as anyone can ever demand in the way of proof of the existence of Abraham; inasmuch as no one could ever demand anything more in the way of proof for the existence of any man who lived outside the bounds of any nation which has left us records from ancient times. And I appeal to you as a jury. I shall argue my case, presenting before you two lines of thought.

In **the first** place, I shall take **the proper names** which are found in the Biblical record of the life of Abraham, and I shall endeavor to show that those names—names of places and countries and persons—are such as are known from the records of Egypt and Babylon to have been in existence, or to be similar to those that were in existence, at the time of Hammurabi and Chedorlaomer, the great kings who, according to the Scriptures, were kings contemporary with Abraham.

And I shall attempt to show in **the second place**, that **the laws and customs** that are mentioned in the Biblical account of Abraham are such as are known, from the records of Egypt and Babylon, to have been in vogue amongst the nations that existed in the time of Hammurabi, the contemporary of Abraham.

In other words, I shall endeavor to show that **the situation, the sphere in which Abraham is said to have lived, is in harmony with the monuments.**

First, then, let us take the Proper Names.

We shall divide them into three classes, the names of Cities, the names of Countries, and the names of Persons.

1. Take the Names of the Cities.

The names of the principal Cities which are connected with the life of Abraham—in fact these names may almost give us a sketch of the life of Abraham—were really Ur of the Chaldees, Shechem, Hebron, Salem, the city of Melchizdek, and Zoar; to which Damascus may properly be added, inasmuch as Eliezer seems to have been from there, and to have joined Abraham on his way from Haran to Shechem. These are some of the cities with which Abraham's story is more or less closely connected. One of the three cities not found on the monuments, is Beersheba, which is said to have been founded by Abraham, and was in fact nothing but a well and an encampment near it. Another is Bethel, between which and Ai Abraham is said to have pitched

his tent. The sentence in which Bethel and Ai occur is a circumstantial clause, equivalent to a parenthesis in English; so that it does not necessarily imply that these cities existed in the time of Abraham. Hammurabi may have visited the six cities; Chedorlaomer may have visited them; any man living in their time, with sufficient wealth to pay for his travelling expenses and for protection to his person and goods, may have visited and lived in or near these six cities. We might call this man John Smith; we might call him Tubal-Cain; we might call him Abraham. No one can deny that a man called Abraham may have lived in or near these cities in the time of Hammurabi. There is nothing mythical about such a supposition. It is a plain matter-of-fact statement:—some man may have lived in these six cities in the time of Hammurabi, for they existed in the time of Hammurabi.

Now, all these other cities have been found upon the monuments of Egypt and of Babylon and of Assyria which are nearest the time of Hammurabi, or on the earliest monuments that speak of the country in which they were situated. Thothmes III., the first great Egyptian conquerer, who has prepared us a record of the places he conquered, on a large gate in Southern Egypt, mentions, among the places he conquered, Damascus and Shechem, and perhaps Hebron. Now, Thothmes III. is the first Egyptian king who lived after the time of Abraham. He lived 300 years before the time of Rameses II., the Pharaoh of the Oppression; about one hundred year or two hundred years after the time of Hammurabi, perhaps three hundred, but in the immediate time of Hammurabi. Now, when I say the time of Hammurabi in this address, I mean the period of time between 2500 and 1500 B. C. Abraham lived in that time. It is before the time of Moses. The fact that Sodom and Gomorrah are never mentioned on the monuments after this time, for instance in the lists of Thothmes' III., may be taken as proof that they did not exist, at the time of Thothmes' conquest; but it does not show that they may not have been destroyed before his time, as the Bible asserts.

The records which we have of that time give us then the cities and countries and persons who were in existence in the great time of Hammurabi. Ur of the Chaldees was in existence for a long time before the existence of Hammurabi. It had its kings and its worship and its monuments. Hebron, the other great city mentioned in the life of Abraham, is mentioned first on the monuments of Tiglath-Pileser I., who lived about 1100 before Christ; and he is the first king who gives us any record whatsoever, of any length, of that particular place.

Now, then, you see that the places mentioned in the life of Abraham, these cities where he resided, are all mentioned within this period, the very nearest to the time of Hammurabi; and that those particular nations existed with reference to those particular localities.

Now, let us suppose that these records had been found, and records of these conquests of these countries and places, and that these names were not

found there; these cities which were so prominent in the life of Abraham are absent from the records; or, let us suppose that we found upon certain records of Egypt Babylon and Assyria that one or two or more of those cities had, as a matter of fact, been founded 500 or 1000 years after the time of Abraham. If that had been the case, I, for one, do not see how we could have defended the historical character of the life of Abraham, unless we were going to maintain that the names of the places had been changed.

But not merely the places, but the very names of the places are found upon the records going back to the nearest point possible to the time of Abraham.

Let us take Sodom and Gomorrah. I am not going to treat of the scientific characteristics of those places, because Dr. Wright has already done that so well. Besides it is not in my line. But does not the fact that Sodom and Gomorrah have not been mentioned upon the monuments found after the time of Hammurabi indicate that those places may have been destroyed by fire in the time of Abraham and Hammurabi? Suppose, for example, that Sodom and Gomorrah had been found mentioned on monuments that post-dated the time of Hammurabi, then it would have been impossible for us to defend the historicity of the Biblical account which is found in the life of Abraham. But, as it is, the very fact that these two are not mentioned is equally a proof that the historical incidents recorded in the Scriptures may have been enacted with regard to these two places, and places like them. The very fact that they are not mentioned in later monuments, say is an indication that they existed away back in the distant past, before these monuments had been written.

2. Let us take the Names of Countries. Now, you remember, the great countries in the time of Abraham, according to the Scriptures, were Egypt on the one hand, and Elam. When Abraham began to live—take him as contemporary with Hammurabi—Chedorlaomer, the king of Elam, had all of west of Asia,—Chedorlaomer and Arioch. Thus according to the monuments Hammurabi and Arioch were sub-kings. About the eleventh year of Hammurabi he defeated Chedorlaomer, and afterwards conquered Arioch the king of Ellasar, who had been theretofore subject to the king of Elam.

Now, you remember that, in the 14th of Genesis, Elam was the principal country and Chedorlaomer the principal king. According to the records which we have gathered from the monuments, of Hammurabi and of Chedorlaomer and of Arioch, at the beginning of the reigns of Hammurabi and Chedorlaomer, Chedorlaomer was the chief king, and later Hammurabi became the chief king. May not that have been after the defeat of Chedorlaomer by Abraham? Monuments say nothing about defeats, ordinarily. But, at any rate, that would harmonize very well with the facts as they exist. But notice this point: there never was a time after that in the history of the world, until Elam was finally utterly destroyed by Assyria, that Elam

had the hegemony in Western Asia; never once after the time of Hammurabi. Thus Hammurabi founded the power of Babylon on so firm a basis that it was never destroyed until Cyrus the Great came with his conquering army and put an end to the Semitic supremacy.

If this Scripture had been a myth, written five hundred or a thousand years after that time, don't you think that Babylon and Assyria and the Hittites would have been mentioned among the other nations that flourished in the time of Abraham? Now there are certain other nations, the Canaanites and Amorites, mentioned as flourishing in the time of Abraham; and the Hittites and the Amorites and Canaanites and all of these are mentioned on the monuments that come from the time of Abraham, both in Egypt and in Babylon, so that the whole situation, as far as the nations of the world are concerned in the time of Hammurabi, suits exactly the situation as we find it in the record in the Scriptures.

What was found to be true of the names of Cities is thus found to be equally true of the names of Countries. The great nations of the time of Hammurabi, are Babylon (or Shinar), Elam and Egypt. If the story of Abraham had been invented in the time of Moses even, one would have expected that Assyria or the Hittites would have been given a prominent place rather than Elam and Larsa (or Lagash) in this connection.

Again, the Canaanites and the Amorites, as well as the Hittites, are known from other sources to have been **then** already in the land. So that, as far as the facts are known today, the Scriptural accounts agree with the situation.

It will be noted, further, that the recent discoveries of the French Expedition to Susa, the capitol of ancient Elam, have shown that, in the early part of Chedorlaomer's reign, he, the king of Elam, held the hegemony in Western Asia, Hammurabi and the kings of Babylonia being subject to him. It was late in his reign, probably after the ignominious defeat of Chedorlaomer by Abraham, that Hammurabi, king of Babylon, rebelled and assumed the leadership in Western Asia, which the kings of Elam never regained.

Thus the story of Abraham is shown to be right in the order and the relative importance of the names of the kings.

The evidence of the monuments, both from the mention and the failure to mention the names of Cities and Countries, is favorable to the historicity of the account of Abraham as it is recorded in the book of Genesis.

3. In the third place, we will look at **the Proper Names of Persons.**

Dr. Gray of Mansfield College has written a very learned work and so have Dr. Nestle of Germany and others written such works, on the Old Testament, in which they attempt to lay out **in strata**, and **not in periods**, the proper names contained in the various documents and the books in the Old Testament. And I, for one, agree that if they could make good their point

about the strata of the proper names they could make good their arguments about the dates of the various documents. I believe in that. There is something in proper names that passes down through the centuries intact. John and Jane and Jack, Jerusalem and Memphis and Rome and Athens—they change not. Proper names of places change not, and of persons, except in endings and in very slight omissions or additions. You can make out proper names from the very beginning of time down to the present from various changes in the phonetics. I believe in that argument.

Now, bearing this in mind, I will go into the Proper Names of the time of Abraham. There are no names of persons mentioned in the Biblical life of Abraham which may not well have been borne by persons living in the time of Hammurabi.

First, we have Chedorlaomer and Amraphel (or Hammurabi) and Arioch and Tidal mentioned in Genesis xiv. These were the four great kings who came from the East and conquered Palestine and there stayed twelve years; and then upon revolt they came again and conquered the land, and were defeated by Abraham and his followers and others at the battle at the north of Palestine.

The long-sought name of Chedorlaomer has been found within the last few years by Prof. Scheil, Père Scheil of Paris, who was in the Morgan Expedition to Susa, Babylon, in three inscriptions, published and translated by him in the *Recueil d'Assyriologie* [for 1897. Hammurabi and Eriaku were contemporaries of Chedorlaomer, and can now be identified with certainty as the same with Amraphel and Arioch of Genesis xiv. And, if you will allow me to speak of my own knowledge of Assyria, I would say that, in my opinion, there is no doubt whatsoever that those three inscriptions, published by Père Scheil, have the name of Chedorlaomer upon them exactly as we would expect to have it; and these inscriptions also contain mention of his relations with Arioch, the king of Ellasar.

Now, Hammurabi on his monuments declares that he defeated Chedorlaomer and conquered him, and also that he conquered the king of Arioch.

The only point in doubt is as to the identification of "Tidal, King of Nations," either about the text or about the nations. But the name of Tidal has been found by Mr. Pinches, who makes the mention of it in the time of Chedorlaomer; a plausible argument for admitting the identification of this name also. The name itself has been found in that time. Nobody can dispute these facts. In my opinion, at least, it is impossible to dispute that.

Now, we come to **Abraham**. The name Abraham itself has been found on one inscription which goes back just three generations beyond the time of Hammurabi. That is, the name of Abraham has been found as existing in that very time, three generations of men back beyond the time of Hammurabi. The very name, **Abram**, has been found as the name of the father (?) of a witness living immediately before the time of Hammurabi.

Now, we have **Isaac** and **Ishmael**, the sons of **Abraham**. **Isaac** and **Ishmael**: these names have not been found; but I am arguing now for the character of names, for the forms of names as well as the names themselves. **Ishmael** has not been found, but **Jabin-el** and **Jopohi**, names of exactly the same formation, have been found occurring in the Tel-el-Amarna tablets. Those of you who are Semitic scholars will recognize that **Jabin-el** and **Jopohi** are substantially the same as **Ishmael** would be, and so also with **Isaac**.

These further names of that time have been found. Of **Melchizedek**, king of **Salem**, the name in full has not been found, but both parts of the name occur in proper names in the Tel-el-Amarna letters, viz., **Ben-zedek** and **Milkili**. **Abimelech** is found in the same letters, as the name of a king. **Eliezer** does not occur, but the equivalent of **Eli** is of frequent occurrence in proper names. **Sara**, from a Babylonian root, meaning **Queen**—being simply the feminine of the word **Sar**, meaning **King**—was in use from the earliest times of the Babylonian language, apparently. But notice that **Hagar** on the other hand, is not a Semitic word, but has, it seems, been found in **Egyptian**.

I had almost forgotten one name, **Pharaoh**. I don't want to forget that, because that is my pet name. I have made an investigation of that for the last two years. I have been investigating the names and titles of the kings of antiquity, and I am going to state the result just in so far as I think it to be true.

It has been said against the Pentateuch that it cannot be true because it calls the king of **Egypt** **Pharaoh**, and does not mention the personal names of the kings; where further on, in the Old Testament, in the time of **Shishak**, it begins to mention names, and mentions the names of kings from that time on. Now, I was rather surprised, on having made this almost voluminous collection—which took up about seventy-five pages of octavo in the *Princeton Theological Review*, of names and titles—in looking over it, to sum up, to find that the name **Pharaoh** occurred but two or three times apparently, as far as I had collected, before the Twelfth Dynasty, the dynasty during which **Abraham** is said to have lived; and that skipping over the 13th, 14th, 15th, 16th and 17th, we have no name records at all. The only names we find are in the 18th, 19th and 20th dynasties. So that the king is called simply **Pharaoh** in what we might call literary works, and we will find the name **Pharaoh** mentioned twenty-five times to the mention of the proper name of the king once. **Pharaoh** is the literary title given to the king of **Egypt** during the 18th, 19th and 20th dynasties in literary works. Now, I am going to investigate that farther hereafter, but at the present it is my opinion at least that from the 12th to the 20th dynasty, inclusive, **Pharaoh** was the literary title and the title which foreigners seem to have employed in referring to the head of the **Egyptian** government.

If that be true, you see that **Pharaoh** was the exact and proper title for **Moses** or for **Abraham** to apply to the king of **Egypt**. It was the title by

which foreigners addressed him, if you please. It was the title which literary writers employed in speaking of him. I must say that I cannot see either why the writer of Abraham's history should have gone out of his way to bring in each one of the names of the kings of Egypt. Each one had four, and the first one of those four titles contained three or four names, or three or four Egyptian words. So it might have been extraneous to the idea of the writer.

I waive the question whether the **Pishi** of the title of the king of Hashija may mean Pharaoh, or not. But I wish to raise the question whether **Pharaoh** may not have been the proper literary designation of the ruler of Egypt, from the 12th to the 20th dynasty, inclusive. It is certainly a striking fact, that the name came first into general use at the time of the 12th dynasty, and that it was frequently used in documents of the 18th, 19th, and 20th dynasties. Shishak and other kings of the 20th dynasty, however, and other kings of late dynasties, as well as the literature of their periods, seem to have avoided the use of the title by itself as a designation of the king of Egypt. If my conclusion, based as I am forced to admit, upon a necessarily incomplete induction of the facts, is not upheld by future investigation, it will still be true that during the time of the 18th and 19th dynasties, and also during that of the 9th and 12th, **Pharaoh** alone was an ordinary designation of the king of Egypt.

I might go into this farther, but time is passing, and I think you will allow me to say that, in general, it is absolutely true and undeniable by any Assyriologist who has gone into the subject at all, that the names which are to be found in the Biblical account of Abraham are such names of persons as are known to have existed at that time of the forms of which names existed at that time.

Suppose we had found it otherwise—suppose we had found that the names of Chedorlaomer and Hammurabi were found on the monuments; and then we found that the names in the Biblical account of Abraham were entirely different from the names found at the time of Hammurabi; that they were not of the same nature; that they were not of the same forms and could be shown not to be Semitic names, and not names of characters of the time of Hammurabi at all—I don't know how it would be with you, but I, for one, would not know any way of escape from supposing that the life of Abraham has lost some historicity.

In conclusion, we may say that there is no reason in the kind of names employed, why the life of Abraham may not have been lived in the time of Hammurabi. All the names that I have mentioned (and of most if not all of the others the same is true) have been found, or forms like them, in the earliest records that have come down to us from those that lived in Palestine or in its surrounding countries in the time of Hammurabi.

The force of the argument, as against a mythical theory of the life of Abraham, will appear if we suppose that these records had come down to us, and that the names of the persons then living were all entirely different both

in sound and form from those mentioned in the Scriptural account of Abraham's life. Languages may change, but proper names usually preserve some measure at least of their original sound and form. If the history of Abraham had been written 1000 or 2000 years after the time of Hammurabi, would it not have been marvelous that those far-off writers, in a construction of myths, in throwing these projections of the imagination upon the canvas of the 20th century B. C., should have used no Jehovistic names, no names, in fact, that would enable us to say: This name indicates a date as late as 1000 B. C.; this name could not have occurred at 2000 B. C.; because no people using the language of these names existed in Palestine or its surrounding lands at that time? If this argument would be valid, not to say convincing—and I, for one, cannot see how it could be answered if it were true—does it not follow also, that **since** the names of persons mentioned in the life of Abraham may all—and I know of no exception—have been used in the time of Hammurabi, that some one during the life of Hammurabi may have been brought in contact with persons of just these names? And who can say—who knows enough to say—that there was not such a person, and that his name was not Abram?

II. Let us pass on to the consideration of the **Laws and Customs which characterized the time of Hammurabi.**

In general, the laws and customs and general conditions of the life of Abraham as given in Genesis are not out of harmony with the times so far as they have been revealed on the monuments.

I shall divide these into, (1) those connected with business, (2) those connected with the social status, and (3) those connected with religion.

1. There is not much in the life of Abraham about **business**, but the little that there is harmonizes very well with what we know about the business of the Babylonians in the time of Hammurabi.

When Abraham is going to buy a piece of land he discusses the matter before witnesses, and the business is transacted in legal form. Of course, that might have been at any time of the world, but it suits what we know of the customs of that time.

And you also notice that silver and gold are both mentioned but silver before gold. Silver was the money at the time; gold was used for ornaments. Now, if that account of Abraham had been written as late as 800 years before Christ, if you please, or 500 years before Christ, after gold had come to be used as money, it is certainly possible that the writer might have made a mistake and spoken of gold having been used as currency in the time of Abraham. Then we could not have answered the critics. Then rings and bracelets of gold were used for adornment, and were buried with the dead. Everybody that ever goes over to Cairo will see a most beautiful exhibit of gold ornaments that came from before Mina the first king of Egypt of the First Dynasty.

Then the cattle mentioned—horned cattle and sheep and asses—are the ordinary possessions of Abraham, and they were the ordinary possessions of Babylonians and Egyptians at that time. I am not going to skip the camel and the horse. Erman and other writers on Egyptology say that upon the Egyptian monuments the picture of the camel does not appear up to the time of Thothmes, and that is true. There is only one instance known, and that is a little ornament that has two camels on it, but the age of it is not certain. Now, the conclusion that is drawn from this fact that the camel is not shown upon the Egyptian monuments to the time of Thothmes, is that the Egyptians did not know anything about camels until the time of Thothmes. I will leave that for the present. Whether the Egyptians knew anything about camels or not, the Babylonians and the Assyrians did, for the first and great king of Assyria who conquered all western Asia speaks of camels, and that was 1100 years before Christ. But that was the dromedary; but the real camel existed away back before that in Babylon. Professor Hommel thinks that the name is derived from Arabia, because that is the natural habitat of the camel, and that is where we would expect camels to originate.

Now, notice this little argument that camels existed in Western Asia, and of course would be used in the desert especially, as they are today, in the time of Tiglath Pileser, and long before that in Babylon. Do you suppose that those kings of Egypt who conquered all Western Asia and who had commercial relations with Babylon and all Western Asia knew nothing about camels? Besides, Egyptologists are not agreed that camels were not known in Egypt, although figures of camels are not found on monuments, while one of them says that camels were known to the Egyptians. So, it is merely an argument from science in regard to the camel. But if the camel was known in Western Asia 1,000 years before its picture is drawn on the Egyptian monuments, why may it not have been known 1,500 or 2,000 years earlier?

Now, about the horse. The horse is not mentioned in the time of Abraham. There were horses in Egypt at the time of the Exodus, as you remember; there were horses in Egypt at the time of Rameses II., because they cover the walls of one monument as high as a house; he drives against the Hittites in his chariot, and horses are pulling it. There is no doubt about that. But it does not follow that Abraham had horses, or that he ever saw horses, for that matter. The name of the horse in Babylonian is the ass of the East, and it has been assumed from that fact that the horse was imported from Persia, and in fact that is what the scientists say. The horse comes from central Asia: that is its original habitat; and so they call it the ass of the East. But in the time of Hammurabi and 300 years before the time of Abraham, horses are sent to Egypt as presents; and that is about 400 years before the Exodus. So the history of the horse is exactly in harmony with the life of Abraham and the history of the Exodus.

2. We come to the Social Status of the time of Hammurabi.

They buried the dead in Babylon. Abraham buried his dead in the Field of Machpelah. Down in Egypt they embalmed them. Joseph was afterwards embalmed. They did not do that, at least not at that time, over in Babylon; they did not burn them as they did in Greece.

Again, polygamy was practised. Now, you need not suppose that polygamy was the universal custom. There were different kinds of polygamy, and the kind of polygamy that Abraham practised was the kind of polygamy that prevailed in Babylon; it wasn't the polygamy of the Mohammedan, or the Mormon polygamy, but the kind that prevailed in Babylon. When his wife was childless she gave her handmaid to Abraham as a wife, exactly in accordance with the laws of Hammurabi. I had three laws on a piece of paper, but I thought I would not read them here, because laws of those times were very much as they are today, full of repetitions. But if you look at laws 146, 171 and 176 of the Code of this very Hammurabi who lived in the time of Abraham, you will find this very point in regard to polygamy and in regard to Hagar and Ishmael and Sarah.

It was customary for a man to take a second wife, a handmaid or slave, when the first wife and real wife was childless. He might acknowledge the child of that second marriage, if you might call it that, as his heir. If then the real wife had a child the question would arise, What is the status of the child of the handmaid? If the father called that child of the handmaid "my child", that is, his child, then the child of the handmaid inherited along with the child of the wife; but if the handmaid had a child the law was that she might not thereafter be sold as a slave, nor the child. She might be driven out, if you please, but she went free.

Now, you see how that all harmonizes exactly with the situation connected with the life of Abraham, Hagar, Sarah and Ishmael. Sarah wanted that boy driven away lest he might inherit with the child of the free woman according to the Babylonian law. She gave the handmaid to Abraham according to the Babylonian law. Abraham might have adopted Ishmael according to the Babylonian law. The whole circumstances are in exact accord with the laws 146, 170 and 171 in the Code of Hammurabi, the contemporary of Abraham, according to the Scriptures.

Then Abraham married his sister or step sister, or whatever relation she was to him. Now, the Egyptians did that preferably. I am not here to defend it, but I am just stating the facts, that the ancient Egyptians married their sisters preferably. A savant of Berlin, who is an authority on Egyptology, dwells on this. He says that the Egyptians preferably married their sisters, although they might have called other ladies sisters when not real sisters—that is true. But the kings certainly married their own sisters. So you need not think that it shocked humanity when Abraham married his half, or step sister, or whatever kind of a sister she was.

Just one other point here, and this is one that the radical critics revel in. They say this is not history but myth, because it says that Abraham twice lied about Sarah, calling her his sister; and then Isaac repeated it, apparently afterwards. Now, they say that is evidence of myth, of the mythical evidence of the whole thing.

It does not strike me that way at all. When I was preparing for college, I was ill for several years, and I had an old professor who believed in teaching literature by reading it. So he had me read, among other things, the great novelists of the 18th Century, Smollet and Sterne and Fielding. Now, I will tell you one thing about all of those novels in general: they all describe certain things that are almost exactly the same; there is a difference in the names of the places, but the general characteristics are the same. There is a tavern, and there is a young man, and there is a woman, and there is a brawl, and there is a duel, and somebody is hurt. The general characteristics are the same. The same is true of the French novels like Gil Blas, and the Spanish novels of the same period. Why? Because one was copied from the other? Because there were three accounts of the same thing? Because there was one original story and they all have copied and varied it? No, not at all. But why? Because the state of society at the time when those novels were written, or the state of society which those novels are describing, is the same state of society. A young man could not leave Edinburgh or York and go to London in that century without coming to taverns just like that, and being robbed just like that, and going through scenes just like that.

So I take it if you would go back to the time of Abraham and note the condition of the world at that time,—here an almighty tyrant down in Babylon, and here another one down in Egypt, and here comes along a stranger. Why, what more natural than that he should impose on the stranger? It was the custom of kings in those days to marry the daughters of their neighbors. Kings in those days intermarried just as much as they do today, and when Abraham came along with his wealth and his power, what more natural than that the king should want to make an alliance by marrying Abraham's sister? What more natural than that the king of Egypt should have done so? It harmonizes with the state of society which existed in the world at that time.

3. I pass on to the Religious Observances of the time of Hammurabi.

That is the central thing after all. Abraham saw visions, fell into a deep sleep, and he had dreams. Now, dreams and visions like that were characteristic of the Egyptians and Babylonians in that time, and all through their history.

How about the worship? Babylonians sacrificed the sheep; so did Abraham. Of course they had their altars. You cannot sacrifice without

altars, but the priests of Assyria were kings as well; or kings were priests as well, would be a better way of stating it; just as Melchizedek was a priest and a king. And tithes were offered in Babylon before the time of Abraham, just as Abraham offered tithes to Melchizedek, the Prince of Jerusalem. But here is a singular fact, and that is, if Abraham is a myth, that the names of the sacrifices which Abraham employed are the names which the Babylonians used, and they are not the names of the Mosaic cult.

Now, if I were pleading my case before a jury, and you were the jury, I would like to know, if this history of Abraham is a throwing back upon the distant past of the ideas of the eighth or seventh century before Christ, how it happens to come about that the writers mention only those sacrifices as being made by Abraham which were common to Babylonians? Isn't it strange that he never got mixed up and mentioned the sin offering or the trespass offering?

Now, negatively, two points and then I shall close: the offering of Isaac, and Circumcision.

Abraham was ordered by God to offer up his son as a burnt offering. The Egyptians did not practise human sacrifices, the Babylonians did not practise this human sacrifice. Here, then, is Abraham doing something which was not in vogue among the Babylonians out of whose myths he came, nor amongst the Egyptians. I do not know enough about the Palestinians in that time and others between them, to say exactly what they did. But you notice this fact, that according to Scripture Abraham was ordered by God to do that. It was not a customary thing, apparently for the family of Abraham. It was an order from God. And when Isaac walks along beside his father he says, "My father, behold the wood and the fire, but where is the lamb for a sacrifice?" What does that mean, but that Isaac did not know anything about human sacrifice. And Abraham says, "My son, God will provide himself a lamb for a burnt offering." And God did provide the lamb. No human sacrifice took place. There is no lack of harmony with the monuments and that story at all.

And the next thing is circumcision. So far as I have been able to get information, the Babylonians knew nothing about circumcision. They have no name for circumcision, as far as I have been able to find, and they did not use circumcision. The Egyptians did.

This, then, is the situation. Abraham comes out of Ur of Chaldees in the midst of the Babylonians, and they didn't have circumcision there and Abraham and his family were not circumcised when they came out of Palestine. They go to Egypt and learn what it is and come back to Palestine, and the Lord makes a covenant with Abraham, and the circumcision was first introduced as a sign of the covenant.

Now, notice, the Babylonians, out of whose midst Abraham came, knew nothing, so far as we have any information, about circumcision, and the descendants of Abraham have done it practically from immemorial time.

Where is the proof in this that circumcision was not existing in the time of Abraham? There is not the shadow of proof except in the imagination of certain critics.

And now, my friends, I will resume. I have endeavored to show in the first place, that the Proper Names,— the names of Places, the names of Countries and the names of Persons—which are found in the Biblical accounts of the life of Abraham, are such as were found in the world at the time of Hammurabi. I have, in the second place, endeavored to show that there is nothing in the Laws and Institutions and Customs which characterize the Biblical account of Abraham, which is contradicted by what we know of the world in the time of Hammurabi; but on the contrary that all we do know confirms the Biblical account.

Was Abraham a myth? We will take what the Bible says, we who believe in Christ. Isaiah and Micah and Ezekiel all base their arguments upon the belief that he was a real man. In the new Testament Paul bases his great argument for the fundamental principle of Christianity upon the assumption that Abraham existed and lived the life that the Old Testament says that he lived; and the Epistle to the Hebrews is just as full references to the life of Abraham. The Lord himself in his discourses and in his sayings as recorded in the Gospels, refers to Abraham as a real person. "Before Abraham was, I am." And for the sake of those of you who are Greek scholars, I would just like to say that in Greek it is this: "I say unto you before Abraham came into existence, I am."

I don't know how it may be with you, but as a believer in Jesus Christ, and seeing that the monuments of the time of Hammurabi do not contradict the historical statements of the Biblical account in reference to Abraham, I for one, expect to believe in the historicity of that account until some proof, some evidence other than the assertion of any man, is brought forth, and such convincing proof as that it cannot be gainsaid.

I might close, and I shall close, by adopting the words of England's great liberty-lover:

"Though all the winds of doubt and criticism should be let loose upon this earth, so truth be in the field, we do injuriously to misdoubt her strength. Let truth and falsehood grapple. Truth is mighty, next to the Almighty, and must prevail."

To bear witness to the truth is the mission of the Christ, and the Christ himself is Truth.