

MEDIA, India, Japan
Compendium, vol. I, Chapter 15

Today we pick up where Assyria left off and cover Chapter Fifteen which involves parts of further Asia from Assyria all the way across to the Pacific—Media, India, Japan and China.

Notice the first two paragraphs of this chapter. The factor that binds Media, India, and Japan together in Dr. Hoeh's organization of the material is Assyria! These three areas of the world had important contact with Assyria. The Chinese, however, as Dr. Hoeh points out, remained relatively apart from the West. RAS.

The MEDES were one half of the empire which had two parts—the Medo-Persian Empire. Both nations lived in the area which we today call Iran. The Persians were generally more toward the south adjacent to the Persian Gulf; the Medes up in the north near the Caspian Sea. There were all kinds of other peoples in the area as well—you will remember that this is where the Israelites were taken captive—and there were some minor tribes, but these two predominated. There were times when they did fight against each other, but in their later period they joined together and became powerful.

They eventually helped the Babylonians to destroy the Assyrian Empire in 608 BC. Then, of course, we are all familiar with Darius the Mede and Cyrus the Persian who came against Babylon, destroyed it, and then ruled for quite awhile over the world as the empire of silver as it is known in Bible prophecy in the Book of Daniel.

Here in this chapter we are interested mainly in the story of the MEDES. The Persian kings are correctly given in any basic text book on that period of history and thus do not have to be handled in this section of the Compendium. (For a list of the Persian kings in Egypt in Dynasty XXVII see pages 218-220 of vol. one.)

There are two parts to this story of the Medes (at least as much as has been preserved). The earlier kings over the Medes, if there were any, have been lost. This story picks up in 816 BC. You possibly remember the Babylonian dynasties of Berossus, how he mentions that there were 11 Chaldeans, and then there were a number of Medes reigning in Babylon and then there were Arabs, and then there were Chaldeans again (pages 250-51). This shows there were some earlier Medes, not too long after Babel, who did rule in the Mesopotamian area. But we have no specific knowledge about them as to individual names.

But now here at a later time we can pick up the story of the Medes in greater detail. Basically we have two sources for this: One is this Greek called Ctesias, who was a doctor of the Persian court—he, of course, had access to their material; and the other one is Herodotus. These ancient historians have preserved for us two lines of Median kings.

The thing is that one of these lists has been rejected by historians in the world, the main reason being that they have tried to identify both lists as one and the same—they try to identify these two families as one and the same. And, at the same time, they have found certain differences and certain similarities so they didn't know what to do. They ended up saying, "Well, at least one of them must be corrupt, if not both!" So out went the list as given by Ctesias primarily.

At this point we must go back to Assyria for part of the story—look at the list on pages 318-19. Here is this Assyrian king list from Ctesias starting with Ninyas which goes all the way down finally ending on page 320 with Thonos Concolerus who finished his reign in 816 BC—in 816 the Medes ended this long-lived Assyrian dynasty, a point which Dr. Hoeh comments on briefly. We can pick up the story of what happened in this crucial year in

Ctesias' history about the Medes—turn back to pages 328-29—where in 816 there was a weakening in the Assyrian Empire and there was a revolution of the Medes. THE ASSYRIAN "REICH" ESCAPED TOTAL DESTRUCTION JUST BY THE SKIN OF ITS TEETH!! This is apparently the time when Jonah came and warned Nineveh.

Now in Jonah's prophecy we are not given any particular date as to when he preached to Nineveh, but it is around about this time. And it certainly would fit the situation because the Medes were rising up, becoming powerful, and God was going to use them to destroy the Assyrians if the Assyrians did not repent. And because the Assyrians finally heeded Jonah's warning, they repented and the Assyrian kingdom was consequently not brought down. Nevertheless, the Median uprising was successful which ended that particular dynasty of the Assyrians (page 320 again) recorded by Ctesias and, as a result, in Media, an independent native dynasty of rulers was set up. Diodorus of Sicily (bottom of 328) also mentions this revolt.

Often this revolt in Assyrian history is confused with the ultimate end of the Assyrians in 612-608—it's usually confused because of similar events, in some cases, because at the end of the Assyrian Empire, remember, it was also the Medes and the Persians in concert with the Babylonians who dealt the death-blow! It's always been the Medes and the Persians who have been the ones to defeat the Assyrian or Babylonian power. Every time!

Even in the end time now we are right in identifying the Medes and Persians basically with the SLAVIC nations in the east of Europe—Russia, and the Ukraine and so on. You can see why it was the Russians who came against Berlin in the end of World War II and were allowed to destroy it rather than the Americans. It just gave the Germans a foretaste of what's going to come again—and, in a way, what's always been in the past. History does repeat itself!

Back to the story on 329: Certain Median royalty came to power in 816 BC. And this was the line from which Darius the Mede of the Bible eventually came—the one who was set up as ruler over Babylon after Cyrus conquered it. Then some others arose at a later time.

This earlier Median dynasty is given on pages 329-30. It starts with an Arbaces and is named after him as the Arbacid Dynasty. Various names are given and the list is carried on down till the year 549 (or 546, an alternative date). Now the last ruler is named Aspadas and he is called Astyages by the Greeks in some of their histories that they wrote—and also in the Bible, of course, the father of Darius the Mede. And the Hebrews called him Ahasuerus which was a common Median or Persian name.

Now the son of this last ruler on the list, Aspadas or Astyages, was Darius the Mede. In Greek history (because the Greeks have preserved the story of the Medes and the Persians) you do not find "Darius the Mede" anywhere mentioned by that name—you can search high and low and you will not find him. Rather, he is given under the name of CYAXERES—that name is given here on page 330 below the list, Cyaxeres II. The way we can identify this individual with Darius the Mede is from the history of XENOPHON. Xenophon was a Greek mercenary general and a historian. He went out with a group of Greeks fight with one of these Persian usurpers and the Persian was killed and so all the Greeks tracked back home again—it's known as "The Retreat of the Ten Thousand," quite an interesting story. They criss-crossed also the Middle East so he was able to pick up quite a bit of information. And he wrote the story about Darius the Mede and Cyrus, and he calls Darius the Mede "Cyaxeres."

Xenophon records a case where, after the conquest of Babylon—remember, Cyrus the Persian and Darius the Mede came against Babylon—that Cyrus clearly made the statement to this Cyaxeres: "You now go, I have prepared a house for you in Babylon where you can stay and rule and I will take care of the rest of the kingdom." This clearly illustrates that this is what happened; and that parallels the Bible story as well because there we find Darius being appointed as the one to rule over Babylon by Cyrus while he had to take care of some other parts of the empire. And then Cyrus came into Babylon later after it had been conquered and ruled over for awhile by Darius (see CC Lesson 12).

Historians, however, have confused this history of the Median independence and the Medes rising up and establishing this separate dynasty because they confused it with another dynasty which is given by Herodotus. (This is the list on page 331.) The two were very similar in some respects and so they tried to make one out of these two!

We find in the year 700—which would follow the death of Shalmaneser III who destroyed Samaria—there was another bunch of Medes who rose up and declared independence, apparently in another part of the kingdom. It seems that what happened is that the Assyrians were reigning over all Medes: Then in 816 part of the Medes declared independence and a certain line began to reign. And in the year 700 another section of the Medes (which still apparently had remained under Assyrian domination) also declared independence.

This sort of thing is quite common in history. A modern example: In the last century the Greeks were reigned over by the Turks. Finally, in the 1830's, the Greeks declared independence; they fought the Turks and won back about half the territory of Greece—only about half of them became independent. Several decades later they were able to defeat the Turks again and take the rest of Greece.

The same situation existed here where ~~one~~ part of the Medes became independent; then, in 700, following the death of Shalmaneser III (notice that here is a case of a great Assyrian king dying—an event which would greatly weaken the kingdom) this other group of Medes made a stab for independence.

This now made them completely free from Assyrian rule and so a different line of kings (probably in a certain local area of this other half of the Median realm) rose up and became independent. And this is the HOUSE OF DEIOCKES given on page 331. Now look at this list carefully and compare it with the one on page 330. Notice that the last three rulers in each list have IDENTICAL LENGTHS OF REIGN—22, 40, 35! (Do not overlook the misprint of the "40" in 330!!) Amazingly, in both lists, these kings reigned for the same length of time and their reigns began and ended in exactly the same years. An amazing coincidence—that three men in succession, in two different dynasties, could do this!! Equally surprising is that the last ruler in each dynasty had the same name—ASTYAGES!! Did God have anything to do with this???

This is what has caused historians to confuse the two lists, and to want to make one list of kings out of both of them!!

They concluded, "Well, the last one has the same name, they ruled the same length of time, therefore the men must be identical one with another." The only difficulty was, when they went back towards the beginning of these king lists, they ran into difficulties—so they can't explain it! Consequently they throw Ctesias' record out the window because they cannot decide on whether it is right or not. But the answer is very simple: There were just two different Median royal houses reigning. One was probably lesser, one was greater, and they lived in harmony as far as we know. [This last statement seems in error—see the last sentence of the second paragraph on page 332.]

Now, on page 331, the last ruler, Astyages, did not have a son to continue his lineage. But he had a daughter and he married her to the king of Persia, Cambyses. We must realize that, at this time, the Medes were predominant while the Persians were smaller—they were just a tribe and their kings probably at this time were no more than tribal chiefs. So this Astyages of the House of Deiockese married his daughter to Cambyses, a Persian. After their marriage they had a son whom they named CYRUS (or, in Persian, Kuru-sh; in Hebrew, Korash). And this Cyrus was the one who became great—Cyrus "the Great" who was prophesied in Isaiah 45 ("a ravenous bird from the east" he is called in one place,)—and he was to come and destroy the Babylonian Empire.

In addition to the Bible, Cyrus was foretold in the local Persian and Median prophecies. We are told by Herodotus that Astyages had a dream that he would be dethroned by the son his daughter was about to bear. Thus he tried to get rid of the child while it was still a babe. The child was placed in a tub of some kind and allowed to float down the river; finally he was fished out and raised by a shepherd who somehow perceived he was of royal stock and so brought him up with military teaching. Finally, so the story goes, Cyrus was recognized by his father and made chief and then went back to the palace. That's one story.

Another story relates that Astyage's daughter would give birth to a MULE who would knock him off his throne. Now in this slightly mysterious prophecy Cyrus was referred to as a MULE because a mule is a cross between two different types of animals, the horse and the donkey. And, Cyrus, of course, was of two different lineages—his father was a Persian and his mother was a Mede. So that was the meaning of this prophecy.

Both these stories predicted that Cyrus would throw Astyages off his throne—and that indeed is what happened! In 549 BC the twin Median dynasties both were terminated. The alternate dates on page 330 show the Arbacid Dynasty lasting till 546 which might very well be the time when Aspadas finally died. But he was deposed in 549 by Cyrus. Here is the picture: Cyrus attacked the Medes with a force of Persians and turned the tables of the government in the Empire. Up to that time the Medes had been predominant while the Persians were the lesser. Now Cyrus came along and reversed the situation so that now the Persians were dominant and the Medes were secondary. The kingdom continued right on in the same way except that now the Persians were on top. It's called the "Medo-Persian" Empire but it might better have been termed the "Perso-Median" Empire! Be that as it may, the two continued together. And there apparently was no great rivalry afterwards because you find Cyrus appointing Darius the Mede (his uncle) to rule over Babylon for him with no seeming danger of collapse.

So Cyrus the Persian subjugated the entire Medo-Persian realm under his authority. He moved into Asia Minor and about 546 BC or so took the kingdom of the Lydians extending Persian rule clear across Anatolia.

Cyrus Takes Babylon (539 B.C.)

Now all that was left was Babylon—whatever was left of the great empire built by the famous Nebuchadnezzar. [By this time, of course, Nebuchadnezzar had already "gone crackers"—that's an English expression; the Americans say "lost his marbles"—but had recovered from his illness (569-562 BC) and then died.] His successors came along down to Nabonidus, and then his son Belshazzar really being the one who reigned. (Nabonidus was sort of weak and went off to a summer resort in the desert of Arabia and lived a life of pleasure.)

Then against Belshazzar came Cyrus in the year 539 BC with his army of Persians and Medes and besieged the city of Babylon. A very interesting account of how this siege took place is contained in Herodotus. He mentions that Babylon was built right on the Euphrates river—in fact, the river split the city of Babylon in two, it flowed right down the middle of town! In order to defend the city, the Babylonians had built a massive wall around the entire periphery—a wall over one hundred feet high and wide enough on top for several chariots to be driven abreast, sort of like a super highway or freeway all the way around! Then inside Babylon, because of the river running straight through the middle of the city, they had built walls along the river bank as well so that one part of the city was actually separated from the other part. And there were certain gates in this river wall which were open in the day time so the people could go down to the river to wash their clothes or get water; but at night those gates were closed. Then they had bridges connecting the two halves of the city but they could also be closed—some were equipped with draw bridges which could be lifted up and others were closed by barricades—during the night. This was in case one half of the city got taken, the other part could still be defended; Then they also foresaw that perhaps an enemy force could perhaps swim in under the city walls by use of the river, so they had taken MASSIVE BRASS GATES and put them right in the bed of the

stream to close off the part where the stream entered in under the walls (and apparently there was a grating too which let the water run through but nobody could even get through that) so it was very well fortified. Cyrus looked at this situation and saw the problem immediately. Instead of trying to take the city by forces which would have entailed a great deal of energy and loss of life, he decided to use a very interesting strategem: He sent a group of men upstream. Now realize that this country was very flat, so he had his men build a number of channels into which the waters could be diverted for awhile--for a period of a few hours. So they made a few channels and directed the stream's flow into them. In this way the water level of the Euphrates dropped. Then, when the water level was down, his forces which were near Babylon, under cover of night, went down into the river which was now only about knee deep, waded right through the shallow Euphrates and got into the city. Here was one of the most crucial junctures in history for it marked the key incident in the transition from the first great world-ruling empire to the second--from Babylon to Persia! Now the Bible also says in the prophecy in Isaiah 45, verse one, of Cyrus when he should come, that he shall "open before him the two leaved gates." This prophecy refers to the gates of Babylon--the gates there on the river had two leaves, that he would open those gates! Here is a detailed prophecy given around two centuries prior to the event in history--so God planned and directed Cyrus' life quite closely for him! Now, interestingly enough, in the Book of Revelation, when describing one of the Seven Last Plagues--the sixth, Revelation 16:12--it says that the sixth angel poured his vial on the river Euphrates so it would be dried up to prepare the way for the kings of the east. So again this event is, in a general sense, repeated: the river Euphrates is dried up in order to let the kings of the east walk in and destroy the final Babylonian power--a repetition, not only twice, but actually three times in history, in that respect. What was this third time?

So that's how Babylon was taken. Cyrus got his forces in by way of the river. And then, of course, Belshazzar's great feast for a thousand of his lords was going on Babylon in the palace--they didn't know what hit them until they were conquered! With good reason, they were certain that Babylon could never be penetrated. They should have asked Daniel about Isaiah's prophecy! Belshazzar was killed that very night! (Daniel 5:30.)

Now Cyrus, although he did mastermind the seige, never entered the city at that time. He just sent his forces in, but he himself remained outside it somewhere; as soon as he knew that the city was taken he just sent Darius the Mede in to take over and rule it. Daniel 5:31--"And Darius the Median took the kingdom, being about threescore and two years old"--he was the uncle of Cyrus and 82 years of age. Cyrus himself went off immediately to some other part of the Empire, he didn't even bother to enter Babylon. Then a year later, after Darius had reigned for one year as his vassal king over Babylon, Cyrus finally entered the city in triumph--one year had transpired since the original conquest. Now that gives the background to the story. All of this is not mentioned in the Compendium because the destruction of Babylon and the later rule of the Persians over that part of the world is very well known. The Persians ruled right down to the time when Alexander the Great came and conquered the Persian Empire in 332 BC.

EXPLANATION OF THE THREE TROJAN WARS

Note: Here we are breaking into the middle of a lecture. The important topic is Mr. Freiberg's explanation of the significance of the three Trojan Wars which picks up at the bottom of the page.

The Hurrians

Next we have the Hurrians, a people who come into Mesopotamia. They are called "the Huri" or "Hurrians." They came into Mesopotamia rather suddenly and took over the power that was left when the Mitanni kingdom went down. Pp. 372-73: "Tushratta was the first Mitannian king of this era to claim the title 'lord of the Hurrian land' as well as 'lord of the Mitanni land.'" When the Hurrians came in the Mitanni kings were still at large. One fought against the other and the Hurrians finally got the upper hand and the Mitanni succumbed, and the Hurrians established themselves in Mesopotamia.

They first appear in the time of Amenhotpe III; and the statement is that they apparently came from the east. The Egyptian sources make the statement (p. 373): "The Ethiopians, removing from the River Indus, settled near Egypt." (See more on this on 161.) This must be referring to the Hurrians who came into Mesopotamia at that time. The borders of Egypt extended right up the Euphrates in those days (p. 374). The Egyptians had gone up and conquered along the shore of the Mediterranean all the way up into Mesopotamia bordering on Assyria. That's why the statement is that when these Hurrians came into Mesopotamia and settled there that they were settling on the borders of Egypt—by virtue of the fact that Egypt extended that far. They are called Ethiopians: Remember there were Ethiopians in the east and Ethiopians in Africa. These were Ethiopians from the River Indus.

These were a Cushite type of people. No list of their kings has been preserved.

The Phrygians

Next we have one more important people, the Phrygians. They were a people in Asia Minor contemporary to a large degree with the Hittites. Later on they figure very prominently in European history; thus they are very important.

The Phrygians lived in almost the very center of Asia Minor as part of the empire of the Hittites or Hatti; but Phrygia was a separate kingdom within that empire. Remember that in the ancient world there were kingdoms and sub-kingdoms and sub-sub-kingdoms (just as it has been till recently before modern republics came into being). The discussion begins on page 375.

These Phrygians were also connected with the Assyrians to quite a great extent.

The name "Phrygia" is a Greek word. Notice the definition on page 375. "Phryges" or "Phrygians" means freemen — men who are free.

These people were involved in what is known as THE TROJAN WAR. This war is very important—it really is the beginning of European history in one way of looking at it. So we should discuss it in detail.

On the very northwestern tip of Anatolia, where the straits are fairly narrow, there was this famous fortress called the city of Troy. As we have, of course, Homer's famous work, the Iliad, which deals with the last year of the famous battle of Troy. In this battle the Greeks fought against the Trojans, ended up defeating them, and destroying the city of Troy.

Troy's Strategic Location

Troy was a very important and very strategic fortress primarily because of the fact that it controlled the Dardanelles-Bosphorus Straits (the Hellespont). To be in control of Troy was like holding Gibraltar in the days before airplanes! Troy controlled all the shipping coming through the Black Sea to the Mediterranean and vice-versa; and could charge any kind of a tribute they pleased from people passing through. And in times of war they would be able to control the movement of troops across the straits as well as through the straits whichever way any military forces tried to move.

In about the 1200's BC the Greeks had already begun to establish some colonies on the north shore of the Black, and Greek shipping was going through the straits. Their purpose was to pick up grain to feed the population at home. But the people in Troy controlled those straits; thus they put quite a strain on Greek shipping. Therefore it was just a matter of time before the Greeks would start to complain, the Trojans would say "no," and war would result!

Homer's story is that the whole battle was fought over a woman! But like Herodotus, the Greek historian, said: If HELEN had really been involved there and that's who they fought over, the Trojans would have gladly given Helen back in order to save their city! He said they wouldn't have fought over a woman! That's just put in there to make the story more interesting. The story is that the Trojans had captured Helen who was the wife of one of the Greek generals and the Greeks launched one thousand ships in order to get her back! And they fought there at the city of Troy for ten years.

The Trojan Wars

It is a fact that they did fight for TEN YEARS. (See vol. two, page 169.) The war actually started in the year 1191. The Greeks besieged Troy for ten miserable years!

All the main forces of Greece had gone over in league to Troy to fight against the Trojans. On the other side the Trojans were holding out. Homer's Iliad describes the final battles in the last year. The story opens up with the picture that here is the tenth year of the seige, they hadn't gotten anywhere, all had grown discouraged and were about to give up. Finally, however, they made a few last attacks and finally overcame Troy in 1181.

However, there was a later Trojan War — and then a later one still, three in all which were very similar! Homer has taken all three and telescoped them together (sort of put them in a concertina and squeezed them all!) and made one long epic story out of three separate events. But basically, the first war ended in 1181. This first war the Trojans lost. Hence the Greeks had the opportunity to glorify themselves about this event and Homer could write the story he did.

Next, there was a second war of shorter duration which ended in 1149. In this case the Trojans won and the Greeks lost. Consequently you have a hard time finding anything about this war in Greek history!

Then, finally, there was a third Trojan War which also lasted for ten years — and there were some amazing parallels. This final struggle lasted from 687 to 677. Again this time, the Greeks won and the Trojans lost!

Now how do the Phrygians fit into this picture? The Phrygians fought on the Trojan side. The parallels between the peoples who fought on the two opposing sides in the First and II Trojan Wars is very similar. Thus, as far as the populations are concerned, we may speak of the two without separating them.

Assyrians in the Trojan Wars

Basically the picture is that the Greeks were fighting against the Trojans. However, on the Trojan side were not only the Trojans themselves because Troy was a small city of just a few acres in size. It was a fort—that's all it really was. But all of Asia Minor, and even some people from further east, came to the aid of Troy. That's the important thing! The Phrygians came to their aid; the Hittites also; and some minor kingdoms from along the immediate coastal regions; and the Assyrians from Nineveh sent a large contingent, a large army out to the west, to help the Trojans!

The reason why the Assyrians would send a great army all the way from Nineveh to western Asia Minor was that all of this region was controlled by Assyria. No matter what all these people were racially in the area, Assyria was in control over them. This was the region of the greater Assyrian Empire. Thus it was in Assyria's interests to maintain a hold on that strategic sea gate! Therefore Assyria sent an army to help the Trojans against the invading Greeks.

When Troy fell to pieces, the Assyrians and all their allies along with the Trojans were defeated. The Greeks won. What happened next is very important: Many armies had come to Troy to fight. Though defeated, they were not obliterated—there were no atomic bombs in those days! Many of them did not return to their homeland; others had come to power back there anyway. So these soldiers began to drift around; some of them remained in Asia Minor. But basically they began to move into Europe! Thus, after all three Trojan Wars—but mainly after the First and Third—large migrations into Europe took place! (And Homer is useful in that he describes who the peoples were on both sides in these conflicts; and so we have some details about these people who came into Europe.)

The point for our present study is that the PHRYGIANS were among those who migrated into Europe after the Trojan War!

Phrygian Migration Into Europe

After the war we find the Phrygians coming into Macedonia north of Greece.

The Macedonians were a bit tongue-tied; they were like some Greeks are today—they cannot pronounce foreign languages very well (they have difficulty learning English). And the Macedonians were like that. So when the Phrygians came into Macedonia and settled there, they didn't call them "Phryges"—they called them "Briges!" They couldn't pronounce the "f" sound. Their own king Phillip they called "Billip!" Now in the Macedonian language the name Briges also meant freemen—just as the Phrygians in Asia Minor were known by the meaning of their name as freemen. That is important because this appellation went all the way along with them in their migrations.

The Greeks, later on, have records of these Phrygians in Europe going a little further to the north and settling in the area of Hungary (and also part of Rumania) where they expanded and became quite populous.

Then, from there, those Phrygians migrated into Western Europe. It is not known whether they traveled overland or by sea. They could have sailed down the Danube and out through the Mediterranean Sea and out in the Atlantic. (This seems like a long trip but it actually would have been easier than crossing Europe in wagons through territories with many hostile tribes.) At any rate, they made the trip because next they turn up in Holland!

However, in Holland they are no longer known as the Phrygians or Briges but they are known as the "Franks." Now, to be quite frank about the Franks, the word "Frank" means free—to be "frank" is to be free! The meaning of the name is free. So the Franks too were freemen—this same appellation followed the Phrygians all the way west!

The Greeks, incidentally, had referred to the Phrygians, and later on they gave to the Franks, one and the same name: Phraggoi (top of page 376). The Greeks today would pronounce this word "Franci"—you put an "n" before the double "g". "Franci" (hard "c") is the way the Greeks pronounce the name of the Phrygians. They use the same term for the Franks in Europe. Even today in parts of Greece any westerner is commonly referred to as a Frank, and they spell it "Phraggoi." So here is more proof that the Phrygians are the Franks.

They went into Europe as far as Holland. But they didn't stay in Holland. They migrated down towards Belgium; then they started Gaul or France. They generally drifted down into that region. They took over all of France; they gave their name to France.

Then branches of them sent settlements into Germany where we find them living today mainly in Franconia.

Charlemagne, the first German Kaiser, was a Frank. Many other German Kaisers were Franks. There apparently were two types of them—German Franks and French Franks. But that is how the Phrygians figure into European history. They are very important. And they were part of the larger Assyrian Empire.

Notice on page 376 that Dr. Hoeh notes that the Phrygians were mentioned in Hittite records also.

He also mentions the fact that there were two types of Franks—East and West. One was German, the other French. The separation came in the Middle Ages (see page 181 of vol. two—it was the first half of the 300's AD) when France and Germany became established.

Were the Franks from Reuben?

Whether or not the Franks are descended from Reuben is a question for further research. Read Mr. Apartian's thesis on the origins of the French. Mr. Freibergs had not read it as yet but he does connect the western or French Franks with Reuben. He does make the connection in that booklet. Check the details there. There is very scarce material in this field, very little material on which to base any conclusions.