

The Syro-Mesopotamian Ethnology as Revealed in Genesis X

by R. Gayre of Gayre, editor *The Mankind Quarterly*; (1973)

In memory of Dr. R. R. Marett, Rector of Exeter College, Oxford, Anthropologist, Seigneur of Jersey.

Foreword

The ground-work for this essay was completed long ago. It was part of some extensive research carried out at Exeter College, Oxford, before the war.

Believing that there may be some value in giving some aspects of this work I have decided to release the results of the research for publication. The references are dated, as a consequence, but, I think, for all that, are not out of date, and the facts adduced are still valid. Needless to say this is only the result of my research in those days, and it does not go into the detailed studies of many aspects of the subject. It is merely the conclusions of the work then undertaken.

23rd March, 1973.

R. Gayre of Gayre and Nigg

Introduction

In the tenth chapter of Genesis we have an account of the ethnology of the known world at the time the chapter was written. In the past, such as in the nineteenth century, and earlier, and spilling over into this one, many people, and at certain periods, all people, took it as their *vade-mecum* of the relationships of the nations of the whole world. It was because of this that certain fundamentalist groups held the view that slavery, for example, was justified because Ham had to serve his brethren, and Ham was identified with the black races.

In the same way it was taught that, for all that, all men were brethren, being descended from Ham, Shem, and Japhet. As a consequence of which (and other arguments as well) the polygenists were routed by the monogenists. This view is still with us, but has spread from religious circles, where the tenth chapter of Genesis was not of any relevance any longer, to the secularistic, and, ultimately, to the Communist society. These latter hold to a doctrine which had its origins in the Bible, more firmly than anywhere else—although they and the believers in the Bible are deadly enemies.

There are in the Church today many elements which may consider that the tenth chapter of Genesis has no connection with modern ideas. But in that it had, so far as their predecessors are concerned, and in so far as it annunciated an apparent doctrine of the monogenist origin of mankind, they are the heirs of that thinking, for all that.

What, we wonder, might have been the climate of thought, if this chapter had been rightly understood, especially in the nineteenth century, when roots of much of modern thought had been implanted! We think it might have been different.

Therefore, it is my view that an exposition of what this chapter of Genesis says is relevant to us today, and that is an excuse for this little book

We have not ignored the Egyptian attempts at an accurate ethnological analysis of the peoples of ancient times. These are much later than the times of which we speak in this essay.

The internal evidence suggests that this is an account of the second millennium B.C. and so, vastly older than the period at which it came to be written down.

In the Bible we have the whole ancestry of Man derived from the Creation in the Garden of Eden, which Professor E. O. James^[1] points out starts with the Bronze Age of 4000 B.C. That account is a Subarean story, and the rivers which flowed out of it came from four heads. From the account it is clear that it is located somewhere in the northern Mesopotamian region. One of these rivers encircled the land of Havilah. The background is a land rich in minerals—which is true for the region of the Taurus Mountains stretching into the Anatolian and Armenian complex of mountains.^[2]

The account of the next great episode is the Flood. In this connection the Ark comes to rest on Mount Ararat, and so in the same complex of mountains, whence issues the four rivers of Eden. The account also has its nearest parallel in that of Gilgamesh which is believed to be pre-Semitic, and of Subarean origins.

Therefore, the background to the Bible story is quite clear. It is not located in the Semitic world at all, and it has nothing to do with Cush in Ethiopia or with southern Arabia, but with the northern Mesopotamian lands, and in particular of Harran and the lands over which the Mitanni exercised some control.

It is true that at a later date Cush, for instance, is taken to refer to the lands south of Egypt, and that Sheba and the rest are identified with southern Arabia. But these are not the identifications of the original places of Genesis x, and this has been the trap into which the expositors have fallen.

The reasons for a duplication of names in two very different parts of the world are manifold. We have, first of all, tribes raiding southwards, and so, in some cases, they took their names with them to new settlements. Sometimes, however, the names are purely fortuitous and, by chance, they came to resemble the original names. This is so as far as the Cush name of

Egypt is concerned. Therefore, no matter how hoary is the belief that these places are those referred to in Genesis x, it is simply not true.

We believe that in the light of all this, the tenth chapter of Genesis has to be viewed in an entirely different light than it has heretofore. It does not support a monogenetic origin for man, as it is simply concerned with a section of the white races. Furthermore, it is restricted to peoples who form an arc of mountain peoples to the north (called Japhet and belonging largely to the Armenoid race), an inner circle of Semito-Hamitic peoples (called Ham and belonging mainly to the Mediterranean races), and injected through these, particularly on the line separating these stocks, other tribes (called the sons of Shem) who are influenced by the Indo-Europeans, and are, in some cases, more or less Nordic.

All this may be folklore, biblical folklore, and that of the ancient world. But what folklore, giving us glimpses into the world of the Fertile Crescent in two thousand B.C.! But we believe it is more than folklore. It was a serious attempt to classify the races with which the account was concerned on a definite genetic basis, and for that reason the genealogical method is employed.

The Background

The tenth chapter of Genesis sets out the ethnology of the time of the writer or writers. What time is that? Was it written as a whole or was it written by several writers over a long period of time? Did it come into its present form in the sixth century, or thereabouts, B.C.?

All these questions would lead us a long way from our subject, and into the realm of Higher Criticism, which I wish to avoid—partly because I am not a Higher Critic but an ethnologist.

In ultimate it does not matter. By the time the Bible, and this chapter of Genesis, took its form, there was listed the nations of the "world" and it is from that point we start. We ought to repeat that, as we have already stated in the introduction, that in our opinion chapter ten, or some elements of it, are ancient, and come down from as early as about the time of Abraham, which can be placed at the beginning of the second millennium, although other parts may be later.

In the end it should be remembered that the date of its construction and the accuracy of its story is not in any way limited by the theoretical structure of textual analysis, based upon the use of particular forms of speech, words, or dialect. It can only be judged by the reliability of the account which it conveys. Professor Sir John L. Myres has adopted a similar position in his analysis of Greek folk memory.^[3] "If the result is coherent, it must be so for one of two reasons, either amazing ingenuity among the sixth century chroniclers 'must be postulated,' in which event we have still to ask how they knew on what historical assumption to proceed, or a

living, accurate folk-memory of ancient times. And if the result coheres also with sources of information quite beyond the knowledge of these chroniclers, the conclusion seems unavoidable that Greek folk-memory was historically trustworthy, that it enables us to explore aspects of Greek antiquity for which we have not yet other evidence, and, in particular, to select the right localities wherein to look for such evidence as Schlieman selected Troy and Mycenae, and Sir Arthur Evans selected Cnossos."

Therefore, if the biblical account coheres and is accurate for its ethnology of the second millennium B.C. then it is reliable, whether the account is due to an accurate transmission of folk-memory, or derived from earlier sources still. It may have been written down and edited in the seventh century B.C. but that is all.

The chapter takes the genealogical form. The nations are reviewed, and a genealogy constructed, on which they are all linked together. This is as good a form as any, for a pre-scientific age, especially one which recited the relationship. But it means that we must be prepared for curious anomalies to occur. Sometimes people of mixed ancestry, or dominantly of one culture, may have one ancestor indicated where more than one, in fact, might be more appropriate. Furthermore, sometimes a very ancient substratum is given as the ancestral link of the people concerned, and not the more obvious, and later. It is for that reason, among others, that I believe Genesis x is ancient with, at various periods, parts being added later.

Now the background of the tenth chapter is embedded in the Genesis story of Creation, and the Flood.

In the account of Creation I see two stories. These are consistent with Genesis x. In putting this interpretation forward, I believe that it supports the polygenist position, but I can do no other. While it is true that the second chapter of Genesis is thought to be a recapitulation of the first, the evidence is quite otherwise. The first chapter sees the creation of all living things including men. Chapter two onwards deals with the creation of Adam, the Adamic family, and their location in a special country. When Cain is driven out of the Garden of Eden he says that if men find him they will slay him.

Consequently, I cannot escape from the conclusion that two Creations are meant. This is reinforced by the intermarriage which takes place in chapter six between the Sons of God and the Daughters of Men, whose descendants fill the earth with violence.

Finally, we come to the Great Flood, from which our ethnology starts. In the light of what goes before, and what comes after it, it is clear that it was conceived as of limited extent, merely clearing an area, a large area if you like, but limited in extent for all that. It was no cataclysm which covered the whole earth, as Bible scholars once thought.

Therefore, the Hebrew writer, whatever name he uses for God, and the editors who later gave to the world this account, worked to design, of refining down and down, from the generalised Creation, to the Adamic, and then, eventually, to the destruction of certain races of mankind, to start again in the generations after the Flood.

It is then that we have the detailed genealogies, ancestral of certain races of mankind, which are recounted in Genesis x and which are the subject matter of this essay.

It will be observed that the biblical concept of race relationships is a division into three parts—which are considered to be Ham, Shem and Japhet. These, as we have observed, were believed to comprehend all mankind by the theologians of an earlier generation than our own. As a consequence Shem was ancestor of the Caucasoid races, Japhet of the yellow or Mongoloid and Ham of the black races. This led some to seek to attribute the black colour of skin of the latter stock as a curse set on them by God and hence it was justified to enslave them. Now the curious thing is that this three-pronged division of the races of mankind comprehended the white race solely.

Professor A. H. Sayce^[4] claims that the tenth chapter of Genesis is ethnographical, being also geographical, and not ethnological.^[5] This is in a sense true, but when it classifies people by their allegedly blood relationship, it is attempting to be an ethnological account, and I have, therefore, treated it as such.

We have to discriminate between the strictly ethnological format (of blood), that of culture (or ethnographical in this context), and one of neighbourliness (or geography). It is true, therefore, that this is an ethno-geographical account but, for all that, there are important ethnological links given, which I think the following pages will make clear.

Of course, this is not the only early account of ancient races, but it is the most comprehensive. The Egyptian monuments portrayed the features of the main races with which they had contact, but they do not seek to classify them, and make a reasonable relationship, detailing how all that we mentioned spring from the same source. Therein is chapter ten unique. That man arose so late as the Flood is simply not true. But, if we leave that aside, as this was a convenient basis on which to construct the "Tables of the Nations," the relationships which are shown are essentially true, as well as are the distinctness of each stock.

Therefore, it can be said that Genesis x is the earliest comprehensive account of the nations of the ancient world, and it throws light on the situation early in the second millennium in particular. However, we should note that the astrological soothsaying texts of Assurbanipal (668-626 B.C.), but going back to earlier originals, divide the world into four quarters, namely, Akkad (Sumu) in the south, Elam in the east, Amurru in the west and Subartu in the

north.^[6] This is, nevertheless, later than the Triune system employed by the writer of Genesis x.

There is, however, no yellow race mentioned and certainly none of the mistakenly dubbed "Cushitic" or Hamitic race, and of the Negroid races. All these are rigorously excluded from the Bible account of the "Tables of the Nations."

Shem

At the outset it will be shown that the sons of Shem are not the same as the Semitic peoples, who spoke the language of Canaan and Babylonia.

The mistaken identification of these peoples led to the term *Semitic* being applied to a series of tongues, the survivors of which, today, are Hebrew, Arabic and Maltese. In fact it becomes clear that these languages should never have been called *Semitic* at all. But the Hamitic tongues are rightly named. Since these languages are cognate I shall throughout call them the Semito-Hamitic languages in order to take the unfortunate emphasis off Semitic for them.

At the same time, for the sons of Shem I shall use *Shemitic* to distinguish them from Semitic. In fact, the peoples speaking Semitic in this account are Hamites, and the Shemites did not (at an early date, it is true) speak Semitic at all, but when, eventually, they became Semitic speaking, it was Aramaic which was their first language.

With that explanation we will therefore proceed.

The Sons of Shem are given in the tenth chapter of Genesis as Elam, Asshur, Arphaxed, Lud and Aram.

Immediately Professor A. H. Sayce^[7] would point out that Elam is not related to the other races mentioned here. But what is his authority for this?

Elam was a neighbour of the Medes. It came to the notice of Babylonia, for instance, by its immigration into southern Babylonia which was not unconnected with arriving bands from Media and Persia. The Elamite King was the lord of Khammurabi when he came to the throne. But Khammurabi rebelled and this was the beginning of the end of the Elamites in Assyria. Khammurabi was, himself, of Syrian strain.

Donald A. Mackenzie,^[8] citing C. H. W. Johns,^[9] asks: "Were the pre-Semitic Elamites originally speakers of an agglutinative language, like the Sumerians and the present-day Basques, who were conquered in prehistoric times by a people of Aryan speech?"

The term Elam is said to be merely a translation of the Akkadian meaning "highlands." The native title for their country was Anzan, or Ansan, and the capital was Susa.^[10]

Professor Sir John Myres^[11] speaks of the Medes, Persians and Elamites as Aryan which is in line with Donald A. Mackenzie's view. Flinders Petrie claims that the Hyksos were Elamites who came from and through Syria from the Caucasus.^[12] This is, again, looking in the same direction, for there is clear association of the Hyksos with Aryan origins.

It would look as though we have a people who were Armenoid originally, and later subdued by the Indo-Europeans.

There was an attack of drought upon Turkestan and Persia^[13] which afflicted Anau, Susa and Tripolje, at the end of the third millennium B.C. and which set the tribes and people in motion.

Therefore, they would as easily be called sons of Shem or of Japhet, but, so far as the writer of the record is concerned he lists them with Shem.

Asshur is Assyria of course. But at an early period were they not impregnated with Indo-European blood?

As we have pointed out elsewhere, the theory that the Aryan Asura and the Persian Ahura is not generally accepted, but for all that we believe it has relevance here.

However, a thousand years before Thotmes III an early wave of Aryans may have occupied Assyria. Early kings of Assyria have names which are neither Semitic nor Sumerian. As many of the names are Elamite Mr Johns^[14] suggests a connection between the early conquerors of Assyria and the Elamites. The possibility is urged by Mr Johns' suggestion that Assyria may have been dominated in pre-Semitic times by the conquerors of the Aryan military aristocracy of Mitanni.^[15]

In this event it means that parts of the tradition of chapter ten must be very old—2000 B.C., or thereabouts, even if only written down in the sixth century B.C.

The oldest known city rulers of Asshur bear Subaraic names—Ushpia and Kikia. In the third millennium B.C. we find many peoples with Subaraic names settled in various parts of Mesopotamia. It is suggested that they were the remnants of the aboriginal population of lower Mesopotamia, belonging to the Armenoid race. Subaraic was spoken in the region from the Tigris and Assyria to Asia Minor and Syria in the third millennium B.C. It was certainly spoken in the Khabur headwaters also.^[16]

Since Asshur is included in the race of Shem (and not Japhet, which would be the Subaraic) it would indicate that the account in Genesis x is, in part, some time in the third millennium B.C. rather than later.

That the Mitanni had settled for a while at Asshur is clear. This was not much later than two thousand B.C.^[17]

However, it would seem that there must have been some dominant "Mitannian" element in Asshur (at the time this account was formulated) to include it here. We can say that this is a purely geographical linking up of contiguous peoples. But, in that case, it would have been easier to put Asshur with Kish and the sons of Ham.

Arphaxed was the region on the Upper Euphrates which coincided with the land of Harran, and it was adjacent to, if not the same as, the land of the Mitanni. These latter were, at least, partly Indo-Europeans.

The Mitanni had a homogeneous state, which occupied all the foothills east of the Euphrates, with a loose confederation of semi-nomadic Aramaeans. It brought homage and tribute from the "Hittite" states in 1469 B.C.^[18] King Subliliuma (whom the Egyptians called conveniently Suple) threw his whole force against the Mitanni in 1400 B.C. This was the end of the Mitanni.^[19]

The horse was known in southern Mesopotamia (such as the fighting chariots at Ur) in the third millennium B.C., and it was native to Upper Mesopotamia (along with a painted pottery of an earlier period still) at Tell Halaf. The use of an Indo-European word for horse in all this region, coupled with rules and management of the Mitanni for horse-breeding, indicate the introduction of a horse-loving people about two thousand B.C. They probably came from the direction of Elam, where the horse was known as early as the fourth millennium B.C.^[20] They also had chariots with eight-spoked wheels. The horse was known to the Sumerians as the "ass of the east" which indicates the general direction from which the horse came.^[21]

Baron von Oppenheim is quite definite that the Mitanni (or at least their leaders) were Aryans, of the Satem, or eastern, branch of the Indo-Europeans.^[22] The later Hyksos, he suggests, were led by Mitanni rulers.^[23] Sir William Flinders Petrie claims that the Hyksos were Elamites who came from and through Syria. They ultimately came from the Caucasus.^[24] But all this is really pointing in the same direction Hyksos-Syrian-Mitanni-land-Elam.

The confusion has lain in the fact that all these intrusive, conquering, Aryan peoples, adopted the languages of the conquered.^[25] In this case at first a Subaraic language, and later a Canaanitish (Aramaic). But elements of their religion remained, with Mitra, Indra, Varunna and Nasatya. Therefore, the Mitanni elements in the land of Harran had undoubtedly an Aryan background.

Arphaxed, however, means the Land of Kashed, or the Kasdim, or the Khassites.

We may well ask who were these Khassites. Gaudash, a Khassite chief, seized Babylon and founded the second (Khassite) dynasty, and they remained dominant for 576 years.

They were a people of the Zagros range. Peake and Fleure speculate on whether they were of east Alpine or Armenoid type, or whether they may have been allied to the Elamites and kindred tribes.^[26] As early as the time of Sargon, if not before, there was in the foothills of the Zagros mountains a people known as Su and Gu, who, although Subaraic tribes, seem, at least, to have been from the northern Steppe.^[27] These Peake and Fleure believe to have been Nordics, using an Indo-European language. Such people formed the ruling caste of the Kharrians and Hittites, and since the names of the Khassite kings have a very Indo-European appearance we may suspect that these people had come under Nordic leadership, before they established their rule in Mesopotamia.^[28] The Khassites are credited with bringing the horse to Mesopotamia, which seems to be conclusive evidence.

About 1203 B.C., Ula-Buriash, Khassite King of Babylon, conquered the Sea country, thus extending his dominions to the Persian Gulf, as well as his conquests to the north-west, up the valley of the Euphrates.^[29]

The arrival of the Khassites in Mesopotamia, and of the Hittites and Khassians into northern Syria, so disturbed the natives that some emigrated southwards into Palestine and Egypt.^[30]

The Hyksos, who were part of this invading force, perhaps Khassites, or Mitanni, were the first peoples to introduce the horse and chariot into Egypt.^[31]

Then we come to Aram. This refers to the land of the Aramaeans, and so the Aramaeans themselves. These were definitely an Indo-European people, as their features from the Egyptian monuments make plain without any doubt, both as to colour and form.

They became settled in Syria and in the land of Nahor (Nahoraim) and also in the city of Ur (that which is in Mesopotamia, and not that in Babylon). It was from this city that Abraham emigrated in the first instance. In Deuteronomy (xxvi, 5) we read that Jacob said "a Syrian ready to perish was my father." This then is the stock from which Israel originally came.

This land, however, was occupied by the Mitanni or Mitannian Hittites, who had Aryan antecedents, although they may well have dissipated these by intermarriage with the people of the country.

Therefore, at the time of the Patriarch there is every reason to believe that as Syrians they were of northern European type and, directly or indirectly, related to the Mitannians and Mitannian Hittites and Khassites. The evidence for the connection of the Mitanni with Aryans rests not only on the evidence we have given, and their location, but on such things as god-

names. Thus they had Teshup, who is identical with Tarku, Huthor of Anatolia. The nearby Hittite military aristocracy had Mitra, Uruwna and Nasaatiia (Mitra, Varunna, Indra and Nasatya).^[32] One of the Mitannian tribes was called the Kharri, and some think this is Arya. It seems that the Patriarchal family must have had some connection with these people. This would rationalise the fact that they were considered Syrians, whose type is, at a time shortly after this, well known from the monuments. However, these matters will be gone into later when we come to study them more precisely. These people, the Kharri or Kharrians who lived in the biblical Harran where the Euphrates debouches onto the plains, were originally a people of the mountains region west of Persia, and related to the Elamites. They spoke Caucasian or Subarean language, but had come under the influence of Nordic chiefs. Thence the resemblance of their deities, such as Indor (Indra), Mitra (Muthra), Varunna and the Nasatiarma twins. They had horses.^[33] It was out of Harran that the Patriarchs came.

Lud was the Lydian people, who were mercenaries, situated on the southern shores of the Anatolian peninsula. Now we know that the Hittites were Indo-Europeans ruling over a conquered Hattic people. It is, therefore, very likely that the Lydians were in the same category. Thus it is possible to have the Ludim under Mizraim and the Lud from Shem. However, Sayce holds that the text must be corrupted here.^[34]

Furthermore, these terms are to be regarded as extending beyond the people described. The Lydians, for instance, are the north-west peoples, Elam those that lie to the east, and so on. In this sense Professor Sayce is correct in calling the account ethnographical and geographical. But, if so, then Lud refers to the north-west peoples—in the direction of Greece and they are the Grecians. However, I do not think this is the reference here. Either the text is corrupt, or else there is another rational explanation to be sought.

The text then goes on to explain that the descendants from Aram are: "Uz and Hul, and Gether, and Mash."

These are obscure. The land of Mashi was that towards which the Babylonian Noah turned. It was "Sunset Hill." But in the Assyrian inscriptions the land of Masnmash is frequently mentioned. Sargon tells us his conquests had extended throughout Mas, as far as the river of Egypt.

Mesha has been placed in the Yemen, but this seems too far away from the other sites. Traditionally Mash was north of the Euphrates adjoining Syria and just south of Harran. These people came from Mount Masius placed in Mesopotamia, between that place and Armenia. Garstang^[35] says that from Masius Mons (Gebel Tur) to the eastern Taurus, in the upper basin of the Taurus, were the Kharrians.

Therefore, there can be no doubt that Mash was in the north, adjacent to the northern mountains and not in southern Arabia. It is likely that this Mash is the Mesha referred to later as the home of some of the Shemite tribes. If so the whole of these tribes are to be located in Mesopotamia, and not in southern Arabia at all!

Gether and Hul are immediately south of Aram (or Syria) and so may be considered a part of it. Sayce^[36] would see in this term that the inhabitants of Phoenicia and Palestine in the hieroglyphic records are called Zahi and Khal (Kar). This would, perhaps, link them with Kharri, or the Harran peoples, as we should expect on the basis of this genealogical account. Josephus says Gether were Bactrians, and if so they were Aryans. Therefore, to place Uz down in Jordan, just north of Aqqaba, seems strange. Especially as I Josephus (vi, 4) tells us that it is between Palestine and Assyria. There is a district in northern Mesopotamia of this name. Therefore, it is northerly and not belonging to southern Palestine.

Aphaxed begot Salah, and Salah Eber, and to Eber was born two sons, the one Peleg and the other Joktan. That is, coming out of the Khassites or inhabitants of Arphaxed are Peleg and Joktan.

Salah, Peleg and Eber are certainly in the line of Abraham (as is clear from Genesis vi, 11-29), and if so cannot have an origin arising south of Mesopotamia. Therefore it is inadvisable to look south, as one should look to the north for them. Eber is the origin of the name Hebrew. The Khabiru were a tribe of mercenary soldiers in the land of the Hittites, and no doubt, Mitanni as well.

The Khabiru were classified as a tribe of the Syrians.^[37] Here is complete consistency with what we have seen already. These Khabiru comprised the Patriarchal tribes. They appear in Palestine at the time as late as Tell el Amarna. If that is to be equated with the Exodus, then we have the Hebrew (Khabiru) attacking, as the Khabiru relatives also attack from the north the outposts of Egypt.^[38]

It is when we come to Joktan that the mystery deepens. Joktan is associated with the south, the Yemen and Sheba. Can this be related to "and unto Eber were born two sons: the name of the one was Peleg [which means Division]; for in his days the earth was divided; and his brother's name was Joktan" (Genesis x, 25)? There is here a division of some kind. Can it refer to the separation of these "brothers?" Peleg has been identified as Paliga and it is mentioned in a parchment recently dug up at Dura-Europos.^[39] The spelling Phalga occurs elsewhere. This place is on the Euphrates, just above the mouth of the Khabur.^[40] Therefore, there is no southern location here.

Some have, of course, fitted these peoples into those of southern Arabia. Certainly in the Yemen and Saba we have, even today, light-eyed people. The Queen of Sheba's people had some genetic relationship with Israel also. This does not fit the theory of Sayce that this is a geographical account rather than an ethnological one, as there is no geographical relationship here, for these places are widely separated. Consequently, on this basis alone, the orthodox locations are in error. Peleg and Joktan must be in the north.

Then, from Joktan, there is given his "sons." They include Almodab, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, Hadaram, Uzal, Diklah, Obal, Abinael, Sheba, Ophir, Havilah and Jobab.

"And their dwelling was from Mesha, as thou goest unto Sephar a mount of the east" (Genesis x, 30). This would be taken to mean that they dwelt from Mesha, the Yemen and towards the east. But is it so? Are we not confusing the issue. Genesis x, as we analyse it, is taking on the shape of a northern Mesopotamian document. Havilah, for instance, is surely there, as it appears in connection with one of the rivers of the Garden of Eden—which is surely northern in location. Mash (which may well be Mesha also) is in the north as well. Furthermore, these places, if taken to be in the Yemen, are not in the east but the south, for there is no evidence that any compiler of the Genesis account was in southern Arabia, and able to look east to Sephar. The account in Genesis is old, and so words become corrupted and place names are wrongly identified. Thus Cush, which I contend is Kish, comes later, in the Bible itself, to be Kash south of Egypt. In the same way Sheba means, by the time of Solomon, a reference to the southern Yemen location. Once there were great civilizations in these southern parts of Arabia. A "Cushitic" or Ethiopic influence was certainly there, perhaps from across the Red Sea, and an influence from the north is also to be found.^[41]

But the Semitic conquerors of these parts must come from the non-Shemitic peoples who, for instance, from the Bedawin, which, in the classification of Genesis x are Hamitic. On top of these have been imposed a light-eyed strain. But I do not believe that they are a matter of reference in the account of Genesis x. It is a northern story of the origins of peoples, and their expansion. In so far as this account is concerned it is later than Genesis x, and it is from Ham and not from Shem.

It is noticeable that some of their names appear under Cush. Thus we have Sheba and Havilah, for instance. This we do not believe is a mistake. We think that these refer to the same places where the native stock was from Ham, in other words it was Cushitic, that is Hamito-Semitic. That the same or similar names may have been transplanted to south Arabia (such as Sheba or Saba for instance) is either purely fortuitous, or else due to a later migration of peoples from north to south.

Ancient Israel

From the line of Shem, and in particular from that branch which is designated Arphaxed, came Abraham and the ancient Israelitish or Hebrew peoples.

If we take the story as we find it in the Bible, we have derived from Arphaxed, Nahor. As we have already pointed out Arphaxed is the land of the Khasdim. This region is in the Upper Euphrates, where, at one time, the warlike Mitanni were rulers. The term itself is meant for the whole region which lies beyond, because it is at the upper end of the arc of the Fertile Crescent. A writer located in Palestine could easily reach Assyria and Babylon by going through the land of Khased, and so all beyond came to be known by that name.

It is well-established that it was in the land of Khased (Arphaxed) that there existed the land of Nahor. Thus was the land of Aram-Naharaim, the furthestmost and northernmost outpost of the Egyptian empire at its greatest extent. It was from here, at this place, a fortress on the upper reaches of the Euphrates, that the Egyptians looked out on the alien civilizations to the north.

Now the whole of this region was within the sphere of influence of the Mitanni, robber barons who had conquered the whole region. That they had some (or partial) Aryan background of some sort is clear. Out of this region came Nahor of the Bible, and from him Abraham. It was back to this land that Isaac sent his son Jacob to obtain a wife from his own kindred.

Therefore, the background of Abraham was in the land of Aram-Naharaim (the land of Aram or Syria and of Nahor, now the modern Al-Jezireh) on the borders of the land of Khased (Arphaxed) and in the land of the Mitanni. Aram-Naharaim is certainly the Egyptian border fortress of Naharin, known in the Tell el Amarna tablets as Naharima, in the west bank of the Euphrates.

Abraham was also associated with Ur of the "Chaldees." This was not the Ur discovered by Leonard Woolley in lower Babylon. The word "Chaldees" is a translation of Khasdim. It was Ur, the Moon city, of the Mitanni, and it was from there that Abraham came. This is a good 700 miles shorter for the migration than would have been the case had it been from the Babylonian Ur, and it rationalises the Genesis account. There has been confusion here with Kaldu-Kasdu, a name for Chaldea, which does not, however, appear till the ninth century B.C. and is a good deal too late.

Now we are beginning to straighten out the record of Genesis x, and subsequent chapters, so far as Abraham is concerned. But before going any further we must refer to the Hittites. They had conquered that region which is referred to in Genesis x as the land of Lud. Their god-names are Aryan. There seems little doubt that they were an Aryan aristocracy who had

conquered and ruled the Hatti. There appears among them the Khabiru, who have been thought to be Hebrews, but have been rejected out of hand. As we proceed we shall see that this body of mercenaries, employed by the upper class of the Hittites, and very likely of the same race as themselves, were indeed Khabiru or Hebrews, from whence Abraham and his followers were derived, by way of the land of the Khased and of Naharaim. Is so they were, like the Hittites themselves, and the people of Lud, and of Aram, Indo-Europeans by speech, or anciently so, and of Nordic appearance as the monuments make clear when illustrating the Syrian type.^[42]

Abraham is called a Hebrew. Therefore, there was a general falling upon the Egyptian frontiers of a confederacy, of which the Khabiru was a member. The arrival of Abraham on the scene coincided with this beginning of the penetration of the frontiers of Egypt. Later there was the abandonment of Aram-Naharaim, and a general invasion of Mitanni, Aramites and Khabiru into the land of Canaan.^[43] The Tell el Amarna letters show that Palestine was overrun by Khabiru, Mitanni^[44] and also by Amartu (Amorites)^[45] at a later phase of this movement. For several centuries, therefore, these people had been making good their grasp of Syria and Palestine.

In the light of this it can be seen that Abraham was not a Semite shuffling through the desert with his flocks and herds only. True he had these—as they represented wealth. But he had something else—the military instincts due to the stock from which he was derived. This is presupposed in any case, because the Old Testament account is written from the point of view of Abraham, a Shepherd King, who had clearly Aryan affinities. In the time of Metenptah, Eighteenth Dynasty, 1491 B.C., they were in Egypt again.^[46]

It is in the light of that fact that his brilliant night action against the kings is to be judged (whether Chedorlaomer was Kudor-Lagomar matters not to us here). They had taken on a professional soldier, as it were, and they rued the day. That this is no exaggeration the text makes clear. Abraham was a traditional war leader, a Bretwalda. We read that Abraham "led forth his trained men, born in his house, three hundred and eighteen," and pursued the enemy (Genesis xiv, 14). It is significant that in this account Abraham is referred to as a Hebrew, that is a Khabiru.

We must distinguish between Abraham the Syrian (Aramaeans) and the Amorite (Amurru).

It seems at an early date the Amurru had developed in Syria. They were known as being there (by the peoples of Babylonia) and were called the Martu. At some stage they have been conquered by the Aramaeans (Syrians) who formed an overlord caste, and came from the

east—associated with Khassite, Mitanni and the rulers of the Hittites. These overlords were acculturated to the Amorite language, and thus they created Aramaean.

When, eventually, the push against the frontiers of Palestine occurred, and the fortress of Aram-Naharaim was overrun, a whole pouring of peoples from the north took place. Hittites, Aramaeans (the Khabiru and Abraham among them), Mitanni and the Amorites (Amurru or Martu) all fell upon Palestine from early in the second millennium to about the fourteenth century B.C.

Before this, however, the Amorites (Amurru) who were known in the east as Canaanites, in the Twenty-second Dynasty at Akkad (2169-1870 B.C.), won the overlordship not only of Babylon but over the whole of Near East. Khammurabi is the most important ruler of this dynasty.^[47] The Amorites appear to have had remnants of a Subaraic people as that language was still spoken as late as Tell el Amarna times (fourteenth-fifteenth centuries B.C.). There may have been a Subaraic population before the Amorite conquest.^[48]

The sequence of Aramaean and Amorite appears to be as follows. The Amorites conquered the Subaraic folk of Syria. They implanted their language upon them, but they took over some of the gods of the conquered.^[49] This seems to have been the situation about the end of the second millennium B.C. Meanwhile, Mitanni overlords of Harran and surrounding territories established themselves, or near kinsmen of theirs did so. This led to the coming of the "Aramaeans" who were not strictly the Amorites. The dialect of the Canaanite tongue arose in the north, and became the speech of the Aramaeans, and so Aramaean. In time the distinction between the intrusive Aramaeans from the land of Aram-Naharaim, the land of Nahor, and the Amorites became blurred, and so at the time of the Tell el Amarna and later periods the Amorites involved could have been Aramaeans proper or Amorites. The fact of the matter is that they were well-mixed by that time. This accounts for their portraits showing blond and fair men—in other words Nordics, who were related to the Lords of the Mitanni, and spoke originally Aryan. But, at the time this table in Genesis was written, which we think was about 2000 B.C. or a little later, the distinction was still apparent, and that is why Abraham, a Khabiru, is described as an Aramaean, and also as from the land of Nahor, and, before that, out of Arphaxed, or an original Khassite. He is not described as an Amorite.

That this interpretation of the events seems to be correct is demonstrated from Abraham's dealings with Melchisedek, King of Salem. From what we can judge these invading tribes, although snatching the land from the Egyptians, did so under the guise of being the subjects of Egypt. Thus, from the Tell el Amarna tablets we learn of Ebed-Kheba, King of Jerusalem. He was later than Melchisedek, but he used the same formula—without beginning and end,

without father and mother—as occurs in the case of his predecessor. This is clear from Hebrews vii. As Flinders Petrie says: "We must recognise in it a formula familiar at Jerusalem, and as quoted by Abdkiba in referring (to) his elevation to the King."^[50]

What is this, although dimly grasped after a passage of time, but a religious formula derived from the Aryan concepts of the priest-king who never died? We ourselves have it when we proclaim the death of the king, and follow it at once with the name of his successor! We do this 4000 years, or so, later than the times of which we write, when these things still had a meaning and relevance.

Anyway, after his defeat of the kings Abraham comes to Melchisidek and gives him his offerings (as he was bound to do for the priest-king of the same stock whence he was hewn) and the magic formula is used—without beginning and without end, without father and without mother. It was after this priest-kingship that Jesus Christ modelled himself, we are told. But it was the normal Aryan priest-kingship. Every household, among the Indo-Europeans, had the head of the household both as head, chief or king, according to his rank, and priest. There had not yet been created a sacerdotal priesthood. This was Aryan. But so was the covenant-keeping God-head into which Abraham enters with his covenant. The gods of the pagan peoples were not likely to be bound by the oaths they swore through their representatives on earth. But the characteristics of the Indo-European peoples is that God swore by Himself and more or less kept his promises. We have Mitra and Varunna, who were deities of oaths and covenants. This also is true of Zoroaster's Ahura-Mazda at a later period.

Not only so, but from this stock came not only a covenant-making and keeping God, but also a code of laws (the Mosaic code). This can be repeated elsewhere where the Aryan tribes had penetrated. The code of Manu in India, the code of Khammurabi (for there are perceptible traces of Indo-European culture in Assyria at that time), and all the codes that the Indo-Europeans have made in later times. Therefore, this characteristic also points in the same direction. What the exact nationality of Melchisidek was we do not know, except that if he were the predecessor of Ebed-Kheba it was Amorite, who are shown on the monuments as fair people, according to Sayce. The Amorites, as we have argued, were originally subordinate to the Aramaeans (Syrians) of earlier times, and may very well have been impregnated with their blood and elements of their culture.

As a consequence we are left with glimpses of Abraham, of the stock of Arphaxed (Khasdim) and Nahor (Aram-Naharaim), who called himself a Syrian (a man of Aram), as a leader of a band of Khabiru coming south, entering into Canaan, at a time when the Egyptian government was weakened. It is doubtful how far he knew Canaanitish (Hebrew) which his descendants

were to assume as their language. He was probably Aramaean-speaking, and before that, his ancestors had some long forgotten Indo-European speech.

Heth, the Hittite, the friend of Abraham is equated with Heth in the genealogical tables in the line of Canaan by Professor Sayce.^[51] This, however, seems to be arbitrary. There were Hittites and Hittites. The common people were undoubtedly different from their Aryan conquerors. That they could have been of the line Canaan is quite possible, and so the whole of the Hittites would be included under Canaan. That we shall explore in due course. Here, however, we only note that a Hittite was the friend of Abraham, and this coincides with a time when they were advancing into Palestine. The letters from the Egyptian King to his governors in Syria about B.C. 1400 give us an insight into the Hittite armies attacking Palestine then.

That there were strong ties with their homeland on the part of the Patriarchs is seen from the fact that Abraham says "Go to my country, and my Kindred" (Genesis xxiv, 4), and, in addition, Jacob is sent back to Aram-Naharaim to obtain his wives.^[52] This incidentally, throws light on to the position of Esau. The story as told in Genesis xxvii is a very harsh one, full of feminine guile. But it should be remembered he had broken tribal law, by his alliance in marriage with the peoples of Canaan, and so he was not considered fit to be the chief.

In addition I have never accepted the argument that Javey was none other than Zeus-piter in another form: the God of Battles with his thunderbolt in his hand. This, alone, would be another characteristic of a remote Aryan origin (see chapter ix). He is Teshub of the Mitanni.

Therefore, the Abrahamic story of a covenant-making and keeping God, with ultimately, a Code of Laws, and of the people who came out of Khasdim related to the Khabiru of the Hittites, all fits together, and leads one to Indo-European origins.

Arphaxed, the ancestor of Abraham, and whom we have seen was Khasdim (Arphaxed being the land of the Khasdim) has linked to him Salah, and Salah had Eber (which is Khabiru), and so on. These are names which are picked out from a tribal history which had some significances in tribal lore. Professor Albright^[53] reminds us that among modern biblical scholars there has been hardly one who accepts the Hebrew account of Abraham's Mesopotamian origins from Ur and Harran, yet there is strong evidence to support this tradition. "In the first place, it cannot be accidental that the names of the clan-ancestors who figure in the genealogy of Abraham occur in Assyrian times as place-names (*i.e.* old names of clans) in the region of Harran, *e.g.* Terah, Nahor, Serug. The name Arphaxed is also probably Mesopotamian, nor can we overlook the increasing probability that some of the cosmogenic stories of Genesis came from northern Mesopotamia. The view that these stories were borrowed from Mesopotamia at a later date has now been given up by all competent scholars.

They may, of course, have been adopted by the Hebrews from a secondary Palestinian source, as is probably held now by most scholars. Against it is, however, the fact that the pre-Israelite region of Canaan was very different in many respects from the paganism of Israel after the conquest, which contained elements borrowed at a later date from purely Iron Age cultures. It is most unlikely that the Hebrews would have borrowed such stories as that of the Flood from their neighbours after their settlement in Palestine. The divergence of the J. and E. recensions is alone sufficient to establish the antiquity of the common original, which was already distinctly Israelite. A Hurrian source for the name of Noah has recently been suggested. However this may be, the fact that the ark grounded in the Armenian Mountains (Ararat-Urartu) indicates a North Mesopotamian source, since the Babylonians sought their mountain of the ark in the Zagros, which lie north of Babylonia. If the Canaanites possessed a Flood story, we may safely suppose that Lebanon or Hermon played the corresponding role. The story of Paradise, which locates the Garden of Bliss at the source of the Euphrates and Tigris, and employs a north-western Mesopotamian place-name to describe it, is clearly derived from the same region."

That there was Indo-European blood in ancient Israel seems to be quite clear. King David is described as ruddy and the Galilean disciples of Christ appear to have been different from the people of Jerusalem. Even today in the hills of Galilee the Christian Arabs are Nordic and Nordo-Dinaric. But the statement that Abraham and his kin were Syrians (Genesis xxv, 30) surely demonstrates this beyond any question of doubt. For the monuments have left us with the type of the Syrian which was clearly Nordic.

The Sons of Ham

The sons of Ham are Cush, Mizraim, Phut and Canaan.

Sayce considers Cush to be the land between the First Cataract and the Mountains of Ethiopia.^[54] This is certainly the country called by the Egyptians Kash. It was this territory of Ethiopia which had the name Kas attached to it by the Greek and Roman geographers. Sayce admits that originally it was a small district on the southern side of the Second Cataract. Near Wadi Haifa was found an inscription by Useratesen, Twelfth Dynasty, as he marched from the boundaries of Egypt up the Nile. Heading the tribes was the district of Kash.^[55] In the time of the Twenty-second Dynasty, the Dynasty of Shishak^[56] mentions a Kingdom of Cush.^[57]

These people, however one looks at the problem, belonged to the white race. Even further south, the peoples of Ethiopia even today, are not Negroid, and in those days were less dark than now. So taken at its widest extension Cush cannot infer the black race. While at the time of which the account is speaking it was used, in all probability, for the small territory south of

the Second Cataract. Here in Nubia the conquerors were Egyptians and only the conquered were a dark people, although again, not Negroid.

The Nubians, with many of the tribes of Ethiopia and Somalia, today are "Hamitic" or Ethiopics. They are a very early cross between the white race and some such stock as the Neanderthal which has evolved as a shatter-belt between the white and the black races, gradually adopting the language of the white race. To this may have been added some Negroid in the course of time, through the employment of slavery.

It is, however, unlikely that it was to the native Nubian population that the writer alludes, but to the rulers of the land, the white men, namely, or at least latterly, of Egyptian origin (assuming that this identification were correct which we do not believe). We do not accept this identification. It creates for us all manner of difficulties in dealing with Nimrod, who comes out of Cush. This, we show in a later chapter, was Kish in Babylonia. This is, therefore, in our opinion, the true identification of Cush. It does not require us to look to the Upper Nile, or even beyond in Ethiopia. Therefore, the land of Cush is as described in Genesis x, in the land of Shinar.

The writer couples the name of Cush with Mizraim. This is the Hebrew name for Egypt. This name^[58] means the two Mazors or wells of fortifications. On the Asiatic border Egypt had a chain of forts called Shur, or the wall, by the Canaanites. From this word Mazor was derived. It was a term which applied only to Northern Egypt. But Upper Egypt was comprehended in time by the plural Mizraim. In Babylonia and Assyrian the name is Mizin or Muzur, singular, because it embraced Lower and Upper Egypt as one.

The next in order after Cush and Mizraim, is Phut. These people Sayce^[59] considers were a people of the Ionians, who were mercenaries. We see a nation who were considered in a special manner the Greek mercenaries. It may have been a Greek colony of Kyrene. They served anyone who would employ them and so we find them in service with the armies of Tyre (Ezekiel xxvii, 10).

At the time when this account was written these people of Phut ranked large, although their base may have been small indeed. Sayce^[60] quotes a broken fragment of the annals of Nebuchadnezzar which sheds light on this term. We read that in the thirty-seventh year of his reign he marched against Egypt and defeated the army of the Pharaoh, Amassis, as well as the troops of the city of Phut-Javan, or the Ionian Phut. The Pharaoh was pro-Greek, and had granted special privileges to them, as well as having a Greek bodyguard at Memphis. It may be, as Sayce remarks, that "the city of Phut-Javan" refers to a place where the Greeks were

considered to belong. It may be the Greek colony of Kyrene from whence Amasxis had taken a wife.

On the other hand, while Phut may refer to some place in Egypt, or near Egypt, it cannot refer to the Greek Ionians. In Jeremiah (xlv, 9) we read of Egypt and her mercenaries. The Ethiopians, the men of Libya (Phut, fifteenth marginal reading) handle the shield, "and the Lydians that handle and bend the bow." In Ezekiel (xxx, 5) we read of "Ethiopia, and Libya, and Lydia, and all the mingled people, and Chub." But the marginal reading for Libya is Phut. In Ezekiel (xxvii, 10), in the ranks of the armies of Tyre, we find the people of Phut mentioned. "They of Persia and of Lud and the men of Phut were in their army." In Jeremiah (xiv, 9) we read of "the Ethiopians and the Libyans, that handle the shields." The marginal references are Hebrew Cush^[61] and Hebrew Phut respectively for Ethiopians and Libyans. Again in Ezekiel (xxx, 5) we read: "Ethiopia, and Libya, and Lydia, and all the mingled people, and Chub." Here again the Hebrew for Libya is Phut.

There seems no doubt that Phut refers to Libya to the Hebrews and Syro-Mesopotamians, and Phut-Javan to some place where the Ionians were settled, which may have been Kyrene in Libya. Now this is interesting because the writer of Genesis x has identified the racial place of the people of Libya before the settlement of the "white Libyans," who, joined with the sea peoples, raided Egypt later in the reigns of Menephtah I and Ramses III (about 1200 B.C.). This throws light on the fact that the Egyptians referred to these people as "white" to distinguish them from the native inhabitants who were the people of Phut, translated in the Bible as Libyans, and who were not necessarily dark, but were more swarthy and had the fair-skinned Ionians in their midst, or the later fair-skinned or white Libyans.

The next "son" of Ham is Canaan. Here we are on firm ground. In the Tell el Amarna letters, Kinakhkhi or Canaan denotes the district which stretched from Zidon in the north to Gaza and Gar in the south and eastwards to the Dead Sea. The original land of Canaan was Phoenicia to the Greeks, and Kaft to the Egyptians. The name Phoenix in Greek means a palm branch, and so does Kaph (Kippah in Hebrew).

When we come to the next "generation" in the pedigrees we find that the sons of Cush are given as Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah and Sabtechah, and the sons of Raamah were Sheba and Dedan.

Now when we come to determine the generations linked to the generalised stocks such as Cush, Mizraim, Phut and Canaan, we are in some difficulties, as those are relatively minor divisions within each.

First of all Seba is near enough to the name by which the country of Sheba or Saba, or the Yemen was known. Seba is linked with Havilah in Genesis x. Sayce^[62] associated it with the southern Arabian tribe of Sheba, through the "sandy" deserts of Havilah. This was the region mentioned in connection with the garden of Eden (Genesis ii, 5) which was a place where gold was found. The Garden of Eden is somewhere to the north of Palestine, as we have shown earlier. Therefore, this throws great doubt on the identification of Seba with the Yemen. It is true that, in later times, the name was used for the Yemen, but at this time, especially associated with Havilah and minerals, it is clear it must be in the north.

Sabtah, Raamah and Sabtechah are mentioned, and must be in the same quarter, for the account goes on to give the sons of Raamah as Sheba and Dedan.

Then we come to the son of Cush called Nimrod, whose kingdom is given as Babel, Erach, Accad, Calnah, in the land of Shinar. These are all in the Babylonian and Sumerian regions. Erech, the Uruki of the inscriptions, is represented by Warka,^[63] Shinar is Sumer, and Calnah is the town of Kalneh called Kul-unu. Again we have here an early extension of the Hamitic-Semitic speaking peoples into Babylonia, before the immigration of the Shemitic or Indo-European tribes. The producing of Nimrod in connection with these movements certainly makes it clear that it is early in Babylonian history, as he is their god Merodach. This question of Cush we shall deal with fully in chapter vii and it is only mentioned here in order to put it in its proper place.

Turning to the history of the various branches of Mizraim we have the Ludim, Anamin, Lehabim and Naphtorim.

For the Ludim, it would be tempting to look to the Lydian mercenaries, if it were not for the fact that elsewhere Lud is classified under Shem. Could this be a people who had settled among the Egyptians, and became absorbed by them? Or are we on a wrong track altogether, and these people were a branch of the Libyans, or closely related to them? I am inclined to think this is so, and that they were located on the borders of Libya and Egypt, where, traditionally, the Ludim are located.

Anamim were, perhaps, the inhabitants of Heliopolis or On.

The Lehabim were considered Libyans. They became sufficiently important and powerful to place the Pharaoh Shishak on the throne of Egypt.

The Naphtorim are thought to be the Memphites, the people of the god Ptah.

From Mizraim also came the Pathrusuim, Casluhim (out of whom, so the text of Genesis x, 14 tells us, came the Philistim) and the Caphtorim.

The Pathrusuim, Sayce^[64] says, were Upper Egypt people. The Casluhim (quoting from Ebers) were the coastal people. The Kaphtorim, or Caphtorim, were the inhabitants of the island of Kaptara or Caphtor of the Babylonian texts of Sargon of Akkad (2750 B.C.). We are told that westwards of Babylon there is an island in the sea called Kaptara, and beyond this the sea itself was "Tin-land."

Caphtor should have the explanatory note concerning the Philistim and not Casluhim. However, since both peoples are obviously of the same race, and since the Casluhim are the coastal peoples there may have been much coming and going between them. This account is obviously ancient, with an interjection, later perhaps, concerning the Philistines.

The Philistines appear in Palestine quite suddenly, and it appears that the Pharaohs established them in southern Palestine as a guard to safeguard this quarter. The five cities which they held commanded the coast road from Syria and formed the point from which Egyptian conquests of Asia occurred.

This would suggest that originally Crete was inhabited by a people who spoke Semito-Hamitic (if our view that Genesis x as an ethnological table is correct) whatever was spoken there later. Several conquests of Crete took place, and we see it after it was independent and not subject to Egypt in any way. But originally, it would be regarded as Semito-Hamitic in speech.

From the main branch of Canaan, in which the Semitic language evolved out of the original proto Semito-Hamitic as the Hamitic evolved in the other descendants of Ham, we learn that the sons were Sidon, Heth, Jebusite, Amorite, Gargasite, Hivite, Arkite, Sinite, Arvadite, Zemarite and the Hamathite.

As I believe this account in Genesis x was written down, or formulated, in Syria it follows that the tribes in Syria and adjacent in Palestine, came in for more detailed attention than elsewhere. As a consequence we get accounts of the Sidonians, the "Hittites," that is the Palestinian ones, who had immigrated about the time of Abraham into Palestine and were acculturated, the Jebusites (who were about Jerusalem), and Amorites (a numerous tribe, especially in the north) and so on.

The "rock," Tyre, was built on an islet, and we learn from Herodotus that he was informed that it was founded 2300 years before his visit. Yet we have no mention of Tyre in the account of Genesis x. Its foundation is generally ascribed to the thirteenth century B.C., and by the tenth century was a mistress of commerce under Hiram. This would appear to set the date of the account before the thirteenth century, or at the very least before the tenth century B.C. Israel knew all about Tyre. Ezekiel xxvii says: "Those that dwellest at the entry of the sea, which art

the merchants of the peoples into many isles." Such a power could not have been overlooked if it existed before this account was formulated.

Northwards of this was Sidon, northward again was Gebal or Byblos. There the worship of Ashtoreth was renowned.

In Joshua (x, 5 and 6), the Amorites are classified with the Jebusites. The latter inhabited Jerusalem. In the time of Ebed Kheba (whom we suspect of being a successor to Melchisidek and so a part of a conquering stock although he served the Egyptian Pharaoh) we find that, in his time, it was the Amoritish Jebusites who were in rebellion. This we have already dealt with earlier. There, we have shown the complexities in handling the Aramaean-Amorite question. Certainly, the Amorites were Semites, and as such are justifiably placed under Ham. But, elsewhere we have shown that they were the recipients of so much Nordic blood, that it is shown clearly on their portraits. The Amorites, therefore, although not Aramaeans, absorbed so much Aramaean blood that their features displayed it.

The Arkites were the dwellers of the Phoenician city north of Gebal, and the Arvadites were the inhabitants of a place near Tyre and Sidon. The Zemarites were inland, and from there the Egyptian governor of the Eighteenth Dynasty had ruled the region. The Hamathites were settled on the banks of the Euphrates.

Professor Sayce however makes, we believe, a mistake^[65] when he talks of the fair-skinned Amorite and the yellow-skinned Hittite, to support his argument that these were not related in blood, but only by contiguity, as we shall see in the next chapter.

The Amorite, Canaan and Hittite

Although these are dealt with under the sons of Ham we have thought fit to discuss them here in greater detail. But in so far as we may repeat ourselves it may do no harm, as these facts have to be driven well home to be properly understood.

As we have observed, the Amorites are called Amar on the Egyptian monuments and Amurra in the correspondence of Tell el Amarna, and the Martu to the people of Babylonia and Chaldea. It was given, as a territorial name, to all the district to the north of Palestine, and included Kadesh, a holy city on the Orontes. However this was, in the time of Abraham, they were also settled in the south, and in his time lived at Hazazon-Tamar, on the shores of the Dead Sea (Genesis xiv, 7). Jacob took Shechem out of the hand of the Amorite according to Sayce's reading on Genesis xviii, 3.^[66] The Babylonians considered that the whole of their west was inhabited by the Martu. They had penetrated into Babylonia as far as Sippara.^[67] Even the God of the West Wind was called the God of Martu.

Ezekiel says that the mother of Jerusalem was a Hittite and its father an Amorite (Ezekiel xvi, 3, 45), while Joshua (x, 5, 6) makes the inhabitants of Jerusalem, Hebron, Jarmuth, Lachish and Eglon, all Amorites.

On the eastern side of Jordan they had established two powerful kingdoms of Og, the King of Bashan (Deuteronomy iii, 1) and Sihon at Heshbon who was an Amorite also. In Numbers (xxi, 26-29) we learn how Sihon has conquered the King of Moab.

This seems to indicate that the Amorites had split into a northern and a southern section. They seem to have been associated with the Hittites. The northern Amorite territory was occupied by Hittite conquerors in the reign of Ramses II. Southwards, the Jebusite population of Jerusalem was partly Amorite and partly Hittite. Israel, on its invasion of Palestine found the south, of what was to be their land, was mainly in the control of the Amorites.

These people built great cities. Thus, Lachish, has a proportion of walls 28 ft. 8 ins, in thickness.^[68]

The Jebusites, although listed independently of the Amorites, were probably an Amorite tribe.^[69] They, with the Hittites, occupied Jerusalem by the time of the Tell el Amarna tablets (1400 B.C.). However, on the occupation by Israel, down to the time it was captured by David, it was commonly known as Jebus, and its inhabitants as Jebusites. Therefore, it was certainly Jebusite at this time: but probably it is assumed that they were Amorites.

However, we have to make a distinction between the Amorite, Amurru or Amorite, and the Aramaean or Syrian. They both came from the same place, but they are not of the same race. The Aramaean appears to have settled later in Syria, and indeed, to have conquered the land. This was the stock to which Abraham was related. The language (Aramaic) was probably that of the conquered people—the Amorites. In time, some of the blood of the Arameans passed into the Amorite stock, yet whereas one was like the Indo-Europeans the other was like the Canaanites—or Mediterraneans.

Sayce^[70] appears to me not to have grasped this fact, and so he equates the two, and from his book it is not possible to know whether he is describing Amorites or Syrians. As a consequence he makes the Amorites blond north-European in type. This we consider a mistake. That some of the Amorites would have absorbed the Nordic type from the Arameans there is no doubt. But, basically, they must have been Mediterraneans. The Syrian which he shows from ancient Egyptian monuments is not an Amorite but truly a Syrian (or Aramaean), and we believe that most of the instances he gives of "Amorites," such as the "Amorite chief of Kadesh" who had a white skin, light red-brown eyes and hair," were Syrians.^[71]

Were this otherwise it would make the population of Palestine predominantly Nordic. While I am sure that there was much more Nordic blood than today this could not have been the prevailing type—which was Mediterranean. That these Amorites were settled, with their relatives, in much of Palestine, and survived afterwards to mingle with the later Hebrews, there is also no doubt.

The same Amorite is said to be derived from "the High ones" or Highlanders and the Canaanites, as a whole, are the "low-landers."^[72]

The Amorites are regarded by the writers of Genesis as much the owners of the land of Canaan as are the Canaanites themselves. Thus Genesis xv, 16; Joshua xxiv, 18; and Judges vi, 10. They were settled in the Mountains of Judah and on their southern slopes. The Mount of the Amorites is mentioned frequently.^[73]

We hear of them also at Gibeon, north-west of Jerusalem (II Samuel xxi, 2), at Aijon, west of Gibeon, in the northern part of the Philistinian plain (Judges i, 34, 35), and in the land of Ephraim (Genesis xlvi, 2). On the east of Jordan, after having driven back the Amorites and Moabites, they occupied the whole of Gilead and Bashan, and founded two principal kingdoms of Sihon, capital Heshbon, and Og, capital Ashtaroth.

In the Egyptian literature there are frequent references to the Amar, Amarru, or Amaor. Brugsch was of the opinion that their country was northern Syria, on the banks of the Orontes. Among the towns of the Amar, Amarru, or Amaor were Daphur and Kadesh, which seems to bear out our theory that the Amorites came from the north originally, and may well have had some Nordic blood. They were, certainly, capable of organising important states at that time. But that they were distinct from the Aramaeans is only equally certain. That they should be included in the table under Cush seems to be reasonable from an ethnological point of view, despite certain traits which may occur among them, from time to time, of being of a Nordic ancestry as well.

The Canaanites, to whom we have referred in the genealogical table, were in the land of Palestine at the time of the Israelite invasion. If, as we suggest, the Amorite meant Highlander and Canaanite Lowlander, then there would be reason for using the name Canaanite comprehensively. Thus in one place (Exodus xiii, 5) the Canaanites include also the Hittites, Amorites, Hivites and Jebusites. In another place they include the Perizzites with the others (Exodus iii, 8, 17), and in another they add also the Girgashites (Deuteronomy vii, 1). Once they comprehended ten tribes, omitting the Hittites, but including the Rephaim, and three Arab tribes, the Kenites, Kenizzites, and the Kadmonites (Genesis xv, 19-21). The latter are thought by some to be added by mistake.

As, at a later period, even the Phoenicians are covered by this name, so it looks as though it was comprehensive for all who spoke a Canaanitish language. Thus, the Phoenicians accepted the name of Canaanite. Hecataeus of Miletus, about 520 B.C., knew Xrâ (Chnâ) as a synonym for Phoinike; the same identification is found in Philo's *Sanchoniakon*. St Augustin tells us that the Punic-peasants when asked who they were replied in Punic that they were Chanani.^[74] Schroder^[75] tells us that on a coin of the date of Antiochus Ephiphanes, Laodicea in the Lebanon district is called "a mother, or metaophis, in Canaan."

While, at the other extreme, the town nearest to the Egyptians, of the Shasu or Bedawin, was called Pa-Kanana.

The fact is that the Canaanites were a people speaking Semitic whose name became generic for the whole of the tribes who sooner or later adopted their speech.

The Amorites must, originally, have spoken Aramaic, but coming south eventually spoke Canaanitish. The Patriarchs, or their ancestors, on the other hand, must have spoken some other tongue, till they adopted Aramaic, and that gave way in due course to Canaanitish, which ultimately came to be Hebrew.

A similar problem arises with the Hittites. The Hittites, in the first place, were located in Asia Minor, and were known as the Khatti. Later they were conquered by Indo-Europeans, who imposed on them their God-names, and who had a different language from the common people. Nevertheless the prevailing type was brachycephalous—probably with a dome-shaped head, like the modern Armenian.

In the closing days of the Eighteenth Egyptian Dynasty Hittite invaders were advancing from the north. In the reign of Ramses II we find them at Kadesh.

They were, in part at least, related to the Mitanni, who lived in the region of the Upper Euphrates. These people exercised an influence on the Abrahamic family who lay adjacent to them in the land of Nahor. Myres believes the Khatti were the Hyksos of the Fourteenth, Fifteenth and Sixteenth Dynasties.^[76]

Some believe that the inclusion of the Hittites in this list under Ham is a mistake. Certainly, they do not fit in here. Their characteristics are of Anatolia, and not distantly connected with some elements among the Mitanni.

It would seem reasonable to suppose that they took part in the invasion of Palestine, along with the Aramaeans, and perhaps even the Amorites. They swept up with them early indigenous elements, such as the Rephaim. Nevertheless they, and the Amorites, are

distinctly unlike the Canaanites in their political capacity, having founded kingdoms east of Jordan.

Therefore, the Hittites entered Palestine, mixed with its inhabitants, spoke at first their own language, but gave way to the Canaanitish lingua franca, and hence there arrived a stage at which it was not certain whether to put them with Canaan, or give them an entirely different ancestry. In this respect, I agree with Sayce, that there are geographical criteria for judging these peoples, but I do not believe that the ethnological are overlooked. The Sons of Heth at this time were resident within Canaan and were already of mixed blood. I do not necessarily regard, therefore, the name Hittite as coming here by mistake. It may have been intentional. On the other hand I would have been happier had Hittite been placed under the sons of Japhet. This would have reflected more nearly their type. Much depends on the date of this passage. If it were about 1400 B.C. then they could be regarded as Canaanite, as they would have absorbed so much of their blood by then. If it dates from nearer 2000 B.C. the Hittites in Palestine were still intrusive conquerors and could have had little opportunity to be classified with the sons of Ham. But if the passage is intrusive we are speculating on something which is of no consequence to our interpretation of this account, as the Hittites do not fall among the sons of Ham at that early time.

The Sons of Japhet

The Sons of Japhet are given as Gomer, Magog, Medai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech and Tiras.

These nations we can identify. Gomer is the Gimirra of the Assyrians and Kimmerian of the Greek. Their centre was on the river Tyras (Dniester). They were driven out by the Scythians. In a horde they fell upon Assyria, but were defeated by Esar-haddon 677 B.C. Some elements remained in Kurdistan, but the main parts of Gomer fled into Anatolia. They sacked Sinope, and overran Lydia on the coasts of the Aegean Sea. They killed Gyges, the King, and it was not till the next generation that they were thrown out.

Magog is the same name as Gog—the prefix is merely the name for *country of*. In Assyrian *Mat Gugi* is the country of Gugu. Sayce sees in the name the Greek Gyges, and so this represents Lydia.

Josephus, who is followed by Jerome, says the Scythians (Skuthai) were probably intended. According to others the Massagetae. But it seems that it is more likely that it was a people in northern and eastern Armenia.

The Madai are possibly the Medes, the Mada of the Assyrians. They first appear in the cuneiform records as the Amada, in about 840 B.C. when their country was invaded by the

Assyrians. They were settled in Kurdistan east of Lake Urumiyeh. Fifty years later we find them in Medis Rhagiana where they were no longer Amada but Mada.^[77]

These people were, in our opinion, of the same stock as the surrounding people. Sayce holds that originally they were Aryans but, in Classical times, the indigenous peoples among whom they were settled were known as Medes. That they were originally Aryan is supported by the fact that Herodotus (vii, 62) says: "Apioi is an old name of the Medes." Perhaps the solution to this problem is that the Medes who presented themselves to someone from Harran to Palestine, where we judge the account was formulated, were largely of non-Aryan type through crossing with the local inhabitants. Those in the Kurdish Mountains would be likely to show crossing with the local tribes. Those further afield would be considered Aryans and especially those of whom Sargon's account speaks, where they are on the southern shores of the Caspian. Here they had small states such as those of the Greeks.

Javan is the Greek "Ionian." Greece, being beyond the Ionians, was called the Island of the Ionians by the Assyrians, much as all Europeans are Frenchmen (*Ferengi*) to Islam. Sayce, however, suggests that it may be to Cyprus that the reference in Isaiah xvi, 19 belongs.^[78] He is undoubtedly right when, in Genesis x, 41, among the sons of Javan, Kittim is mentioned, which he identifies with Cyprus, the site of which is now Lanarka. This was a Phoenician and not a Greek settlement.

Yavan is used in several senses in the Bible. It is apparently used for the Greek Islands and coastlands, in another it refers to the traders of Tubal and Meschech (Ezekiel xxvii, 31) and, again, it describes the Macedonian Empire (Daniel viii, 121, x, 20 and xi, 2). Consequently, the biblical form covers a wide usage. But, in the inscriptions of Sargon (722-705 B.C.) and Sennacherib, it appears in the form of Mat Yavna, Yavian and Yaniana. In the Persian Texts we have Yauna. In the Babylonian transcriptions of Darius Mystaspis the name Yavanu represents people of Asia Minor.^[79] When in 711 B.C. the people of Ashdod revolted against Assyria and deposed their lawful king, he was replaced by them by a certain Yavanu.

That these people of Javan, or Ion, had a coastwise distribution seems inescapable. Thus Sargon (722-705 B.C.)^[80] boasts that "he drew the Ionians like fish from the sea." Gaza was also called Iônê, and the sea between Philistia and Egypt was known as "Ionian." There is the significant survival of the names for the sea to the west of Greece, which would suggest that Greece was also Ionia. But, in historical times no Ionian Greek lived on the shores of the Ionian Sea. This suggests it was the name for pre-Achaean Greeks.^[81] In classical times the name covered the islands and drowned valleys in western Lydia and Caria. D. G.

Hogarth^[82] admits the possibility of there being an "Ion" people somewhere in Asia Minor before the historical Ionian settlement on the coasts of Asia Minor.

In the Egyptian hieroglyphs we find that Ha-nibu, or uinivo is rendered Uinin or "Ionians" in demotic. The Mediterranean is called the "circle of the Ha-nibu" on early pyramid texts of the sixth century.

Therefore, it would seem that the eastern Mediterranean, from western Greece to Anatolia and across Egypt, was associated with Javan. Furthermore, the reference to its occurrence at Gaza, supported by the fact that one of the Tell el Amarna tablets (1400 B.C.) speaks of the Yivana or "Ionian" in the land of Tyre, indicates that Javan settlements occurred throughout this maritime region, and they are pre-1400 B.C. The people of Javan appear as allies of the Hittites in their struggle against Ramses II under the variant Yevana.^[83]

The Javan peoples were thought of by the ancients as being in four main groups, which are termed Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim and Dodanium. Most certainly Elishah is the Alisiya in the cuneiform and is sometimes identified as Cyprus^[84] and at other times with the Aleian plain of north-east Syria or eastern Cilicia.

The Tyrians are said to have procured purple dye from the Isles of Elishah. Ezekiel (xxvii, 7) refers to this trade and speaks of "blue and purple from the isles of Elishah." Therefore, it was clearly a maritime place. Josephus^[85] identified these people with the Aeolians. This is, however, held to be phonetically impossible. Many writers have tried to identify it with Elis, but Professor Sayce^[86] has said that Elis probably began with digamma and is probably the same as the Latin vallis.

We find numerous references to this country of Elishah. Tell el Amarna (1400 B.C.) contains letters from the Pharaoh to the King of Alasia, which must be the same, as was suggested long ago by Conder. A hieratic docket attached to one of these identifies it with the Egyptian Alsa. Now Alsa, which is sometimes written as Arosa, is mentioned in the walls of Karnak (list nos. 213 and 236) as having been overrun by Thotmes III during his successful Syrian campaigns. This would certainly make Elishah somewhere on the mainland, near to Syria, and seems to disqualify Cyprus, which Professor Sayce, following Max Müller and Winkler, suggested. Maspero^[87] however, takes a different point of view and makes Alasia the northern part of Coele-Syria. This seems more consistent with the facts. Professor Sayce^[88] points out that in an hieratic papyrus in, or formerly in, the Hermitage Museum, Petrograd (now Leningrad), there is a description of an embassy sent by sea from Egypt to the King of Gebal, the mountainous region to the south of the Dead Sea, which still bears the name Jebâl,^[89] in the time of the high priest Hir-Hor. The envoys were wrecked on the coast of Alsa, where they

were hospitably received by the queen. This clearly indicates a location, not only on a coastline, but one not so greatly removed from the Palestinian region to which the envoys were travelling. This would indicate north-eastern Syria or eastern Cilicia. This would also suit an identification with Cyprus, if it were not for the objections already mentioned, the inclusion of Alasia in the conquest of Syria, and for the fact that the Egyptians had a name for Cyprus which was not Alasia but Asi. Furthermore Josephus believed that Elishah was a district in Asia Minor.

Tarshish is thought to refer to Tartessos in Spain, but having regard to the quite localised ethnography with which we are dealing, it is more likely to refer to Tarsus at an early time. By extension, later, it could come to include Tartenos, and even beyond, so that by the time of the Prophets it does not mean what it does here. Tarsus was originally settled by the Hittites—probably the Hatti—proper, and formed part of the Kingdom of Tabal, which flourished in Cilicia (Khilakku).^[90]

In the passages of the Scriptures which refer to Tarshish, all the language used seems too grand to refer solely to Tarsus. However it is clear that Tarsus is in fact meant, although this by extension, in the mouths of the Prophets, comes to mean much more than that. Later when in Jonah (i, 3) we learn that Jonah was determined to flee to Tarshish, the account infers it is at the ends of the earth. Again in Isaiah (lxvi, 19) it represents, with Javan and the isles thereof, the most remote quarters of the world to which exiled Israelites had fled. Ezekiel (xxxviii, 13) places Sheba and Dedan, and the merchants of Tarshish in the same mystery-enshrouded category as Gog and Magog! As W. Max Müller^[91] has pointed out, it is impossible to draw any inference about the situation of Tarshish from this. It certainly is not intended to indicate the countries of Sheba and Dedan.

In Isaiah (xxiii, 6) the Prophet sarcastically advises the Tyrians to flee from the wrath to come when Tyre is overthrown, and to seek refuge in Tarshish and the Isles. This makes it clear, by inference, that the merchants of Tyre were in close association with Tarshish, but it does not indicate the distance that separated them. On the other hand, it infers that they were near, if it was a principal haven for refugees. On the basis of this we see no reason for departing from the identification of Tarshish with Tarsus.

Dodanim has Rodanim as an alternative reading, and if so it will indicate the inhabitants of Rhodes. It was occupied by the Phoenicians and subsequently by the Dorian Greeks. But as at the time of the compilation of this account there is no mention of the Phoenicians, it must be anterior to them.

Therefore, it seems clear that a group of related peoples, under the name of Javan, are concerned and as they are adjacent to Asia Minor it is more economical to look to them as Anatolians. In that case they were not Greek Ionians. Javan then has to be seen as either a name unrelated to the Aryan Greeks, or as a name meaning Ionian, certainly, but derived from an earlier people than the Greeks, in much the same way as the English are "British."

Sir William Ramsay^[92] says: "More than twenty years ago, writing (in 1915) to a great European Scholar, I said that the chief problem which now lay before us as historical investigators was to answer the question, who were the sons of Yavan, the old Ionians who represent the Greek race in the early Semitic tradition (Genesis x, 4)?" I think that is answered by considering them an Armenoid people, whose name lived on to be absorbed by Aryan Greek settlers. This is supported by the fact that the Assyrians referred to the lands of Javan in the eighth century B.C. which would seem to be too early for a widespread settlement of Greeks down this coast. Furthermore, we find no Achaeans, or Dorians, blended with Javan. If we may return to the sons of Japhet we find that Tubal is next mentioned after Javan, and along with Tubal is Meshech.

In the Assyrian inscriptions Sayce^[93] says the name Tubla and Muska are known. To the classical geographers these were Tiboreni and Moskhi. In the time of Sargon and Sennacherib their territories stretched as far south as Cilicia and the northern half of Komagene. Later they retreated to the Black Sea. Here Xenophon and his Greek army found their remains.^[94] Again, we have a people of the same general (Anatolian) appearance as the others so far described. The Medes above alone show any inconsistency.

The people of Moschi were very powerful in their day. They were largely the cause of Assyrian powerlessness. They closed the route to the most prolific sources of the metal trade. Consequently the chief attention of any revival of Assyria had to be directed to the north.

Tiglathpileser I, Ashur-resh-ishi's son, immediately on his succession, faced an invasion by the Mushki, from the lands of Alzi and Purukuzzi which they had so long held. Their objective was the seizure of Kummuh, and their army was commanded by five petty princes, and was twenty thousand strong.

Tiglathpileser I marched against and defeated them. The Qurti came to their support under Kill Teshub or Irropi, who was defeated and captured. The Assyrians advanced eastwards where Shadi, Teshub was King of Urratinash, and caused them to surrender the fortress. They ravished Mildish. In the next year the power of the Mushki was broken when Alzi and Purukuzzi paid tribute.

Finally we come to Tiras, which is obscure. Professor Sayce has nothing to offer concerning him. Guesses have been made. Tiras has been thought to refer to the Thracians by some and by others to the Tyrsenians. Cheyne and others expressed the opinion that Tarshish is identical to Tiras (being vocalised probably of Tur(a)s, of Genesis x, 2). This latter is probably not correct, as we have in the list, under Japhet, Tarshish already mentioned. However, we should rather look in the direction of Tyrsenians, Tyrrhenians or Etruscans. This would link the Etruscans with the Tyrsenians. The Etruscans are known to have had all the features which would suggest an Anatolian origin. The Tyrsenians raided Egypt in the twelfth century B.C. and were known to the Egyptians of the Tursha.

Next we have the sons of Gomer who are specified as Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah.

In Jeremiah ii, 27, Ashkenaz is, with Ararat and Minni, told to march against Babylon.

Therefore Ashkenaz must have been in the neighbourhood of the others, and so of Armenia.

Sir William Ramsay^[95] points out that Ashkenaz is an eponymous hero of Asia Minor. The cuneiform inscriptions of Armenia have fixed Ararat as the district between the Araxes and the mountains south of Lake Van, while Minni adjoined on the east. Ashkenaz must be where an inscription of Sargon places the people as Asguza. Ashkenaz is the Askanios of Homer (850 B.C. according to Ramsay, or 1000 B.C. according to Sayce).

Togarmah in the Hittite Texts is Tegarama and is to the north of Carchemish and Harran.

Ezekiel (xxxviii, 6) joins Togarmah north of Gomer, and Tubal and Meshech, and the land of Gog.

Tubal and Meshech were inhabited by the Alarodian race, to which the modern Georgians belong. As Professor Sayce points out^[96] the Aryans from Phrygia entered Armenia in about 600 B.C. and imposed their rule on them. This, then, gives us a date before which this passage can be placed. It dates from before 600 B.C. as there were no Aryans at this time in these parts. According to Strabo, Togarmah traded horses with Tyre.

Riphath we have no information about, but it can be assumed to be with Ashkenaz and Togarmah.

Now the interesting thing in the list which we have perused is that all, with the exception of the Medes, form a group of Armenoids to the north of Palestine. Perhaps, in part, there may be some Dinaric, and Alpine, but they are mainly Armenoids. At any rate, they are white peoples of the brachycephalous group. While ethno-geography does come into the classification to some extent, it is one that is mainly ethnological, and the genealogical method is justified, as a simple way to explain the relationships, especially at this period in time.

The Medes were the Madai, or Madâ, and are often mentioned from about 800 B.C. as living in the mountains south-west of the Caspian Sea. Undoubtedly they were, originally, of the

same racial matrix as the rest at an early date. But there is little doubt that like the Khatti, they were overrun by Indo-Europeans. This again, would place the document of Genesis x early, at a time preceding the acculturation of, at least, their upper classes, to the Indo-European cultures.

Cush Begot Nimrod

We read that Cush begot Nimrod and he "began to be a mighty one in the earth. He was a mighty hunter before the Lord: Wherefore it is said, even as Nimrod the mighty hunter before the Lord."

D. A. Mackenzie^[97] says that Nimrod, King of Babel, in Shinar (Sumeria) was a deified monarch ultimately identified with the national god of Babylonia. Professor Pinches^[98] has shown that his name is the same as Merodach. In Sumerian Merodach was Amaruduk or Amarudu, and in the Assyro-Babylonian language Marduk. The "uk" was dropped, rendering it as Marad. The Hebrews add "ni" which makes it ni-marad, assimilating the name "to a certain extent to the 'niph'al forms' of the Hebrew verbs and making a change, in conformity with the genesis of the Hebrew language."

In Micah (v, 6) we read of the land of Asshur and the land of Nimrod. This justifies the marginal reading of Genesis x, 11—"out of that land he went out into Assyria." We read (Genesis x, 10): "And the beginning of his Kingdom was Babel, and Erech and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar." Then it continues (Genesis x, 11-12): "Out of that land went forth Asshur and builded Nineveh, and the city of Rehoboth, and Calah. And Resen between Nineveh and Calah, the same is a great city."

The Kingdom of Nimrod began in Babylonia, in the north Erech and Accad, and in the south Calah. The remains of Erech (Uriki) of the inscriptions are now the mounds of Warka. It was the centre of Semitic influence in Babylonia from an early time.

Asshur, who went out of Nimrod's country to build Nineveh, was a Shemite. The narrative takes a sudden change. Nimrod and his followers had been early in the land of Babylonia, and spoke the language of Canaan, the Semitic tongue. But there emerged in the north of it Asshur who began a series of conquests around Nineveh, and he was a Shemite.

Despite its non-acceptance, we should look again at the theory that Asshur was identical with Aryan Asura and the Persian Ahura.

At any rate the account is perfectly plain as to its main import. The Cush influence is clear enough. The descendants of Cush, through Nimrod, settled in Babylonia and created its civilization. They were close relatives of the Canaanites, and so a language not unlike theirs

became that of the country. He subdued Babylon, Erech, Accad and Calneh, all states of the lower Tigris-Euphrates Valley, and situated close to the Persian Gulf. Then marching north, the Cushitic "Nimrod" subdued what became known as Assyria.

The old idea that this Cush is the later "Ethiopian Cush" is entirely erroneous. Judging by the name, the state, and its location, the simplest identification is with Kish. The history of that state is so closely paralleled with Cush, and the elements of the Nimrod episode, that all doubt is removed.

For instance, Esarhaddon (670 B.C.) called himself King of Cush. But he never, in any way, became King of Cush, south of Egypt. Therefore, it could not have been to this Cush that reference was made.

Kish was one of the old Semitic states (and it will be found that the "Hamites" of chapter x are ethnically Semites) and was probably the cradle of these peoples in Babylonia. Near Kish is Jemdet Nasr, which witnessed the same early development. There, painted pottery ware of an early period is found, perhaps preceding in date the second Sumerian period. According to the dynastic lists of the Sumerian Kings, the first dynasty after the Flood ruled at Kish, and this dynasty is earlier than the first at Ur in the south. The bas reliefs illustrate bearded men in decided contrast to the shaven heads of the southerners at Al Ubaid. This indicates a Semitic stock in the neighbourhood of Kish.

This early importance of the region of Kish, and its Semitic character as expressed by statuettes and dynastic lists, seems to rest upon undoubtedly solid foundations. For we now find, as has already been pointed out by Childe^[99] that the most archaic-pictographs at Kish support the traditions embodied in the dynastic lists.

If any more evidence is wanted, the names of the first dynastic period are Semitic, and the towns of the north of Babylonia, Kish, Sippar, Akshak, Opi and Agade (which gave its name as Akkad to the whole of northern Babylonia) were traditionally the homes of Semitic rulers.

The early developments of Kish, with its earliest known wheeled vehicles, and the oldest written documents, are found nearby at Jemdet Nasr. The expansion of the Kish group first embraced Babylon, and then spread to the south, and, finally, expanded northwards to embrace the later Assyria.

This is quite parallel with the biblical statement, which first established itself at Cush (Kish), embraced Babylon, and then marched south to Erech, Akkad and Calneh, and finally northwards to Nineveh, Calah and Resen.

This is so involved a series of moves, that they could not have been the unwarranted creation of the seventh century B.C. scribe. They must come down from a much older tradition. Furthermore in the seventh century B.C. no one would have identified the lower part of Babylonia with Cush, since by that time Cush was thought of as in the neighbourhood of Ethiopia.

However, it does seem to indicate that Cush was Kish, and Nimrod (Merodoch) carried out his expansion from thence. They were, as a consequence, a Semitic-speaking people, allied to those of Canaan.

Since we learn that, before 3000 B.C., figures from Kish have large noses, and are of the Subarean type,^[100] and were not the original inhabitants^[101] coming from the mountains of the north east, we must place the Nimrod expansion of Kish somewhere in the fourth millennium or even earlier.

This means that the story of Nimrod is very early, contrary to all that has been thought by those who have put these accounts down to scribes of the seventh and sixth centuries B.C.

The Age of Genesis X and Its People

The Synthesis of Syro-Mesopotamian Ethnology

At one end of the scale we can say that there are no Phoenicians mentioned by name unless Sidon is meant to refer to them. They made their first appearance in the Mediterranean Sea in about 2000 B.C. and they came from the region of the Persian Gulf.

The Philistines are only mentioned in a parenthesis, by saying "and Casluhim (out of whom came Philistim)." This looks very much like a later interpolation.

The Philistines appear to have been a people of Crete. Amos (viii, 7) says: "Have I not brought up Israel out of the land of Egypt and the Philistines from Caphtor" (Crete). They overran the coasts of Palestine, from whom it came to be called. This stock in time came to consider itself as Canaanite, and we suggest that the Caphtorim were a Semito-Hamitic people in any event. They settled in Palestine about the time of Ramses in of Egypt (1198-1167 B.C.).

If my interpretation of the interpolation is not correct, then the account would date, at the latest, to the twelfth century B.C.

The involvement of the patriarchal tribes with the Hittites and Mitanni, in Harran and Naharaim, and the later immigration into Palestine, would, according to some, give a period to which these events relate of between 2000-1700 B.C.

Then there is the restricted nature of the survey. It does not see across the seas. It is limited by the coastlands of Asia. It is limited by the arc of nations from Anatolia in the north to Persia. Southwards it is the same thing. It barely touches Ethiopia. It is limited by the peninsula of Arabia, and hardly that, being concerned mainly with northern Arabia, and it is only just aware of the peoples of Libya. It has no account of the Sea Peoples who attacked Egypt in the reign of Meneptah I and Ramses III (1198-1167 B.C.).

Therefore, there seems little doubt that we must look upon the account of the races in Genesis x as exceedingly early, whenever it was written down. It can have been handed down for centuries before it was committed to writing. Most of the account must, therefore, come from before the middle of the second millennium B.C.

But it might well be much earlier as to the message which it conveys. Its writing down is another matter altogether. William Foxwell Albright^[102] points out that in excavations at Yorgha Tepe near Kurkuk, in south-east Assyria, the fifteenth and fourteenth cuneiform tablets discovered in this city, which was known as Nuzi and occupied by Hurrians (who, as a group, stretched from eastern Syria to northern Mesopotamia), are to do with adoption for sonship. This was based on the law which prevented the alienation of land or property from the family, or a properly constituted heir. This fell into disuse long before the Iron Age. It throws light on the obscure adoption of Eliezer, a Syrian, by Abraham before the birth of Isaac. This throws light on several matters, among which is that by being associated with Abraham it settled his date as early and not late. Furthermore, it associates him with the Hurrian system.

As chapter x of Genesis is dealing with the immediate ancestors of Abraham, a part of that document, at least, must be equally early.

Likewise, and incidentally, patriarchal religion, as we have shown, reflects pre-Mosaic conditions and is equally early,^[103] and, in some respects, reflects more intrusive elements than was formulated later. Professor Alt shows that it is not an artificial construction of priestly historians of a later time. Consequently, if the religious concepts are old, these passages embedded in those concepts must be old also. We are left with the feeling that we are dealing with the beginning of the second millennium B.C. to the middle of it.

Certainly, Yahweh, the God of the Hebrews, was not unique to them alone. We find the expression Yau-ilu, "Yah is God," in a Babylonian text. Yami or Yahweh may have been common to Canaan, Syria and Babylonia. "It is only safe to conjecture that Yahweh was not entirely an unknown deity among the Aramaeans before he was brought into prominence by Moses."^[104] Therefore we can look to Syro-Mesopotamia for the origin of the biblical Yahweh.

But, since beyond that in the Indo-European world we have Jove (or Zeus-piter) I think the origin of Yahweh is in the north.

We are now in a position to review what was the position of the ethnology as it came to be known to a writer about the second millennium B.C.

It appears to have been a work which was formulated in the region of Syria and the northern arc of the Fertile Crescent. It looks to the arc of encircling mountains, in their broad sweep from Anatolia, and on to Armenia, with their teeming hordes of people. Then it comprehends the peoples of Semitic and Hamitic speech from Shinar, through the steppelands of northern Arabia, and on to Egypt and Libya. Finally it includes the peoples of the race of "Shem," the Khabiru and other peoples of Aryan origins, who were settled in the northern parts of the Fertile Crescent, in process of being acculturated, and ultimately they spread out to the south over some parts of northern Arabia. It is only these latter settlements for which there appears to be no evidence (other than the Hebrews) of any clear nature as to how they got there. But, since there appears under Ham, such as Havilah, Seba and Sheba, and again Havilah and Ophir under Shem, for groups of places known to be closely connected, either we consider that this is a mistake, or else, and more probably, because here we have mixed populations.

There is no mention of the peoples of Asia (such as the Mongoloid races) or of Africa (the Negroid, or even the so-called "Hamitic" or "Cushitic") and the whole account is concerned with the peoples of the white races.

The most detail is given for the cities of Palestine and the countries of Babylonia, so that it appears to be of Syro-Mesopotamian authorship, and its timing is that when the Aryan influences through the Hittites and Mitanni and others is to give way, and become obscured, in the racial groupings of the second millennium B.C.

That the author of this account is Syro-Mesopotamian and belongs to the foothills and mountains to the north of Naharain is clear. He is descended from Adam, who is clearly from the account a northern man.^[105] The ultimate origin of the patriarchal line in the northern races is surely to be seen in the name of the original progenitor, Adam, which in Sanskrit is *Adima* (the first) and his wife Heva. He is descended from the peoples who are conceived of coming out of an Ark, after the Flood, which rests on the mountains of Ararat. Finally, as they journey to the east they come into the plain of Shinar. The discovery of Sumeria for these people is from the north and west.

Then in the Plain of Shinar they build the Tower of Babel. In other words these are the ziggurats, built originally by the Sumerians, and indicating that they came into the plains from the mountains also, and had as a result to build there high places.

These are all the marks that Genesis x, and the associated accounts, which go to make up the story of the Patriarchs, is northern in origin and belongs to the northern section of the Fertile Crescent and the mountains which encircle it to the north.

Any names which, today, we associate with southern Arabia, such as Sheba, and with Africa, such as Cush, are of a much later identification with those regions. At these times of which we write, they either belonged to the text, and represented original places such as Cush meaning Kish, or they are interpolations at a later period. However, this latter theory we would not accept unless we have exhausted all investigations in the north first. For instance, Uz, the land to which Job much later was associated, is mentioned in this text. Uz was, at this time in our view, in northern Mesopotamia, and whether it became localised further south later it is difficult to say.^[106] Hul, for example, was likewise in the north. Josephus even tells us that Hul founded Armenia. Therefore, at this time, it cannot be localised in the south.

Some of the difficulty may be due to the fact that migratory tribes take their names with them and consequently it is necessary to plot such names on the map at various periods. In other cases, the name has been given to places further south because of their similarity of sound.

At any rate, we are brought back in the end to the Garden of Eden, the Flood, the dispersal of nations here in Genesis x, and the tower of Babel in the land of Shinar, as all belonging to one corpus of tradition, which is very old (that of Genesis x being about four thousand years ago), and the location of all start, wherever they finish, with the northern arc of the Fertile Crescent and the mountains to the north.

Notes

1. ↑ E. O. James, *The Old Testament in the Light of Anthropology*, p. 8.
2. ↑ E. O. James, *op. cit.*, p. 10, looks to the lands of the Sumer and Akkad for the Garden of Eden, but we do not think this is justified from the text.
3. ↑ John L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?*, California, 1930, p. 307.
4. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament*, London, 1925, p. 65.
5. ↑ In this he is followed by E. O. James, *op. cit.*, p. 13.
6. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *Tell Halaf*, pp. 40-42.
7. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*
8. ↑ Donald A. Mackenzie, *Myths of Babylonia and Assyria*, p. 278.
9. ↑ C. H. W. Jones, *Ancient Assyria*, London, p. 11.
10. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *Fresh Light From the Ancient Monuments*, p. 40.
11. ↑ John L. Myres, *The Dawn of History*.

12. ↑ Charles Maston, *The New Knowledge and the Old Testament*, p. 70.
13. ↑ C. E. P. Brooke, *Climate Through the Ages*, 1926, p. 358, and H. J. E. Peake, *The Bronze Age and the Celtic World*, 1922.
14. ↑ C. H. W. Johns, *op. cit.*
15. ↑ Donald A. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 279.
16. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 49.
17. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 60.
18. ↑ John L. Myres, *The Dawn of History*, p. 153.
19. ↑ John L. Myres, *op. cit.*
20. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 155-156.
21. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 308.
22. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-61.
23. ↑ *Ibid.*
24. ↑ Charles Maston, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
25. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 62.
26. ↑ Peake and Fleure, *Merchant Venturers in Bronze*, Oxford, 1931, p. 113.
27. ↑ Peake and Fleure, *The Steppe and the Soan and The Way of the Sea*, 1929.
28. ↑ Peake and Fleure, *Merchant Venturers in Bronze*, p. 114.
29. ↑ *Ibid.*
30. ↑ Peake and Fleure, *op. cit.*, p. 117.
31. ↑ Peake and Fleure, *op. cit.*, pp. 117-118.
32. ↑ *Vedic Index of Names and Subjects*, Macdonald and Keith, London, 1912, Vol. I, pp. 64 and 65.
33. ↑ Peake and Fleure, *The Way of the Sea*, pp. 143 and 144.
34. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament*, pp. 100-101.
35. ↑ Garstang, *Hittite Empire*, p. 34.
36. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *The Egypt of the Hebrews*, p. 72.
37. ↑ Donald A. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 30.
38. ↑ W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Syria and Egypt from the Tell el Amarna Letters*, p. 172, rejects the *Khabiru* as Hebrews because they appear from the north! What he does not realise is that as Israel attacked from the south (the Exodus) other Hebrew, *Khabiru*, tribes attacked from the north.
39. ↑ Baur and Rostovzeff, *The Excavations at Dura-Europos*, 1931, pp. 206-207.
40. ↑ W. F. Albright, *The Archaeology of Palestine and the Bible*, 1932, p. 210.

41. ↑ R. Gayre of Gayre, "Zimbabwe," *The Mankind Quarterly*, Vol. v, No. 4, April-June, 1965, pp. 212-243.
42. ↑ E. O. James, *op. cit.*, p. 35, considers the Khabiru as Indo-Europeans.
43. ↑ E. O. James, *op. cit.*, p. 42, says that if the Khabiru were not Israelites they were brought in relation to them.
44. ↑ W. M. Flinders Petrie, *op. cit.*
45. ↑ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, article on Syria.
46. ↑ John L. Myres, *The Dawn of History*, p. 115.
47. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 45.
48. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 149.
49. ↑ Max von Oppenheim, *op. cit.*, p. 70.
50. ↑ W. M. Flinders Petrie, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-138.
51. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *Races of the Old Testament*, p. 90.
52. ↑ St Stephen (vii, 2) says that Abraham came out of Mesopotamia into Haran. Eliezer of Damascus was the heir of Abraham—again a Syrian.
53. ↑ W. F. Albright, *op. cit.*, pp. 139-140.
54. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 207.
55. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 208.
56. ↑ The members of a high-priestly family Thebes fled to Ethiopia to the city of Napata and established the worship of the Theban god Amun.
57. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 209.
58. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 82.
59. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 86.
60. ↑ *Ibid.*
61. ↑ By this time Cush had come to mean the Upper Nile, and the original identification in Kish had been forgotten.
62. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 67.
63. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 103.
64. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 84.
65. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 92.
66. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 164.
67. ↑ Fritz Hommel, *The Ancient Hebrew Tradition*, pp 58-59.
68. ↑ W. M. Flinders Petrie, *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund*, July 1890, p. 165.1

69. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 179.
70. ↑ *Ibid.*
71. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 167-168. Sayce would find the home of the Amorites in Asia Minor and considers them related to the Mitanni, which seems to bear this out. See *Ancient Egypt*, September 1924.
72. ↑ See Numbers xiii, 19, Deuteronomy i, 44 and Joshua x, 6.
73. ↑ Genesis xiv, 7, 13, Numbers xiii, 29. Deuteronomy i, 7, 20, 40, Joshua xi, 3 and Judges 1, 36.
74. ↑ *Bened.*, Vol. III, Col. 931.
75. ↑ Schroder, *Die phonizische Sprache*, p. 275.
76. ↑ John L. Myres, *The Dawn of History*, pp. 153-157.
77. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 73.
78. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 75.
79. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *A Dictionary of the Bible* (edited by James Hastings), T.T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1899, Vol. II, p. 552.
80. ↑ R. Pietschmann, *Historians' History of the World*, London, 1926, Vol. II, p. 282.
81. ↑ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, p. 576, article on Ionian.
82. ↑ D. G. Hogarth, *Cambridge Ancient History*, Vol. II, p. 546.
83. ↑ W. Max Müller, *Asien under Europa*, p. 370.
84. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, pp. 696-697.
85. ↑ Josephus, *Antiquities*, 1, vi, 1, identified these people with the Aeolians.
86. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *A Dictionary of the Bible*, Vol. I, p. 696.
87. ↑ Maspero, *Recueil de Travaux*, Vol. X, p. 210.
88. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, Vol. I, p. 697.
89. ↑ Armitage Robinson, *Biblical Researches in Palestine*, Vol. II, p. 154.
90. ↑ Donald A. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 395.
91. ↑ Max Müller, *op. cit.*, Vol. IV, p. 684.
92. ↑ William Ramsay, "Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation," *Gifford Lectures 1915-16*, London, 1927, p. 1.
93. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *The Races of the Old Testament*, p. 77.
94. ↑ *Anabasis*, Vol. 5, p. 5.
95. ↑ William Ramsay, *op. cit.*, p. 2.
96. ↑ A. H. Sayce, *op. cit.*, p. 79.
97. ↑ W. A. Mackenzie, *op. cit.*, p. 277.

98. ↑ Pinches, *The Old Testament in the Light of the Historical Records and Legends of Assyria and Babylonia*, pp. 126.
99. ↑ Childe, *The Most Ancient East*, p. 16.
100. ↑ M. Rostoutzeff, *A History of the Ancient World*, 1926, Vol. I, Plate VII.
101. ↑ M. Rostoutzeff, *op. cit.*, p. 19.
102. ↑ W. F. Albright, *op. cit.*, pp. 137-138.
103. ↑ Professor Alt, *Der Gott der Vater*, Stuttgart, 1929, makes this point.
104. ↑ E. O. James, *op. cit.*, p. 91.
105. ↑ Eden is in the north. Bit Eden (Bitadini) is in the Upper Euphrates Valley—*American Journal of Semitic Language and Literature*, Vol. 36, pp. 200ff and Vol. 39, pp. 5ff.
106. ↑ *Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 14th edition, article on Uz.