

ANNOTATIONS (D) TO TABLES XVII-XIX  
KHAMMURABI, ABRAHAM, AND SENSERT III, IN RELATION TO THE HITTITES AND HYKSOS.

ANNOTATIONS (D) TO TABLES XVII-XIX.  
KHAMMURABI, ABRAHAM, AND SENSERT III, IN RELATION TO THE HITTITES AND HYKSOS.

Khammurabi was the 6th king of the so-called 1st Dynasty of Babylon (*refer Table XVIII and Annotations (B)*). He warred with the Elamites until his 11th year. From his 11th year to his 30th year was a period of peace between Khammurabi and the Elamites in Babylonia. Until his 30th year Khammurabi was nominally vassal of Elam. In his 30th year, he, however, threw off the Elamite yoke, and was completely victorious against the Elamites in Babylonia in the following year. (Refer King, "Hist. Babylonia," p. 153 *et seq.*; Cambridge Anc. Hist., Vol. i, pp. 487-488; Hall, "Anc. Hist. Near East," p. 196; Rogers, "Hist. Bab. and Assyria," Vol. I, p. 388 *et seq.*; Johns, "Anc. Bab." p. 78.)

The period from the 11th to the 30th years of Khammurabi is therefore the only period in which Khammurabi could be in alliance with Elam. From *Table XVII* this period is dated as 2077 to 2096 A.K. Now from Genesis, xiv, 1-5 and the narrative of Abraham's life to xvi, 3 and 16, in relation to xii, 4 and 5, the invasion of Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, and his vassals, Amraphel (Khammurabi), Arioch, and Tidal (king of Goyyim or Hittites)—refer ¶319—into Canaan occurred between 2084 and 2093 A.K. These two limiting dates both fall within the dated period, of Khammurabi's reign, during which the alliance was possible. But we can more closely date the invasion than this. Genesis, xiv, 2-5, states that the 5 kings in Canaan served Chedorlaomer for 12 Years, rebelled in the 13th. and were attacked by Chedorlaomer in the 14th year. Now Chedorlaomer could not be free to extend his dominion to Canaan when Khammurabi was disputing with the Elamites in Babylonia. The 12 years' service could not begin, therefore, until Khammurabi's 11th year or later. The earliest dated period for the 12 years is therefore 2077 to 2089 A.K. The 13th year was therefore 2089-2090 A.K. at earliest, and the 14th year, the year of the battle, 2090-2091 A.K. at earliest. Being probably in the Spring, "when kings go forth to battle," the date is 2090.5 A.K. at earliest. By the date of Genesis the latest date is the Spring prior to 2093 A.K., and therefore 2092.5 A.K. Again, by the fact, that Khammurabi's resistance to the Elamites in Babylonia continued to his 11th year, we may date the beginning of the 12 years' service a year later at the Spring, 2078.5 A.K., and "the battle of 4 kings with 5 at 2091.5 A.K., at the commencement of the 14th year. The narrative of Genesis and its chronology is therefore seen to agree as precisely with the Babylonian data and chronology as they do with the Egyptian data and chronology.

Now Hittites took part in this battle, and it is after the date of this battle that Hittites are described as first dwelling in Southern Canaan (¶319). In the year of the battle Amorites dwelt "in the plain of Mamre" (Gen., xiv, 13). In the year of Sarah's death Hittites dwelt there (Gen. xxiii, 2, 8, 10, 17, 19). Sarah died 62 years after the Call of Abraham at 2083.5 A.K., by *Gen. xii, 4; xvii, 17; xxiii, 1*. The date of Sarah's death is, therefore, 2145.5 A.K., 54 years after the "battle of 4 kings with 5." Hittites, therefore, first appeared in Southern Canaan between 2091.5 and 2145.5 A.K. Now this identification and this dating are important since Maspero ("Struggle of the Nations" p. 57) attributes the swarming of the Hyksos into Egypt to the pressure of Hittites coming into Canaan. Sayce, in a foot-note to Maspero's statement, remarks that "the Hyksos invasion has been regarded as a natural result of the Elamite Conquest, by Maspero, Lenormant, Meyer, Hommel, and Naville." By *Annotations (B)*, the Elamite Invasion of Babylonia took place in 1965 A. K. By *Annotations (A) to Table XV*, the Hyksos first entered Egypt in the 6th year of Sensert II, at 2063 A. K. This agrees with the dating above, giving the period of Elamite domination over Southern Canaan as beginning in 2077 to 2078 A.K. The first Hyksos migration obviously was effected by reason of the threatening dominance of Elam. The complicated race movements at this time primarily originated, however, as a result of the recurrence of the periodic famine cycle that affected territories successively from the mountains of Elam and Asia Minor down into Egypt (refer ¶319). This again equates the famine of Abraham (2083.5 A.K.) and the river improvement and famine relief works of Sensert III in 2084 A.K. (refer ¶319 and Table XXII), with the race movements central to the return of Khammurabi.

As a result of the data discussed in the preceding paragraphs, Budge considers that the Hyksos invasion of Egypt was contemporaneous with the times of Khammurabi. Regarding these times he states:—

*"The Elamite and Kassite pressure from the East caused an emigration from Babylonia and her dependencies westwards and southwards, and the people thus dispossessed drove before them the nomadic tribes on the North-East of Egypt"* ("Hist. Egypt," Vol. III, pp. 136-137).

Regarding the same movement, Maspero states (r. 56) that "An impulse once given, it needed but little to accelerate or increase the movement; a collision with one horde reacted on its neighbours, who either displaced or carried others with them, and the whole multitude, gathering momentum as they went, were precipitated in the direction first given."

The Hyksos, the first of this stream to arrive on the borders of Egypt, immediately fortified the Eastern frontier of the Delta. Manetho, as quoted by Josephus (*Contra Apian I, 14*) attributes this work to the first Hyksos king, giving as reason that "he regarded with suspicion the increasing power of the Assyrians."

"In this statement," says Budge, "we seem to have a reflection of solid historical fact, for the Assyrians here referred to are, no doubt, those who were dwellers in Mesopotamia, and who were subjects of the viceroys of the kingdom afterwards called Assyria, which they ruled on behalf their overlords, the kings of Babylon, i.e., Khammurabi and his immediate successors. The dwellers in Syria and Palestine joined with the nomadic tribes of Eastern Desert, and fled to Egypt for safety, and it little foresight to see that they might easily be persuaded thither by the victorious armies of Assyria and Babylon." ("Hist. Egypt," III, 135.)

Similarly, in footnote to Maspero, p. 52, Sayce states "Manetho here speaks of Assyrians; this is an error which is to be explained by the imperfect state of historical knowledge in Greece at the time of the Macedonian supremacy ..... read *Chaldaeans* where Manetho has written *Assyrians*. In Herodotus 'Assyria' is the regular term for 'Babylonia' and Babylonia is termed 'the Land of the Assyrians.'"

The reason for the fortifying of the frontier of the Delta by the Hyksos is clearly given by the narrative of Genesis xiv. Chedorlaomer and his vassals, including Khammurabi (Amraphel) had penetrated Southern Canaan as far South as the Dead Sea. This was too close for the Hyksos who had settled in the Delta. As shown in *Annotations (C) to Table XV*, the 1st king of the Hyksos, Apepa I, reckoned his reign from the date of the first entry of the Hyksos in 2063 A.K. and his 33rd year was the 2nd year of Amenemhat III, i.e., 2095.5 A.K. Apepa I's date therefore agrees with the statement of Manetho as related to the invasion of Chedorlaomer and his Babylonian and Hittite allies at 209.5 A.K. The facts relating to the earlier migrations into Egypt • the campaign of Chedorlaomer into Southern Canaan would account for the facility with which Abram's servants — journeying from far "Ur of the Chaldees," captured by the Elamites 118 years previously, passed through Haran in Mesopotamia and through Canaan, into Egypt in time of famine, all as an apparently rational sequence of movement. The date (2083 A.K.) of his journey falls within the period of 19 years' peace between Khammurabi and the Elamites in Southern Babylonia, later identified as the "land of the Chaldeans." It falls also within the 12 years' servitude of the kings of Southern Canaan under Chedorlaomer.

Although not represented as belonging to a horde of migrating people moving towards Egypt, nevertheless Abraham's party moved contemporaneously with such a movement. Naturally the normal rate of movement of the migrating hordes would be accelerated by the famine in Canaan, the severity of which must of necessity have been intensified by the sudden large excess of population projected into Canaan by the first waves of the migratory movement.

We find, therefore, that Babylonian Chronology and the records of Khammurabi relating to the circumstances of the invasion of Chedorlaomer into Southern Canaan confirm that the journey of Abram happened in 2083 to 2084 A.K. Similarly we find that the Egyptian chronology and the records of Sensert III independently confirm the date (2084 A.K.) and circumstances of Abram's entry into Egypt (*Tables XV and XXII and ¶¶ 317 and 319*). The following statements of Petrie and Budge, concerning Sensert III, are therefore significant.

Petrie ("Hist. Egypt" I 178) states: *"The name of this king in the Greek Lists, Lakheres, is quite accounted for by the corruption of X into A, by the omission of the top; thus altering Kha-kau-ra, or Khakeres, into Lakheres." Budge states, "Lachares (Lakheres) must be identified with the Nachares of the Christian chronographers in whose reign the patriarch*