1896.] Archeology versus Old Testament Literary Criticism. 10

tion is the converse of the fact. Not only were there multitudinous writers and readers among the Babylonians and Egyptians from a very early epoch, but the discovery of the cuneiform tablets of Tel el-Amarna has shown us that the century before the Exodus was a specially literary one throughout western Asia, and that the whole country from the banks of the Euphrates to those of the Nile was covered with schools and libraries, scribes and students. An active correspondence was being constantly carried on from one end of Western Asia to the other, and the center of all this literary activity and correspondence was the land of Canaan. Babylonian literature had long been studied there, and its libraries and archive-chambers contained abundant materials for furnishing a knowledge of its past history. If Moses and his countrymen-coming as they did from Egypt-had been illiterate, it would have been nothing short of a miracle. Moses, therefore, could have written the Pentateuch, and his contemporaries could have read it.

Archeological evidence is accumulating that portions of it, at all events, belong to his age. Thus in the tenth chapter of Genesis, in which a geographical chart is given of the nations of the known world, it is said that Canaan was the brother of Mizraim or Egypt. But this was true only while Canaan was a province of Egypt, that is to say, during the age of the eighteenth and nineteenth Egyptian dynasties. After the fall of the nineteenth dynasty, Canaan was separated from the monarchy on the Nile, and it would never have entered into the head of any one to associate them together. Henceforth, Canaan belonged to the geographical zone of Shem. Now the age of the nineteenth dynasty is the age of the Israelitish Exodus.

So, again, the historical statements of Genesis are being confirmed by the monuments, and proved to rest on contemporaneous documents, not on the shifting sands of late popular tradition. The account of Chedorlaomer's campaign, for example, in the 14th chapter of Genesis, has been fully vindicated, and even the names of Chedorlaomer himself, of Arioch or Eri-Aku, and of Tidal or Tudkhul, have all been found in the Babylonian texts. The "critic" had declared that the mention of Salem in the same chapter was an anachronism, and lo, we now learn from the Tel el-Amarna tablets that Uru-Salim, or Jerusalem, "the city of Salem," was already an important Canaanitish state when they were written. The latest discovery of Assyriology has been to show that in the age of Chedorlaomer, a Hebrew-speaking race from Cancan was settled in Babylonia, and that the city of Babylon was governed by a dynasty of kings who came from south Arabia and spoke a language which was at once Hebrew and south Arabic. What a commentary this is upon the statements of Genesis that the family of Abraham lived in Ur (the modern Moyheir), and that Eber was the ancestor alike of "Abram the Hebrew" and of the tribes of Southern Arabia! Even the names of Jacob and Joseph (Ya'aqub-il and

101