

# THE PRESBYTERIAN AND REFORMED REVIEW

No. 2—April, 1890.

## I.

### THE RELATION OF CHRISTIAN ART TO THEOLOGY.

#### I.

**T**HERE is a reasonable excuse for the many who see no connection between the development of art and that of theological ideas in the history of Christianity, and fail to perceive that art and literature were twin sisters in the service of religion, inspired by the same thoughts, but appealing, the one to the sentiment, the other to the intellect. For this connection was severed long since—fully four centuries ago—never to be fully renewed, and its existence can now be conceived only by an effort of the imagination conjuring up the ghost of departed realities that appeal no more to the common consciousness of the nineteenth century. In art, far more than in literature, the scene shifts as rapidly as the colors of a sunset: words retain their meaning, but a work of art has a different one for every generation. It is strangely difficult for us to grasp the meaning of the fact that through the general illiteracy of the people, works of religious art were the direct means of instruction in religious belief for nine-tenths of the body of Christians up to the time of the Reformation. And yet, what use has been made of this fact? In what history is the aid of the monuments called in systematically? In what work on the development of Christian theology is a place given to the paintings and sculptures which, through a period of over a thousand years, show more strikingly than words the beliefs of the people and their teachers, with all their slight, temporal and local variations? As a modern writer well says: “The faintest shadows that darkened, or the lightest breath that disturbed the

## VI.

### THE DATE OF GENESIS X.

**T**HIS article is an attempt to show, from external evidence, that the genealogical tables of the tenth chapter of Genesis could have been, and most probably were, composed as early as the time of Menephtah I and Moses. I. The first question to be settled is, How many of the nations mentioned in these lists are known, from other sources, to have existed before this time? Under this head we shall consider first those nations whose names in the Bible and in extra-Biblical sources have the same radical letters, and which certainly existed 1300 B. C. These are Tubal, Cush, Mizraim, Babel, Erech, Shinar, Assur, Nineveh, Sidon, Heth, Arvadite, Zemarite, Hamathite, Gaza, Gerar, Elam, Accad, Arkite, Calah. We shall consider, secondly, those nations whose names have probably been identified as names of nations known to have existed before 1300 B. C. Such are Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, Girsaites, Lud, Aram, Hul, Mash, Canaan, Phut and Tiras. Taking them up in order, we find that Tubal and Meshech have, since Bochart, been acknowledged to be the Moschi and Tibareni of Herod, iii, 94, vii, 78. In the time of Darius Hystaspes the Tibareni dwelt on the Euxine and the Moschi between the source of the Phasis and the Tigris. In the time of Sargon, Tabal (= Tubal) bordered Cilicia on the north, as remnants of the Tibareni still in Cicero's time seem to have done (Schrader, "K. A. T.," 83). When the third edition of Winer's "Realwörterbuch" was published in 1848, the earliest notices of the Tibareni known were those in Herodotus and Xenophon, though Strabo's mention of them was of special worth, because of his having been born in Pontus. The earliest mention of them until lately was supposed to be that made by Shalmaneser II (860-825 B. C.) in his obelisk inscription ("K. A. T.," p. 82). But, since the last edition of Prof. Schrader's work was published, the inscriptions of Tel-el-Amarna have revealed the fact that as early as 1400 B. C. Tabal (= Tubal) was a country possessing a king and paying tribute to Egypt. In the "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Archaeology," for June, 1888, p. 514, we find the words: "Bir-nani, the king of Tabal, sent the horses to me, and he sent the tribute in haste to the city of Tsimura" (Bir-nani, sar Tabal D. P. kurrames ana yasi u uspira belata kima arkhies ana ali Tsimura). In Assurbanipal's time the principal tribute consisted of horses, for the number and excellence of which Cappadocia was celebrated in classical times also (see Gelzer, "Ægypt. Zeitschrift,"

1875, p. 14 *sq.*; "K. A. T.," p. 83; "En. Brit.," v, 68). No one will hereafter doubt that this nation, at least, may have been known to Moses.

Cush, or Kash, had been the object of campaigns of the Egyptian kings even before the time of Usurtasen III. Prof. Brugsch thinks that there is no doubt that the old name of the country was Aken; but, as early as Usurtasen I, Kas is mentioned as one of the nations of the south which were conquered by him. Both of these kings belonged to the twelfth dynasty; Moses lived in the eighteenth (see Brugsch, "Hist. of Egypt," i, 138-161).

Mizraim, or Mitsraim, is the Semitic name of the land of the Nile. Till within a short time it was supposed that the earliest mention of this name for Egypt occurred on the monuments of Tiglath-Pileser I, and this in a citation made by Assurnatsirabal. The date of the former is about 1100 B. C. He gives the spellings Mutsur, Mutsurn and Mutsri. Shalmanassar II (860-825 B. C.) and Tiglath-Pileser II also mention it, with the same spelling. The Babylonian version of the trilingual inscription of Behistun spells it Mitsir (compare the Arabic Mitsr and the Hebrew Mitsr-aim). See Schrader, "K. A. T.," p. 89, who calls special attention to this latter spelling. Now in the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions, published in the "Proceedings of the Society of Biblical Arch.," June, 1888, Egypt is mentioned twelve times, and always with the spelling Mitsri (it being always employed in the genitive). Prof. Sayce gives the approximate date of those letters as B. C. 1430 ("P. S. B. A.," 1888, p. 489). Mr. Budge dates them about 1500 B. C. These dates would put the Pharaoh of the Exodus in the latter half of the fourteenth century B. C.

Babel is mentioned under the name Babilu as early at least as the reign of Agukakrimi ("K. A. T.," p. 129), who, according to Sayce in his dynastic tables, reigned long before 1450 B. C. ("The Ancient Empires of the East," p. 296). His inscription is: "I am king of the Kassites and of the Akkadians, king of the broad land of Babil (see "T. S. B. A.," iv, p. 138).\*

Schrader thinks that Erech has been identified in Warka, which he calls a seat of most ancient civilization (uralter Cultur). An early king of this city was named Uruk ("K. A. T.," 94; Sayce, "Ancient Empires," p. 293).

Shinar (שִׁנְאָר, Shin'ar) is by Schrader and others identified with the Shumer of the Babylonian monuments. It is written under the form Shumer as early as Hamurabbi, whom Schrader places about 2100 B. C. (see "Sitzungsbericht, Akad. Ber.," xxxi, 579-607, and "K. A. T.," 118). This Shumer passed, according to Prof. Schrader, through the middle-form Shumgër to the Babylonian Shunger, as dinner, "God," passed over into dinger, and then passed over to the Hebrews in the

\* "On Babylon, Shinar, Assur, Elam, etc.;" see, also, Winckler's "Untersuchungen zur Altorientalischen Geschichte," especially the first essay on the Babylonio-Assyrian chronology.

pronunciation shungar ("K. A. T.," 118, 119).\* Now, in the letter of the king of Alashiya to the king of Egypt (published in "P. S. B. A.," Plate ix) the king of Shankhar is mentioned along with the king of Khatte (itti shar Khatte u itti shar Shankhar). This is evidently the same as the Hebrew Shin'ar.†

Heth, in Assyrian and Babylonian, is often written for Hebrew Ayin. So Khaziti for 'Azzah (Budge, "Esarhaddon," p. 105, l. 15), Khumri for 'Omri, Khazazu for 'Azaz ("K. A. T.," p. 107). The only change in spelling is in the attenuation of the vowel of Shan into i. Does it not look as if the Hebrews received their spelling of Shinar as well as that of Mitsraim from the Babylonian as it was written in the time just preceding Moses?

On the rise of the Assyrian empire and the use of the word Assur as far back as 1820 B. C., see Sayce, "Ancient Empires of the East," p. 116, and "K. A. T.," 35. According to Prof. Brugsch ("History of Egypt," pp. 328, 329), Assur paid tribute to Thothmes III, 1600 B. C. Nineveh, the capital of Assyria, is mentioned in the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions ("P. S. B. A.," p. 508). According to Schrader, it is mentioned as having existed as early as the nineteenth or eighteenth century B. C. ("K. A. T.," 97). Prof. Lauth holds that Nineveh is the Nii mentioned as the place in which Thothmes I set up two stelæ in honor of his victorious march into Naharina ("Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," p. 248, note).

Sidon is frequently mentioned before 1400 B. C. Among other places, see "The Records of the Past," ii, 110; "Survey of Western Pal.," p. 164; "T. S. B. A.," June, 1888, p. 548.

The Hittites, children of Heth, are mentioned under Thothmes III, B. C. 1600 (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 334). On the Assyrian monuments, they are first mentioned under Tiglath-Pileser I, B. C. 1100 ("K. A. T.," 107). In the letter of the king of Alashiya ("P. S. B. A.," 1888, 569), they are mentioned along with Shinar. This letter was written before 1400 B. C. (see Shinar, above).

Arvad is first mentioned,‡ in the Assyrian monuments so far discovered, in an inscription of Shalmaneser II (860-825 B. C.). In the time of Rameses II, it appears as one of the cities confederate with the king of the Hittites at the great battle of Kadesh (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii, 44). As early as 1600 B. C., Thothmes III says that in his sixth campaign against the land of Ruthen (or Luthen), he came to the town of Kadesh and destroyed it, and came to the town of Aruthut (Aradus) and served it in the same way (*id.*, Vol. i, p. 331; Lauth, "Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," p. 255; Chabas, "Études," p. 185).

\* Prof. Schrader, in reading Hebrew or Aramaic, pronounces the Ayin like the Arabic Ghain, whenever it represents an original Ghain; *e. g.*, 'Azzah he pronounces Ghazza.

† Compare Lauth, "Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," p. 255. The tribute of the king of Sangar was partly of bluestone of Babel. Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 334.

‡ "Hebraica," p. 205, 1889. Arvad is mentioned in Pap. An. I.

Zemar has lately been identified beyond all doubt as being the classical Simyra, as Michaelis, in his "Spicilegium" (ii, 51) suggested. We cannot see how any one could have identified it with Samaria, as the LXX and Vulgate have apparently done, since Samaria, according to the Scriptures themselves, was built by Omri (1 Kgs. xvi, 23, 24). Jerome, the Targum Jerus., and Arabic version, have no authority for placing it at Emesa (Winer, "Realwörterbuch," Art. "Zemari"). The change of *ts* to *s* in the LXX was caused by the fact that the Greek has no letter to express the Semitic *tsodhe* (Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"). The city of Tsimir (ir Tsimir) is first mentioned on the Assyrian monuments by Tiglath-Pileser II, and often afterwards ("K. A. T.," 105), and frequently in connection with Arka. It is mentioned on the Egyptian records of Thothmes III, who says that he destroyed it (Brugsch, i, 331). In the tablet numbered XI (in "P. S. B. A.," 1888, p. 514) of the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions, edited by Prof. Sayce, the first words are, "The city of Tsumura" (alu Tsu-mu-[ra]); and further on we have, "And he sent the tribute in haste to the city of Tsumura" (u us-pi-ra be-la-ta ki-ma ar-khi-es a-na ali Tsu-mu-ra).

Hamath is mentioned frequently in the Assyrian records from Shalmaneser II on ("K. A. T.," 105); but Thothmes III mentions it in his catalogue of the towns of Upper Ruthen, or Luthen, under the name Hemthoo (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 350).

Gaza is often mentioned in the later Assyrian inscriptions, such as those of Assurnatsirabal (885-868 B. C.) and Esarhaddon ("K. A. T.," 107). In the "P. S. B. A." for 1888, p. 548, the city of Azzati is mentioned. Moreover, Thothmes III says, in the great tablet of victory at Karnak, that in the twenty-second year of his reign he left the Egyptian frontier to arrive at Gaza in a few days (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 315; Lauth, "Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," p. 253).

Gerar is mentioned in this same tablet (No. 80) under the spelling Kerar. K is the regular Egyptian transliteration for Hebrew *g*; for example, Maketha = Megiddo, Makthel = Migdul, Haiklim = Haglaim (Mariette, "Les Listes Géographiques," p. 36).

As to Elam, Assurnatsirabal says that he recaptured from the Elamites a picture of the goddess Nanâ, which 1635 years before had been taken by Kudur-Nankhundi, king of Elam ("K. A. T.," 136; Winckler, "Untersuchungen," p. 18).

The Amorites are mentioned as early at least as the reign of Thothmes III (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," p. 352). They are mentioned afterwards in the reigns of Seti I, Rameses II and III (Lauth, "Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," pp. 290, 302, 361). According to Mr. Budge, the land of the Amorites is mentioned on the reverse of a tablet numbered 63 in the British Museum collection of the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions (see "Proceedings S. B. A.," 1888, p. 549). M. Chabas thinks that the site occupied by the Amor of the inscriptions corresponds with that given to them in the Scriptures (see "Études sur l'Antiquité Historique," pp. 264, 275).

Arka, the city of the Arkites, is identified by Brugsch with the Arkatu mentioned at Karnak. "History," i, 343: "The king went along the sea-road to destroy the town of Arkatu." As Tunep and Kadesh are mentioned immediately after, there can be little doubt that the identification is correct. The inscription at Karnak is Thothmes the Third's.

Accad, as the name of a town, has been discovered by Dr. Hermann Hilprecht on an inscription of Nebuchadnezzar I (see Delitzsch, "Commentary," *in loc.*).

Calah has been considered an insuperable objection to the Mosaic authorship of Gen. x. The question is: Could Calah have been mentioned in a list of places as early as 1300 B. C.? We think it could have been. First, it is stated by Assurnatsirabal that he had built anew the city of Calah, which Shalmanassar had built before him.\* This Shalmanassar was the great-great-grandson of Assurballit, who was contemporaneous with Burnaburiash, of Babylon, who wrote so many letters to Amenophis III and IV, of the eighteenth dynasty of Egypt. Shalmanassar thus would be contemporaneous with Menephtah I, the son of Rameses II. Now, unless we are to suppose that the commotions in Syria, caused by the wars of Rameses II with the Hittites and the invasions of Egypt by the barbarians, in the reign of Menephtah I, had cut off all communication by letter or caravan between Babylonia and Assyria on the one hand and Egypt on the other, what would be more likely than that the building of a new and magnificent capital city by Shalmanassar would soon become known to the Egyptians? The Egyptian monarchs would certainly be interested in this sign of the rising power of a rival kingdom. Had Calah been built in the reign of Assurballit, every one must admit that its foundation stone could scarcely have been laid until a knowledge of his undertaking had reached Egypt. Are we to suppose that one of his descendants, less than a hundred years after, could have built a capital for his empire and not a rumor of its completion and grandeur have ever reached the confines of Egypt? But, even if there were no communication between Egypt and Assyria in the latter part of the fourteenth century B. C., there is certainly room for doubting that Calah was first founded by Shalmanassar. In the first place, the

\* Kalchu machra sha Shulmanuasharid shar (matu) Ashshur rubu alik pania epush machazu shuu enaachma izlal [ana] tili u karme itur machazu shuu ana ishshute abuf nishi kishidti katiya sha matati sha apilushinani sha (matu) shuchi (matu) Lakie ana sichirtisha Sirku sha nibirti (naru) Purat (matu) Zamua ana pat gimrisha sha Bit-Adini u (matu) Chatte u sha Liburna (matu) Patinaai alkaa ina libbi ushatsbit, *i. e.*, old Calah, which Shalmanassar, king of Assyria, a prince preceding me had made—that city was fallen, brought to naught, become a heap and grass-grown—that city I built anew, the people of the conquest of my hands from the lands which I had conquered, I took from Suchi and all Laki from Sirku, at the ford of the Euphrates, from all Zamua, from Bit-Adini and Chatti, and from Liburna, of the country of the Patinai, and I caused to dwell there (see the "Sammlung von assyr. u. bab. Texten," pp. 116, 117).

verb *epushu* or *ebushu* is often used of the rebuilding of a palace or city.\* So that when Assurnatsirabal says that Shalmanassar had built (*epuush*) Calah, it may mean only that Shalmanassar had rebuilt it. But, in the second place, we have conclusive evidence from the inscriptions themselves, that this statement of Assurnatsirabal cannot be taken as settling absolutely the date of the first building of Calah. Nabonidus speaks of building the Temple of Sin at Charran, which Assurbanipal, the son of Esarhaddon, had built; but Assurbanipal himself says that this temple had only been rebuilt (*upatika pitiksu*) by him, and that it had been built (*epushu*) before his day by Shalmanassar, the son of Assurnatsirabal.†

So that, to save Nabonidus from ignorance or inaccuracy, we must conclude that *epishu*, when used of a preceding monarch, does not always refer to the supposed first builder. If it did, then Nabonidus was wrong in speaking of Assurbanipal; and in like manner may Assurnatsirabal have been wrong in speaking of Shalmanassar I. To sum up, we have not convincing ground for believing that Calah was founded by Shalmanassar I; but, if we had, there is small reason for believing that a knowledge of its founding and importance could not

\* Compare, *bit abushati sha ekal belutiya...sha enachuma ishtu ushshishu adi tachlubishu epuush, i. e.*, the house...of my royal palace...which was fallen from its foundation to its roof, I made (anew). See "Sammlung von ass. u. bab. Texten," p. 127. Dr. F. E. Peiser translates the *epuush* by "baute ich (neu)." On the same page we have: *bitu sha pagri sha Erba-Ramman a tamlia rabaa sha paan iltana sha Ashuradinachi shar (matu) Ashur epushu emachuma epuush, i. e.*, the morgue (?) which Erba-Ramman and the great northern tamlia which Assuradinachi king of Assyria had built (and which) were fallen in ruins, I rebuilt (Peiser, *baute ich*). Compare page 129 of the same: *tamlia...sha Tukulti-Ninib...epushu...artsip, i. e.*, the tamlia (Unterbau) which Tukulti-Ninib had built (made), I built (Peiser, *baute ich [neu auf]*). Ramman-nirari calls himself the mokin of the fallen cities of the Kashshi, Kute *et al.* Peiser translates, *der da (neu) gründete (id., p. 5)*. On page 7 of the same, Ramman-nirari says of a gate which had been made (*ipshu*) before but was fallen, that he made and returned it to its place (*epuush ana ashrisu utiir*). On page 42 of the same, Tiglath-Pileser I says, of a temple which had been built (*ibuush*) by Shamshi-Ramman, that it had lain in ruins 641 years, that Ashurdan had torn it down and not built it again (*bitu shaatu ibbul ul ibuush*). Dr. Winckler translates the last, *nicht (wieder) aufgebaut*. A like use of *ebush*, in the sense of rebuild, may be seen in the "Proceedings S. B. A.," 1889, pp. 125, 126, 127, 210, and in many other places.

† See Samuel Alden Smith's "Assurbanipal," pp. 12-18, for the statements of Nabonidus and Assurbanipal. The Assyrian text will be found in the appendix to the same, and in III R., 28, 29, end. The inscription of Nabonidus may be seen in the original in V. R., 65, col. i, 46 *sq.* S. A. Smith renders it into German, which may be translated: "To build Echulchul, the Temple of Sin, my Lord, who goes at my side, in Charran (Haran), which Assurbanipal, the king of Assyria, the son of Esarhaddon, king of Assyria, the exalted, who was king before me, had built." Of this same temple Assurbanipal says: *bit Sin...kirib Charrana Sulmanu-asharedu apil Ashur-natsir (apli shar Ashshur) (mach) riya epishu, i. e.*, the Temple of Sin in the midst of Charran, Shalmanassar, the son of Assurnatsirabal, king of Assyria before me, had made.

have reached Egypt in the reign of Menephtah I, the Pharaoh who reigned at the supposed date of the Exodus.

Before considering the names which have probably been identified as the names of nations known to have existed before Menephtah's time, let us make the following remarks on the nations whose names have already been explained :

First, it is to be noted with regard to them that many of them have different names in different languages ; *e. g.*, Aigyptos was the Greek name for the land of the Nile as far back at least as the time of Homer ; Mitsr was the name common to the Asiatic peoples (see " P. S. B. A.," June, 1888) ; the Accadian name was Magan (Schrader, " K. G. F.," 289 *sq.*), and the native name was Kemi (Lepsius, Article " Ægypten," in " Herzog's Encyclop."). In like manner, Aithiopia was the Greek name for Nubia, Cash was the Semitic name, Milukhkhi was the Accadian name (" K. G. F.," 282 *sq.*), and Kash the Egyptian (Lepsius, Art. " Æg.," in Herzog, i, 175 ; Brugsch, " History of Egypt," i, 285).

Secondly, it is to be noted that some of the names most frequently mentioned on the Egyptian monuments are omitted entirely from the Assyrian and Babylonian, and *vice versâ*, *e. g.*, Elam is not mentioned on the Egyptian monuments, though admitted to have existed as a powerful empire before 2000 B. C. ; and Assurnatsirabal's citation of Tiglath-Pileser's mention of Egypt gives us the oldest notice of Egypt on the Assyrian monuments. The reason for the omission of these names is that naturally and reasonably those nations only are mentioned which were brought into direct communication with the monarchs who made the monuments. The nations which lay beyond direct commercial, tributary or hostile relations, we could scarcely expect to find mentioned on temples of victory, like that of Thothmes III, nor in odes of triumph, like Pentaur's, nor in treaties of peace like that of Rameses II, nor in reports of viceroys like the despatches to Amenophis IV, nor in voyages of discovery like that of Queen Hasheps. Tabal is mentioned in the reports sent to Amenophis IV (" P. S. B. A.," 1888, p. 514) as sending tribute to Egypt, whereas Meshech, its next-door neighbor, is not ; on the contrary, Meshech is mentioned on the Assyrian inscriptions of Tiglath-Pileser I (1100 B. C.), whereas Tabal is not mentioned till Shalmanassar II (Schrader, " K. A. T.," 82-85). Meshech was farther from Egypt than Tabal, and hence was most probably out of the circle of its influence, though not necessarily of its knowledge ; Tabal, in like manner, was further from Assyria than was Meshech, and hence the Assyrian monarchs came into direct contact with it, and mention it about 250 years later.

II. We shall now consider the names which have probably been identified as those of nations which are known to have existed before the time of Moses. We shall take them up in the following order : Elishah, Tarshish, Kittim, Girgasites, Lud, Aram, Hul, Mash, Canaan, Phut and Tiras. 1. As to Elishah, Delitzsch holds that the ancient view of Josephus and Jerome, that this means the Æolians, is the



most probable; though he admits that "this Hebraizing of the name with the inclusion of the nominative ending εἰς is abnormal." Bochart held that it was the Peloponnesus, in which was Elis. Ebrard says: "Since, according to Pausanias, iii, 21, purple was produced to the later centuries in Lacedæmon, we might think of a Greek tribe inhabiting the Peloponnesus" (see "Christian Apologetics," i, 304).

The Targum of Jonathan has the province of Italia. The Peshito has 'Alisha in Gen. x, 4, and 1 Chron. i, 7, but 'Ellas in Ezek. xvii, 7. Ebrard thinks that, "by the interchange of l and r, a trace of the word Elishah might be found in Eryx!" but he seems to forget that this would involve a change also of sh into ks (see "Apologetics," ii, 305). Shulthess held it to be the west coast of Africa, which was possessed by the Carthaginians, and from which they brought purple. He thinks, also, that Carthage may in early times have been called Elissa, after its founder and guardian goddess (Justin, xviii, 4 and 6; see Winer's "Realwörterbuch," i, 321). But, as Dillmann says, it would not then have been put among the Japhetites, nor has it yet been proven that Carthage was ever called Elissa ("Commentary on Genesis," *in loc.*).

Thus we see that Elishah has been variously explained as being Hellas, Elis, Æolis, Italy and Carthage (or Africa proper). In answer to the first three, we might say, with Dillmann, *in loc.*, that the Hebrew shah for the Greek nominative ending s is inconceivable (undenkbar). In the transliteration of Greek words in the Syriac New Testament, as we have taken pains to observe, we always find semkath put for sigma, shin never; as is also the case in the Targums (see numerous examples in Levi's "Wörterbuch"). Delitzsch himself admits that it would be abnormal. Neither Hellas nor Æolis is found often in the poems of Homer (Gladstone, "Homer," p. 13); and if Elis, in its local and more ancient form, were meant, we would expect to find Yelis, from Welis or Velis (see "Encyclopædia Britannica," viii, p. 130). The most that can be said for any one of these three is that, if it were proven historically that it was Elishah, we would be compelled to set aside the philological objections to it. As to the supposition that it is Italy, there is no historical or philological basis for it; the only grounds whatsoever for it, being the paraphrase of the Targum to Ezek. xxvii, 7, and a gloss by Syncellus, "Elissa, from whom are the Sicilians."

Since the Hebrews were generally accurate in their transliteration of names, as any one can see by comparing the proper names which occur both in the Scriptures and on the monuments, let us see if there is not some evidence on the monuments for the existence of a nation or country which would correspond to the Elishah of Gen. x, and of Ezek. xxvii, 7. Among the letters sent from "various Asiatic kings" (Sayce, in "P. S. B. A.," x, 488) to the Egyptian kings, Amenophis III and IV, are a number from the king of Alishiya (compare the LXX Elisa in Gen. x, 4; 1 Chron. i, 7; but Eleisai, in Ezek. xxvii, 7). This

king's name is unfortunately lost; but he styles himself the brother of the Egyptian king, and prays, "may peace be multiplied in my countries" (ina libbi matatiya danis lushulmu, "P. S. B. A.," x, 567). He has horses and chariots. He promises the king of Egypt bulls and trees and vessels of bronze, the like of which were not made in the land of Egypt. He asks for a man who understands eagles, and that the king of Egypt will not make any treaty with the king of the Hittites or with the king of Shankhar. This Alishiya may be the same as the Alus, which is mentioned in the inscriptions on the Temple of Victory, by Rameses III, where he says of the invading nations that they "came up leaping from their coasts and islands."\* Here it will be noticed that they are mentioned again as being neighbors of the Hittites. That they came leaping from their coasts and islands may be compared with Ezek. xxvii, 7, where we are told that purple stuffs were brought from the isles (or coasts, since the word *'iyyim* may mean coasts, or regions; see Gesenius and compare Delitzsch and Cheyne on Is. xx, 6) of Elishah, or as the LXX have it, "Eleisai."† While we do not know enough about Alishiya to say what its language and racial affinities were, yet it seems to us that its identification with Elishah would meet the requirements of history, philology and exegesis. The difficulties in the way of identifying Elishah with Hellas, Elis or any other country increase the possibility that it is the same as Alishiya. If it be admitted that Elishah is Alishiya, the mention of it by Moses would seem the most natural thing in the world; if it be not admitted the impossibility of the mention of it by Moses cannot be asserted, until it be proven (1) what country or nation Elishah was, and (2) that this country, or nation, did not exist in the time of Moses.

By Tarshish three principal historical localities have been understood, to wit: Tartessus in Spain, the country of the Tyrsenoi or Etruscans in Italy, and Tarsus in Cilicia.

1. Prof. Rawlinson argues in favor of Tarsus because of the improbability of Tartessus having been Tarshish, since, owing to the distance of Spain, it could hardly have been known to the Egyptians in Moses' time. Tarsus, moreover, was close to the Kittim ("The Origin of the Nations," p. 185). The arguments of F. G., in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," in favor of identifying Tarsus with Tarshish are: (1) That Tarshish is transliterated *θαρσσις* in the Greek versions; (2) That *Ταρσος* in the New Testament is transliterated in the Syriac versions Tarsos (t = teth, s = semkath). But, in answer to (1), it may be said that it is no argument for any position for Tarshish, since it is a mere transliteration; and besides, not *θαρσσις* but *ταρσος* is the Greek name of the capital of Cilicia. In answer to (2), it may be said that, with the

\* Lauth, "Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," p. 361; Chabas, "Études," p. 260.

† Whether Alishiya has any connection with the Alizones of Homer ("Il.," ii, 857) or with the Halys, or with the Lasonioi or Alusonioi of Herodotus (vii, 77; iii, 90), further discoveries may reveal. May not the Elusa mentioned by Mariette, in "Les Listés Géographiques," p. 49, be the same as Elishah?

exception of Tyros, Greek  $t$  is always transliterated into the Syriac of the New Testament by teth, and that sigma is regularly transliterated by semkath.

2. We find the following facts and traditions with regard to the origin and history of Tartessus in Spain :

(1) It certainly existed before the time of Solomon (1 Kgs. x, 22), and was not first known by this name after the settlement of the Phœceans, as De Goeje supposes.

(2) It most probably existed before the Phœnicians came to Spain, since the name (contra Gesenius' Thesaurus and with Knobel in his "Völkertafel," p. 92) is not Semitic, but most probably Semitized from Turdetania into Tarshish (Dillmann, *in loc.*).

(3) Not the city, but the land and people are meant, or, as Eusebius says, "Tarshish, from whom the Iberians." This is evident, first, from the analogy of the other names in the list; and, secondly, from the statement of Herodotus (i, 163) that the Phœceans made early voyages to Tartessus as well as to Iberia and Tyrrhenia (Herodotus does not say, as the English edition of Delitzsch's "Commentary on Genesis," Vol. i, p. 313, leads us to suppose, that the Phœceans had settled there before the Phœnicians took advantage of the mines of Tartessus).

(4) We think there can be no reasonable doubt that Tartessus is the city generally meant in the Scriptures by Tarshish.

(5) The inhabitants of Spain were probably allied with the Etruscans in origin, language, alphabet and culture (see Knobel, "Völkertafel," p. 90 *sq.*), and this leads us to mention :

3. Some facts and traditions as to the origin and history of the Etruscans.

(1) According to the traditions of Herodotus (i, 94), a body of Lydians colonized Tyrrhenia. Niebuhr claims that these Lydians were probably Mæonians ("History of Rome," i, 108), a tribe mentioned by Homer ("Il.," ii, 864-7) as coming against Troy from the neighborhood of the Gygean mere. As Canon Rawlinson says, "The mythus may represent the flight of the Mæonians westward, on the occupation of their country by the Lydians" (see his "Herod.," i, 281 *sq.*). A. S. Murray, in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," viii, 556, says: "The Lydian origin was accepted by the Etruscans themselves in later times, and many have seen confirmations of it in the similarity of the tombs and tunnels existing in both countries and in the records of a singular community between them in such matters as music, games and customs. The legend of Herodotus is an attempt to explain the word Tyrrhenia," etc.

(2) Another tradition asserts that Pelasgians from Thessaly had entered Italy from the Adriatic by way of Spain and founded Cortona. But, according to Thucydides, xi, 109, and Herod. i, 57, the Pelasgians were the same as the Tyrrhenians. Homer calls Thessalian Argos Pelasgian ("Il.," ii, 681), and Zeus he surnames Pelasgian (*id.*, xvi, 233).

(3) There were Tyrrhenians in Thrace, Thuc., iv, 109. Indeed, Thrace itself, if Knobel's argument for the change of k and s be accepted, might be denoted by the Hebrew *Tars*, and Thrakia might be connected with Tarkonia (= Tarquinius), in Etruria, and with Tarraco and Tarraga and Tartessus, in Spain ("Völkertafel," p. 89). In historic times, the chief seat of the Tyrrhenians outside of Etruria was in Thrace, where they worked the rich silver mines, and seem to have had the same disposition for the fine arts as the Etruscans ("Encyclopædia Britannica," viii, 557). These Thracian Tyrrhenians probably made their way by land to Italy in the earliest times (*id.*).

(4) The same Tyrrhenian race which was found in Thrace was found in Asia Minor also (Thuc., iv, 109; Murray, in "Encyclopædia Britannica," viii, 556). Homer mentions the Pelasgians that inhabited deep-soiled Larissa and places them next to the Thracians, who were led by Akamas.

(5) They seem to have come at an earlier date still from the highlands of Phrygia, whence came all the Pelasgians before they divided into Italians, Greeks *et al.* (see Keary, "Outline of Primitive Belief," 163 *sq.*, and compare Herod. i, 57, 58).

(6) While the name given to this widely extended race by the Greeks after they separated from them was Pelasgoi (from *paras* and *ja*, the far-goers, or from *peran* and *eimi*, the further-goers. See R. Pischl, in the "Zeitschrift für Vergleichende Sprachforschung," Vol. xx, and Prof. R. C. Jebb, in "Encyclopædia Britannica," xi, 82), they probably called themselves Thraks, or something analogous ("Völkertafel," p. 89). Compare how the Greeks called themselves Hellenes, though, according to Aristotle, they had at an earlier time been called Greeks (Met. i, 14).

4. Whether or not it be admitted that the Tartessians, Etruscans and Thracians, all or in part, were the same, it must be admitted that there is a possibility of the dispersion of such a race along the northern shore of the Mediterranean, from Phrygia to Spain, before Moses' time, and that the Hebrews may have denoted one or all by the name of Tarshish.

(1) The analogy of the wide dispersions of the Gauls and Goths, of the Phœnicians and Arabs, of the Normans and Turks, shows the certainty of the possibility of migrations of immense bodies of men by sea or land (compare De Quatrefages, "The Human Species," Book v).

(2) The tradition recorded by Herodotus (ii, 103-105), that the Colchians were colonists from Egypt, left by Sesostris in his Asiatic campaigns, and the long residence of the Babylonian Israelites in Goshen and the early settlement of so many immigrant tribes in the Delta, show how widely different branches of the same nation could be dispersed by land, even in the earliest times. That we do not know how or when the Tartessians went from Asia Minor to Spain does not prove that they did not do so. The emigration could certainly have been made either by sea or land.

(3) If, with Sir John Lubbock ("Prehistoric Times," p. 73), we believe that we are "quite justified in concluding that between B. C. 1500 and 1200 the Phœnicians were already acquainted with the mineral fields of Spain and Britain," we can see how a knowledge of the Tartessians (their name changed into Tarshish, according to the rules given in Gesenius' Thesaurus) may have been conveyed to the Hebrews in Moses' time.

(4) But, even if the Phœnicians did not convey such information to Egypt, the widely extended settlements of the Pelasgoi along the northern shore of the Mediterranean sea would lead us to suppose that they were early accustomed to distant voyages, which might easily have brought a knowledge of them to Egypt.\*

(5) These traditions and suppositions are supported by the Egyptian monuments, as interpreted by Brugsch, Lauth, Birch, Chabas and others. They show that tribes from beyond the Mediterranean, as early as the latest as 1200 B. C., attacked Egypt by sea. Among these tribes are mentioned Danau, Tuirska, Turses, and some who are said to be from the "sea of Tuirsha." Was not one of these peoples, the radical letters of whose names are *trs*, *trsk*, *trsh*, most likely the same as one or more of the peoples called the Tursenoi, Thracians, Tartessians and Tarragonians? May not the Mediterranean, or part of it, have been called the "sea of Tuirsha," because of their wide-spread settlements along its coasts and of their extensive commerce? And may not an early commercial supremacy of such a maritime people and the possible giving of their name to the Mediterranean sea, or a part of it, account for the "ships of Tarshish" of the Scriptures, and also for the fact that Tarshish itself is sometimes translated "sea" (compare the Vulg. to Is. lxvi, 19).

5. From the above arguments it may be seen that, if Tarshish be identified with Tartessus, Etruscans or Thracians, it could have been known to the Egyptians before 1300 B. C., and probably was known under the name of Tuirsha (Chabas, "Études," p. 36, sq.).

\* We are too apt to underrate the commercial ventures of ancient nations. Rev. Joseph Edkins, D.D., says, in the "Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society," Vol. xviii, p. 7: "It is perfectly possible that the art of writing may have been communicated to China from Mesopotamia about 2500 B. C., by the ocean route." Dr. Meyer says: "Um die Mitte des 2ten Jahrtausends vor Christi war der Seehandel der Phönizier, wie die ägyptischen Denkmäler lehren, bereits in hohem Maasse entwickelt" ("Geschichte von Aegypten," p. 230). Egyptian commerce reached as far as Babylon in the twelfth dynasty (*id.*, 183). In the twelfth dynasty, the commerce on the Red Sea, which had been begun in the eleventh dynasty, was in full bloom (*id.*). Chabas says that the objects of Egyptian antiquity found in Algeria may be witnesses of the knowledge in Egypt of this country ("Études," p. 237). Gladstone finds traces of Phœnician influence all through Homer's "Odyssey" ("Phœnician Affinities of Ithaca," in *The Nineteenth Century*, for August, 1889). Sir Henry Rawlinson draws attention to the mention of ships of Ur in the early inscriptions, and to the connection of these with those of Ethiopia ("J. R. A. S.," xxvii.)

As to the Kittim, there seems to be no doubt that Cyprus, or the coast opposite it, was inhabited by them.\* This island was, perhaps, first conquered by the Egyptians in the time of Amasis (Herodotus ii, 182), though under the name of Asebi it certainly paid tribute to Thothmes III, 1600 B. C. The tribute which its king then paid consisted of brass, lead, bluestone, elephants' tusks (?), copper, mares and chariots (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii, pp. 325-327), showing that even then it was rich and civilized. The same king mentions "the Kiti (= Chittim of the Holy Scriptures), who possessed the island, and, in all probability, the sea coast lying to the north of the Phœnicians" (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, pp. 321, 326, 352; Von Ranke, "Universal History," i, p. 13). The first mention of the island of Cyprus in the Assyrian records is in the reign of Sargon (722-705 B. C.), under the name of Jatnana or Atnana. He conquered it, and mentions it often in his inscriptions (Schrader, "K. G. F.," 242 sq.). Judging from the proper names mentioned in the tribute lists, Prof. Schrader concludes that it was, beyond doubt, possessed by Greek colonies much earlier than 700 B. C. ("K. A. T.," 87); though we doubt if they prove more than that a people allied to the Greeks, and not Shemitic, lived there before that time. The inscriptions lately discovered in the island "show that the native Cyprian language is a form of the Greek, and that therefore the native Cyprian people belonged to the Aryan stock" (W. H. Goodyear, in the "Encyclopædia Britannica," American Supplement, ii, p. 509, and compare note to Bunbury's Art. in "Encyclopædia Britannica," vi, p. 661). These Aryans must have come from Asia Minor. According to Prof. Socin, Cilicia, as well as Cyprus, was originally peopled by the non-Shemitic Kittim, who left their name in the Cilician district Ketis ("Encyclopædia Britannica," xviii, p. 818). Perhaps they were the same as the Kiteians of Homer ("Odyssey," xi, p. 521), and the river Ketus of Mysia may have been named after them. Their syllabary is said to be a modification of the Altaic hieroglyphics used in Asia Minor (Conder, "Altaic Hieroglyphics," p. 97). The islanders may have been called Kittim by the Hebrews, from the city of Kition (compare Romans from Roma), or, more probably, from what has been said above, it may be concluded that both city and people were named from a real or supposed ancestor, or hero (compare Jews from Judah).

We have not, at present, sufficient knowledge to affirm or deny that there was historical or racial connection between the Kittim and the Macedonians. Knobel and Canon Rawlinson claim also that the ma of Macar and of Magog denotes places, *i. e.*, Macar would be the land of the Carians, Magog the land of Gog. So, no doubt, Macedon, in its Doric form Makitis, may mean the land of the Kiti (compare the Kiti, and Ketis, and Kition and Kiteians mentioned above). Who

\* Kedi ist "ein mehrfach vorkommender Volksname, der die Bewohner Nordsyriens und vielleicht des südlichen Kleinasiens zu bezeichnen scheint." Meyer, "Geschichte von Aegypten," p. 245.

knows but that the Macedonians may have swerved to the north-west and the Kittim to the south, from their originally common home in Phrygia? Still, in the present state of our knowledge, we think it is more probable that the use of the word Kittim, to denote the Macedonians in 1 Macc. i, 1, viii, 5, and possibly for the Romans, in Dan. xi, 30, is an extension of its meaning, which was probably occasioned by an adaptation or misapprehension of the "isles" or "coasts" of Kittim of Jer. ii, 10, and Ezek. xxvii, 6 (see Dillmann, *in loc.*).

The Girgasites, according to Brugsch ("History of Egypt," ii, 44), are the same as the Kerkesh, who were allies of the Hittites against Rameses II, the father of the Pharaoh of the Exodus. The change of Shemitic g to Egyptian k is usual (see the lists of Thothmes III, Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, pp. 350, 351).

Lud has generally been identified with the Lydians (Josephus, i, p. 64), because of the similarity of the names (Assyr. mâtu Luddi). Some have supposed that there was an ancient Lydian empire, which reached as far as Syria.

It seems to us that most of the arguments put forward by Prof. Sayce in favor of an ancient Hittite empire in Asia Minor would equally well support an ancient Lydian kingdom, such, for example, as the legends which make the founder of the Heracleid dynasty of Lydia, the son of Nilus and the grandson of Belus.

The close relation of art, literature and religion between Lydia and Babylon also points to an early relationship in race (see Sayce, "Ancient Empires," pp. 211-235, and Art. "Lydia" in the "Encyclopædia Britannica." According to Schrader ("K. A. T.," 114), Luddu is first mentioned among the Assyrians on the monuments of Assurbanipal (668-626 B. C.).

Rawlinson thinks that Lud is the Ruten (or Luten) of the Egyptian monuments ("Origin of Nations," p. 234). Prof. Schrader thinks that this is probably true, the ending *en* of Ruten, according to Wiedemann, being a demonstrative sign. Prof. Erman, of Berlin, denies that the *th* of Luthen would go over into *dh*. But is not this *th* the same as that in Tharnaskoo (Damaskus), Loothen (Lod), Makthel (Migdol) and Hadithu (Hadida), as identified by Brugsch ("History of Egypt," i, 350, 351)? This name is frequent in the monuments of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties.

Aram is perhaps mentioned by name in an inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I (Lotz, "Die Inschriften Tiglath-Pileser," i, p. 45). Schrader thinks that Shalmanezer II may mean Aram when he speaks of a king of the mat Aramu. Under the name Naharain, the Egyptians, as early as Thothmes I, understood Mesopotamia and perhaps the adjacent regions (see Lauth, "Aus Aeg. Vorzeit," p. 248).

Traces of the tribe or nation called Hul in Gen. x are found from Armenia to the Jordan. Josephus mentions a town called Oulatha LXX, for Hul = Oul), between Galilee and Trachonitis (Ant., xv, 10), which is in the same locality as the ardu l'khuleh, near the sources of

the Jordan, whose inhabitants Pliny (v, 19) calls Hylatæ, *i. e.*, according to Delitzsch, the inhabitants of the Hule valley, between Palestine and Cœlesyria ("Comment.," *in loc.*). The Lake of Merom is, in Arabic, called the Bahr el Khule (Kiepert's Map of Palestine). Delitzsch says that the cuneiform inscriptions frequently name a country Khûlia, in connection with the mountain land of Kashyar, which he identifies with Mt. Masius, the Mash of our text. He does not mention the date of the inscription (see "Comment.," *in loc.*). This position would accord approximately with that assigned to Hul by Josephus (Ant., i, 6, 4). Sir Henry Rawlinson says: "There are names in the early cuneiform inscriptions, Khula or Khuliya, which are probably connected with Cholobatine (Khul, of Bitan, the latter term being the old Assyrian name for Armenia) and with the Hul of the Scriptures (see Bochart's 'Phaleg,' ii, 9). The upper course of the Tigris is likewise named Khali in the inscriptions" (see note in Rawlinson's "Heroditus," i, 122). We would merely suggest, if this Hul may not be the same as the Khalu (or Kharu) of the Egyptian monuments. A people so named was one of the four principal nations which, in the time of Thothmes III, occupied Palestine and Syria. They were the southernmost of all, and, according to Prof. Brugsch, were the Phœnicians ("History of Egypt," i, 221); but, according to Prof. Rawlinson, they were more probably a Syrian people ("History of Egypt," ii, 257). There is no doubt that they were a Semitic people, highly esteemed by the Egyptians, and carrying on with them a lively trade, partly by sea, partly by caravan (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 221-225). As to the change of Hebrew Heth into Kh in Egyptian, compare Khalgoot (Helkath), Khashboo (Heshbon) (*id.*, i, 350, 351). These Khalu are mentioned as far back at least as Thothmes III (*id.*, i, 321).

Mash is identified by Delitzsch with Mt. Masius, the south-eastern branch of the Taurus chain, lying on the upper Tigris, above Nisibis. He further says that Mt. Masius is the same as Kashyar of the cuneiform inscriptions. If this be so, it is mentioned as far back as Tiglath-Pileser I (Lotz, "Die Insc. Tig.-Pil. I," Col. i, 72). Schrader puts a Mâsh on the Euphrates some distance north of Nisibis (see the map in "K. G. F."). Brugsch identifies the Masu of Rameses II's inscriptions with the inhabitants of Mount Masius ("History of Egypt," ii, 44). On account of their position, this seems more probable than to suppose that the Masu are the Mysians (Sayce, "Ancient Empires of the East," p. 216); which, however, Kalisch on other grounds maintained ("Comment.," *in loc.*). Josephus says that it means "Mesanians, now called Charax Spasini" (Ant., i, 6, 4), which, according to W. L. Bevan (in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," p. 1829), was "in lower Babylonia, on the shores of the Persian gulf." Josephus no doubt confounded Mash with Massa, whose descendants were most probably the Masani, who are placed by Ptolemy (19 §2) on the east of Arabia, near the borders of Babylonia (Bevan, as above,



under Massa), where Schrader says that the Babylonian inscriptions also place them ("K. G. F.," 102, 262ff, 364).

In favor of the northern position of Mash is the fact that in 1 Chron. i, 17, the Hebrew text reads Meshech instead of Mash, and that the LXX, in both Genesis and Chronicles, reads Mosoch. Mash (*i. e.*, Mount Masius) and Meshech (*i. e.*, the Moschi) being adjacent, have probably been confounded, or, as Rawlinson maintains ("The Origin of Nations," p. 244), the country of Meshech was inhabited by a mixed race of Japhethites and Shemites, both dwelling together.

In conclusion, it may be said, that whichever country may be identified with Mash, or wherever Mash may be located, the fact remains that the Egyptian monuments mention the Masu as existing 1400 B. C. and as known at that time to the Egyptians. Let those who assert that Gen. x did not mean them, prove it if they can. The greater the difficulty in identifying them with a people of later times, the greater the probability that the Masu of Rameses are meant, and that the mention of them was made by some one conversant with Egyptian history.

Canaan is probably meant by the mat Akharri of the Assyrian monuments as far back as Tiglath-Pileser I. Under the Akkadian name mar Martu, it is mentioned on an old Babylonian brick inscription of the Elamite king, Kudurmabug, found at Ur-Mugheir, written doubtless before 2000 B. C. It is, perhaps, meant by the mat katnana ("K. G. F.," 365), occurring in another inscription whose date is unknown. It seems to us that it will most probably be found that the mat Kinaaim mentioned in the Tel-el-Amarna inscriptions ("P. S. B. A.," 1888, p. 549) is the land of Canaan. The Babylonian reads: ana sharrani sha mat Kinaaim ardani ahiya, *i. e.*, "To the kings of the land of Kinaim, the servants of my brother." That Canaan was in early times settled by a people related to the Egyptians, Cushites and Phut, Prof. Brugsch believes to be proven by the dark-red color with which they are all painted and denoted on the monuments (see "Abh. u. Vort. des 5ten Orientalisten Congresses," African Section, p. 76).

As to Phut, three main views have been held. Some have thought that it lay between Egypt and Cush, being equivalent to To-Pet, "the region of the bow" (see R. S. Poole, in "Smith's Bible Dictionary"). A second view is that it denotes a part or the whole of Libya, and at least the country between the Canopic branch of the Nile and Libya, which, in Coptic, is called Pi-phait ("L'Egypte sous les Pharaons," ii, pp. 28-31, 243; Cheyne on Is. lxvi, 19; Dillmann and Delitzsch on Genesis, *in loc.*). A third view is that Phut is equivalent to Punt, which lay south, or south-east, of Cush (Bunsen, "Egypt's Place," ii, 304; Ebers' "Egypten u. die Bücher Moses," i, 64; Brugsch, "Die altäg. Völkertafel," in the "Abhandl. des 5ten intern. orient. Congresses," iii, 51 sq.). It is argued in favor of this last view—first, that the omission of n in words derived from the Egyptian is common (compare

Moph from Menf, Shishak from Sheshonk). Secondly, the Punt ethnologically are on the monuments connected with the Egyptians, Cushites and Canaanites, all of these races being painted with a dark-red color. Thirdly, the early importance of Punt historically is vouched for by the monuments. As early as the eleventh dynasty, a maritime expedition was made to it. Its position, race and importance would, we think, suit all the references made to Phut in the Scriptures. In Ezekiel (xxx, 5; xxxviii, 5), it is mentioned along with Persia and Lud, as all three were likely among the most distant nations known to the prophet. In Jeremiah xlvi, 9, it is naturally mentioned along with Cush, which was next neighbor to Punt. Whichever of these three opinions we accept makes no difference in our argument, since all undoubtedly are mentioned on the monuments before the time claimed for the Exodus (see the authorities cited above).

Of Tiras, Dillmann says that "it must, according to its place in the list, lie either east of Meshech, or in a row of its own to the west and south." This suits the position of Cilicia, which was south-west of Tubal and Meshech. May not Tiras be Taurus, or Tarsus? In favor of the former, one might use Brugsch's contention that the Tuirsha of Menephtah II's list are Taurians. In favor of the second are (1) the probability that Tarsus is to be recognized in the Tharshka of Rameses III's list (Brugsch, "History," ii, 152); (2) the fact that in later times the coins of Tarsus bear the letters trz, s and z being sometimes interchanged in the Semitic dialects; (3) the fact that the position of Tarsus on the river Cydnus, near to Cyprus, and not far from two of the great passes of the Taurus, must have caused a city to be built there in very early times. Prof. Schrader and Dr. Winckler think we find Tarsus in the Tarzi mentioned in the inscriptions of Shalmanassur II, who, according to Prof. Hommel, reigned from 859 to 825 B. C. ("K. G. F.," 241; "Gesch. Bab. u. Ass.," p. 589; "Sammlung von Ass. u. Bab. Texten," p. 145). We know, from Shalmanassur's inscriptions, that Tarzi was in the land of Kau, or Cilicia. It seems to have been the chief city of Kau, since, after its capture by Shalmanassur, the Cilicians grasped his feet and gave tribute, and Kati, the king of Kau, was deposed and his brother Karri was made king in his stead.

The second question is as to the names of the nations which can reasonably be supposed to have existed at or before 1300 B. C., such as Javan, Meshech, Madai, Dodanim, Gomer, Uz, Togarmah, Ashkenaz, Magog, and the sons of Mizraim, Cush and Joktan.

Taking them up in order, we find that the only mention of Javan in the Assyrian records is in an inscription of Sargon's (722-705 B. C.), who says that he had drawn out like fish the inhabitants of the land of Javan, which is in the midst of the sea (Schrader, "K. A. T.," 81). Abydenos states that Sennacherib defeated the Greeks in a battle on the Cilician coasts (Eusebius, i, 35). None of the later Assyrian

kings, not even Assurbanipal, who speaks of Gyges of Lydia, mention them; as also do none of the Babylonian kings. In the *Behistun* inscriptions, Darius mentions the Javanese as his subjects, meaning by them the inhabitants of the coast land of Asia Minor. In the edicts of Asoka of the third century B. C., they are called Jona (Kcary, "Outlines of Primitive Belief," p. 163).

In Greek literature it first occurs in the "Iliad," Book xiii, p. 685, where the only epithet applied to them is "with the trailing tunics," and where they appear along with no greater and no less than the Bocotians, Locrians, Phthians and illustrious Epeians. The Ionian invasion of Asia Minor had certainly not occurred before the Trojan war, as "there were no Greeks of Asia Minor at the time" (Gladstone's "Homer," p. 11). "The Ionians of the poem [of Homer] are entirely in the background" (*id.*, p. 13).

It is not till about the middle of the seventh century B. C. that we have any trustworthy account of Ionian cities in Asia Minor, though it is probable, from their importance at that time, that they had been founded some time before. The fact that, for two hundred years, *i. e.*, between 700 and 500, no mention of them occurs in the monuments of the kings of Assyria, Babylonia or Persia, and that before 722 B. C. they are never mentioned, does not prove, however, that they did not exist, and that they were not known by the same name a thousand or more years before this.\* Egypt is first mentioned in the Assyrian kings' monuments in those of Tigleth-Pileser I (about 1100 B. C.), yet all admit that Egypt existed more than a thousand years before that and under the name Mitsri (not Mutsri, as later). We find it mentioned in the letters of the kings of Alishiya, Babylon and Midtani to Amenophis III, about 1400 B. C. (see "P. S. B. A.," 1888). However, it is admitted that they were the earliest-developed portion of the Greek nation (Curtius, "Ueber die Ionier vor der ionischen Wanderung"†); that they were the Greek people first known to the Phœnicians, Assyrians, the later Israelites, and the Persians, and that, in the entire Orient, as far as India, their name was that by which the Greeks were known (Lassen, "Indische Alterthumskunde," i, 729 sq.,

\*"Bei jenen [ionischen] Colonisten kein Neu Ionien war gegründet, sondern es [war] vielmehr ein altes und ursprüngliches Ionien durch frischen Zuzug edler Geschlechter neu belebt und hergestellt" (Curtius' "Ionier vor der ion. Wand.," p. 5). Again, among the allies against Rameses II, 1350 B. C., we find the Iouna or Maouna mentioned along with the Masa, Lika and Dardani (Chabas' "Études," p. 185). If Iouna is read the Ionians doubtless are meant; but if Maouna, the Maonians, said by Strabo to have been the earliest inhabitants of Lydia. May not the Ma in Maonia be the same as that in Magog, Magan, Mazamua, *et al.*, and mean "land," (see Magog, below). If so, this would mean "land of the Ionians."

†Curtius says: "In allen Theilen des griechischen Landes begegnen wir den unverkennbaren Spuren der Ionier, aber in keinem dieser Plätze sind wir berechtigt ein ursprüngliches Ionien anzunehmen."

and Rüetsehli in "Herzog under Jawan").\* Now the question arises as to the age of the word Jawan and the extent of its application.

As to the age of the word in its Semitic form, it is to be noted that in Homer the form of the word is *Ιαωνες*, and that in later times it was *Ιων*. The original form of the *ao* was doubtless *awa*, and the original form of the word Yawan. It is claimed that they were so called because they were the youngest or fighting branch of the Aryan family, the *v* or *w* being the digamma, and the word being closely connected with *juvenis* (Herzog's "Realencycl.," Art. "Jawan;" Keary, "Outlines of Primitive Belief," p. 163). The digamma must still have been pronounced when the name passed over to the Shemites; since *wa aw* or *awa* contracts naturally into *ô* (compare Hebrew *nakôm* from *nakwan*, Latin *bôs* from *bous*, Syriae *kôm* from *kawam*); but we know of no examples of the contrary (see Curtius, "Greek Etymology," Vol. ii, p. 182, *sq.*, and Roby, "Latin Grammar," Vol. i, pp. xxxvi-xl, and the various Shemitic grammars). Canon Rawlinson says that "Jawan is the nearest possible expression in Hebrew of the Greek term which is rendered by Ionians" ("Origin of the Nations," p. 172). This, however, is true only if we suppose that the Hebrews derive the name from the ancient Greek Yawanes.†

Now, since we find the *awa* already, in the time of Homer, contracted into *ao*, the transliteration into Hebrew must have taken place before his time. The question then arises, When was the "Iliad" written? According to Mr. Gladstone ("Homer," p. 11), it was written before the Ionian migration into Asia Minor—before the Ionians had gained (or regained) a prominent position among the Greeks. As we find the Ionians contending on an equal footing with the Lydian kings about the middle of the seventh century B. C., and Jawan mentioned by Sargon, 722 B. C., as enemies of his in Asia Minor, and as it must have taken a couple of centuries most probably for them to establish themselves in Asia Minor, the migration could hardly have taken place later than 900 B. C. The Trojan war, as recorded in the "Iliad," must have been written before that time, and the war itself may have occurred as early as 1250 B. C., as tradition asserted.‡ The sudden rise of the Ionians after the composition of the "Iliad" (just as the rise of the Dorians, according to the traditions concerning the Heraclidæ), points to the supposition that they had been suppressed

\* Curtius says: "Ist das Wort [Ionier] griechisch, so müssten die seefahrenden Griechen selbst im Gegensatz zu den sesshaften Autochthonen sich die Wandernden genannt haben und dieser Namen von den Phöniziern und Lydiern aufgefasst zu Lande und zu Wasser in Asien eingedrungen sein ("Ionier vor der ion. Wand.," p. 8).

† In the Peshito Syriac New Testament, and in Delitzsch's Hebrew version, Omega is always, we believe—without exception—transliterated into 'Etsotsa and Hholem, never resolved into *awa*.

‡ The capture of Troy was "placed by some in the fourteenth, but more commonly in the thirteenth century, till Eratosthenes computed it to have taken place in the year 1183 B. C. (Gladstone, "Homeric Synchronism," p. 13).

for a period, and had recoiled to their previous position of importance after the overthrow of the house of Agamemnon. The Ionians were probably the earliest of the Greek mariners, as is shown by their myths and legends, which are largely Asiatic (Keary, "Dawn of History," p. 204). May it not have been at an early period of prosperity, when they were still called Jawanes, that the Phœnician traders came first to Greece, heard the name, and adopting it as the name for all the Greeks (as the Gauls gave the name of German to the Teutons and the Romans the name of Greek to the Hellenes; see "Encyclopædia Britannica," Arts. "German" and "Hellenes"). Tyre and Sidon, we know, were both in existence as flourishing commercial centres as early as 1608 B. C.\* Part of the tribute paid by the Phœnicians to Thothmes III could only have been gotten by commerce, *e. g.*, tin, purple and corals (see Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 361). Their tin most probably was brought from Britain through Spain, and this as early as 1200 B. C. certainly, and 1500 probably (Sir John Lubbock, "Prehistoric Man," p. 73). No one can deny that even earlier than this the fleets of the Phœnicians most probably sailed to the nearer shores of Greece, even notwithstanding the negative testimony that no objects of Phœnician art have been found at Mycænæ (compare Gladstone, in an article entitled, "The Phœnician Affinities of Ithaca," in *The Nineteenth Century*, for November, 1889).

Finally, there is positive evidence, both from Egypt and from Greece, that a very early knowledge of each was possessed by the other. Homer knew not merely of Egypt, but of Ethiopia (*id.*). On the other hand, among the foreigners who, in 1250 B. C. ("Études," p. 30 *sq.*), made the naval attack on Egypt, were some called Danau, who, according to Brugsch, were Greeks ("History of Egypt," ii, 116 *sq.*; Chabas, "Études," p. 30 *sq.*). By the Phœnicians and Hebrews these Danau and their kindred may have been called Jawan.

Again, as has been hinted at above, there is much to show that Jawan may have been the prehistoric name applied by Hindu and Persian to the tribes who, in the earliest times, left them and wandered westward.† These tribes probably traveled along the southern shore of the Black Sea,‡ and, as they passed, leaving here and there a settlement, they gave their name to the Shemites as the common appellation, the generic name, for the great western branch of the Indo-European family which extended in historic times from Phrygia

\* Tyre and Sidon are both mentioned in "P. S. B. A.," for 1888, p. 548, the city of Tyre being called "The spoil of the king."

† Niebuhr says: "Die Verbreitung des ionischen Namens lässt sich nicht wohl mit den gewöhnlichen Vorstellungen von den ionischen Ansiedlungen in Kleinasien vereinigen" ("Vorträge über alte Geschichte," i, p. 273).

‡ Curtius says: "Die ursprüngliche Ansässigkeit der Ionier in Kleinasien ist eine Thatsache auf deren Erkenntniss alle Entdeckungen und Forschungen auf dem Gebiete der alten Geschichte hinleiten müssen" ("Ionier vor der ion. Wanderung," p. 8).

to Spain (Keary, "Dawn of History," p. 204; Sayce, "Ancient Empires of the East," p. 225). Its assumed derivation would certainly admit of an application more extended than to the Greeks only. The Hindus gave it a much wider application, and it seems to us that when we shall consider the names of the sons of Jawan, we shall conclude that the Hebrews also meant by it not Greeks merely, but many other nations as well. In later times, as one tribe after another dropped off from the original stem, the name of Jawan may have been retained by the one tribe which remained.

The earliest mention of Meshech that has so far been discovered is that found on the records of Tiglath-Pileser I, about 1100 B. C. Being, as it was, north-east of Tabal and north of Mitânî, it may have been beyond the circle of Egyptian influence and dominion in the time of Amenophis IV, but most probably its name and people would be known to traders and the fame of it be brought by them to Egypt.\*

As to the Madai, there can be no doubt that they are the Medes of classical history and of the later Scriptures. They are first mentioned on Assyrian monuments of Rammannirari (812-783 B. C.) as Madai, though this is perhaps the same as the Matai of Samsiramman and the Amadai of Shalmanassar II (see Schrader, "K. A. T.," p. 80, and "K. G. F.," p. 171).

George Rawlinson, in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible," finds traces of the name in the Matini of Mount Zagros, mentioned often by Herodotus, which is the same as the Mitânî of the inscription of Tiglath-Pileser I, 1120 B. C., and of the Tel-Amarna inscriptions, 1400 B. C., where Tushratta, king of Mitânî, styles himself the father-in-law of the Egyptian king, and writes frequent letters to him (see "Trans. Soc. Bib. Arch.," June, 1888, p. 554 *sq.*).

Berosus says that the Medes conquered Babylon about 2500 B. C., and reigned there for 224 years (*ap.* Eusebius' "Chron.," Can. i, 4; Winckler, "Untersuchungen," Essay 1). Herodotus says that the Sigynnæ of Thrace claimed in his time that they were colonists of Medes, though how they came to be there he will not attempt to say ("Her.," 5.9). "Ctesias asserts (*ap.* 'Diod., Sic.,' ii, 1, § 9) and Herodotus distinctly implies (i, 95) that they had been settled in Asia at least from the time of the first formation of the Assyrian empire, B. C. 1273" (Prof. George Rawlinson, in "S. B. Dict.," Art. "Medes").

The fact that they are not mentioned on the Assyrian monuments

\* Tiglath-Pileser I says that the kings of Meshech had been bringing tribute to his lord, Ashur, for fifty years before they revolted against him. Ina shurru sharrutiya XXM ameluti Mushkaaya u V sharranishunu sha L shanati Alzi u Purukuz(?)zi naash belti u madaatte sha Ashur beliya itsbatuni XXX urduni Kummuchi itsbatu (Tiglath-Pileser I, Col. i, 62 *sq.*; see "Sammlung von ass. u. bab. Texten," p. 18). This seems to prove that Meshech had been tributary to Assyria since 1150 B. C.

till about 880 B. C. does not prove that they were unknown, much less that they did not exist. They were probably too powerful for the Assyrians of an earlier date to attack. Tiglath-Pileser I's wars were many, but they were mainly conducted against the small cities and tribes of Mesopotamia and Armenia (see his own inscriptions, published by Lotz). His not mentioning Egypt or Cush does not prove that he knew not of them, but that he did not conquer them in battle; much more would this be true with Media also. There are unmistakable traces of old empires with a tolerably high degree of civilization in Bactria and the Iranian lands. Nothing would be more natural than that these empires should invade at times, even as far back as Berosus puts his Median dynasty, the rich lowlands of Babylonia. The expression "Medes" may have been, as Nöldeke suggests, a geographical, not an ethnographical designation; but in view of the late revelations of the extent of the Egyptian conquests in Asia centuries before the age of Moses, and of their consequent geographical knowledge which Moses could have learned in Egypt; as also in view of the varied knowledge of the neighboring nations possessed by the Babylonians before the time when Abraham is supposed to have lived, and which he would have brought with him from Ur; and in view of the fact that the existence of Nineveh itself bears witness that, from the beginning of history, a rich and extensive commerce was carried on with the inhabitants of the Iranian lands, which commerce would necessarily bring with it a knowledge of Media, the nearest of all great countries; and in view, finally, of the statement of Berosus and of the finding last year on monuments dating 1400 B. C. of other names of nations in this list which were hitherto supposed not to have existed as early as the time of Moses, because mention of them had not been found on the monuments—it requires an assumption of knowledge which cannot be justified, for any one to deny that the Medes existed in the time of Abraham or that their name and fame could have been known to Moses, whether by study, tradition, or caravan's report.

For the word Dodanim there are three readings: (1) Dodanim in the Hebrew of Gen. x; (2) Rodanim in the Hebrew of 1 Chron. i, 7—for which the LXX in both Gen. x, 4, and 1 Chron. i, 7, has Rodioi; (3) Doranim in the Syriac Peshito (Oroomiah edition) both in Gen. x, 4 and 1 Chron. i, 7. This is obviously a correction for the sake of clearing up the difficulties connected with the other readings.

1. As to Dodanim, a few of those who hold it to be the true reading, believe that they find the name in Dodona, the well-known city of Epirus, which, according to Homer, was the oldest oracle in Greece. But most maintain that by it the Dardanians are meant (*ar*, as Knobel has shown, goes over frequently into *δ*). The Trojans were Dardanians, and it was the tribes of the Dardanians who, under Æneas and others, were the closest allies of the Trojans in their war against Greece ("Iliad," ii, end, and xx, 215 sq.). The Hellenes looked upon the

Dardanians as Greeks, and their language was related to that of the Greeks (Knobel, "Völkertafel," 106). This would account for their being classed as sons of Javan. As to the antiquity of the Dardanians we cannot speak with certainty; but since there can be little doubt that the Dardani mentioned as being among the allies of Khetasir in his war against Rameses II were the same as the Dardanians of Homer, we must put their date earlier than 1300 B. C. (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii, 59).\* But if the Dardani of Pentaur's poem be different from the Dardanians, they may still be the same as the Dodanim of Gen. x. There were Dardanians in Kurdistan, as Brugsch suggests ("History of Egypt," ii, 44), whom we take to be the same as the Dardanians who are said by Herodotus to have lived near the Matician mountains (i, 189; see also Rawlinson's note in his "Herodotus," i, 252), in the time of Cyrus; but from the fact that the reading of Herodotus is here in doubt, the existence of the Kurdish Dardanians is consequently uncertain, and from the fact of the importance of the Dardanians in the "Iliad" and their widespread settlements (Knobel, "Völkertafel," 104; "Encyclopædia Britannica," xx, 540), it would be safe to conclude that the Dardani of Pentaur's poem are the Dardanians of Homer and the Dodanim of Gen. x, provided that Dodanim be the correct reading.

2. As to the reading Rodamin, which the LXX explained as meaning the Rhodians, Dillmann, who holds this to be the correct reading, maintains that Rhodes and the islands of the Ægean sea are meant (comment. *in loc.*). Rhodes was known to Homer ("Iliad," ii, 654). The Phœnicians came thither at an early date, as is shown by the legends of the Greeks and by the custom of human sacrifices to Cronus, which were long kept up there. When the Phœnicians came to Rhodes cannot be determined with certainty. They were already a commercial nation before 1600 B. C., as is shown by the tribute paid by them to Thothmes III (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," i, 316 *sq.*). Before the tenth century B. C. they had colonies in Thera and Milos, and had begun to work the mines of Thasos (see Schliemann's "Troja," xxiii). According to Socin, the pre-Hellenic inhabitants of the island of Rhodes were Carians and Cretans (Art. "Phœnicia," in "Encyclopædia Britannica," xviii, 819; Thucyd., i, 8; Knobel, 96-100). The Carians were probably closely allied in history and language to the Hellenes (Knobel, "Völkertafel," 101). "That they were in very early times a powerful and war-like people, distinguished for their maritime skill and enterprise, may be considered as clearly proved, and was indeed a natural result of the configuration of their coasts. It is probable that they were originally established on the continent, and from there extended their power over the islands of the Ægean" (E. H. Bunbury, in "Encyclopædia Britannica," v, 91). As

\* According to Brugsch ("History of Egypt," ii, 125), the name of Dardani, which is mentioned in the campaigns of Rameses II, is preserved in Egypt in the name of the city of Dardanis.



to the Cretans, we know that, according to tradition, they first held the dominion of the sea. In the Homeric poems they appear as a sea-faring people ("Odyssey," xiv, 199). The position of their island gave them peculiar facilities for communication with Egypt and Phœnicia ("Encyclopædia Britannica," vi, 504). If we accept the Trojan war and the traditions which place it at about 1250 B. C. as fact, we shall have no difficulty, in view of the above-mentioned facts, in believing that Rhodes existed before 1300 B. C., and that a knowledge of it could easily have been brought to Egypt before that time.

Gomer is first mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions of the time of Esarhaddon, under the name of Gimmirrai=Kimmirians (comp. "K. A. T.," 80).

Herodotus mentions them (iv, 11 sq.). Homer places them at the limits of the world, in a land and city shrouded in mist and cloud, where deadly night is outspread over miserable mortals ("Od.," xi, 12 sq.). They dwelt to the north of the Black Sea, and some think that the Crimea received its name from them. They are said to have desolated Asia Minor prior to the time of Homer, the third century before the first Olympiad (Sayce, "Ancient Empires," 217). In another invasion, about 700 B. C., they conquered Sardis, the capital of Lydia, in the reign of Ardys ("Encyclopædia Britannica," v, 682).

"Nothing certain can be said respecting their national character and language" (Del. to Gen. x, 2). The Greeks confounded them with the Cimbri (Dill, *in loc.*). Others have thought that they were the same as the Cymry of Wales and Ireland (Knobel, "Die Völkertafel der Genesis," 28). Canon Rawlinson says: "They have been probably identified with the Cimbri of Roman times, a portion of the great Celtic race" (see "The Origin of Nations," pp. 170, 171). But how did a knowledge of these reach the Hebrews? Neither Gomer or Cimmerians are mentioned by this name in the Egyptian monuments.

It is a remarkable fact, however, that Caucaso-Colchian mercenaries are found in the Libyan armies which threatened Egypt in the days of Menephtah II and Rameses III (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii, 123, 140).

How they came to Egypt, we know not. They may have come by sea. Lenormant holds that "one perceives by the inscriptions upon the stela of Thebes that the fleets of the great Pharaoh, after having first conquered Cyprus and Crete, had further subjected to his sceptre the islands of the Southern Archipelago and conquered a portion of the seaboard and even, perhaps, the lower extremity of Italy. It appears to me that one ought to conclude from some monuments that the war vessels of Thothmes III penetrated pretty frequently into the waters of the Black Sea" (Lenormant, "Manual d'Histoire Anc.," i, 386, 387).

If we reject, with Rawlinson ("History of Egypt," ii, 256 sq.), this claim of Lenormant as to the extent of Thothmes III's maritime power, we must admit that, if his power extended to the islands of the

archipelago, as Birch maintains ("Anc. Ag.," p. 100), or even to Cyprus and the Phœnician coast, as all with Brugsch must conclude ("History of Egypt," i, 371, 372), he could have sailed to Colchis.

The Phœnicians, but a short time after this, sailed to Britain, founding colonies all the way. Remains of ancient Egyptian art have been found in Mycenæ, and there are indications of prehistoric relations existing between Mycenæ and Egypt (Gladstone, in Schliemann's "Mycenæ," vii), as well as between Greece and Colchis and Libya (see Art. "Argonauts," "Encyclopædia Britannica," ii, 437).

But it is more probable that they were prisoners of war brought by Rameses II or Thothmes III from Asia to Egypt in one of their military expeditions. In later times, we know that the transference of nations was customary with the Assyrians ("K. A. T.," 256), and, according to Herod. ii, 104, the Egyptians believed that the Colchians of his day were descended from the army of Sesostris. Like the Argonauts, or Cretans, or Phœnicians, of later times ("Odyssey," xiv, 199 sq.; "Herod.," i, 1-3), they may have come as marauders, just as the Cari-Colchians who were defeated by Rameses III in the great battle of Migdol, at the mouth of the Pelusiac branch of the Nile (Brugsch, "History of Egypt," ii, 147). But, however they may have come to Egypt, there were in the time of Menephtah II, just at the time of Moses. Caucasian settlements in Egypt, through which a knowledge of the nations around the Black Sea must have been conveyed to Egypt and could easily have been brought to Moses. The collective name among the Hebrews for the eight tribes mentioned in the monuments of Menephtah II may have been Gomer.

But after what has been shown above with regard to Tubal, and when it is remembered that Elam, though well known to the Hebrews in Abraham's time, is not mentioned on the Egyptian monuments, it seems best for us to accept the traditional view as to the antiquity of the name and nation of Gomer until it is shown to be untenable.

Uz has been identified with the Khazu of Esarhaddon's inscriptions (Rawlinson, "Anc. Monarchies," ii, 470; "Origin of the Nations," p. 242). The inscription reads: "Twenty kasbu of the land of Khazu I left behind me, and I passed through that district" (Budge, "History of Esarhaddon," p. 61). The Ayin of Uz can be transliterated by Kheth in Assyrian (compare Omri, *et al.*). The country of Bazu, *i. e.*, the Buz of the Scriptures, is mentioned by Esarhaddon immediately before and immediately after his mention of Khazu ("History of Esarhaddon," pp. 59, 65). He says that he had appointed Yahlu, son of Khazacl of Arabia, the country of Bazu, a desert, thirsty, and a stony land. It has lately been suggested that this land of Bazu may be meant by the Bit-Bazi of Berosus' fifth dynasty, which, according to Gutschmid, reigned over Babylon from 1518 to 1273 B. C. Dr. Hugo Winckler says: "Die drei Herrscher der Dynastie f wurden Söhne des Bazi genannt. Damit scheint ihr Vater oder wenigstens ihre Familie bezeichnet zu werden; wenn wir aber

annehmen, dass Berossus hier einmal anders combinirt, als wir es thun, so eröffnet sich eine sehr verlockend erscheinende Aussicht. Bit-Bazi kann man ebenso gut als einen Ländernamen auffassen; danach könnte man die Dynastie (meinetwegen irrthümlich) als eine Dynastie von Bit-Bazi auffassen" ("Untersuchungen zur Altorient. Geschichte," p. 5 sq.). Now, if Buz existed 800 years before Esarhaddon, so may Uz, which is so generally associated with it. That Uz is not mentioned between Esarhaddon and Ptolemy, or the LXX (*i. e.*, if the *Ἀδοστῆραι* of the former and the *Ἀδοστῆριδι* of the latter, in Job i, 1, be accepted as the same as Uz, or Khazu), would be as strong an argument for the non-existence of Uz during that time, as a failure to find mention of it for the 600 years preceding Esarhaddon would prove that it did not exist 1300 B. C. Uz would more likely be known in Egypt, or to Moses in Midian, than Buz, because, according to Esarhaddon ("History," p. 59 sq.), it was farther from Assyria and hence nearer to Egypt.

By Togarmah, some have thought that the Germans were meant; but this is impossible, as much because of the origin of the name German (see "Encyclopædia Britannica," Art. "Germans"), as from the position accorded in the Scriptures to Togarmah, which is mentioned as a neighbor of Javan, Tubal and Meshech (Ezek. xxvii, 14), and in connection with Gomer (Ezek. xxxviii, 6), and is most probably to be looked for in or near Armenia. Grimm's theory that the word is derived from *toka*, the Sanskrit for tribe, and *armah*, agrees with this supposition, which Canon Rawlinson thinks "may well be accepted" ("Origin of the Nations," p. 183; "Geschichte der Deutschen Sprache," ii, 825). Friedrich Delitzsch thinks it may be the *Tul-garimme* of the cuneiform inscriptions. In 712 B. C., Sargon conquered a new province in the vicinity of Urartu and Muski, whose capital was *Tul-garimme*, which was probably also the name of a province.\* If it were of equal importance with Kammanu before Sargon's time, as, according to Dr. Winckler, it may have been, we see no good reason why, with Meshech, it could not have existed in the time of Tiglath-Pileser I, or with Tabal in the time of Amenophis IV. May it not, however, be possible that some trace of the name may still be found in the Gurans, or Southern Kurds, who still inhabit the country around Mount Zagros? The earliest inhabitants of this land were Turanians, and the modern Kurds are largely Turanian (Art. "Kurds," "Encyclopædia Britannica," Vol. xiv, 158; Hommel, "Gesch. Bab. u. Assyrien," p. 601). The "gar" which occurs in Gurau means "mountain" ("Encyclopædia Britannica," Vol. xiv, 158). The "ma" of Togarmah is the early Turanian word for "land," which is generally prefixed, as in Magau, Magog, Magamua; but in

\* Dr. Hugo Winckler says, in his "Sargon," Einleitung, p. xxix, note 5: "Für eine Identificirung von Togarmah and Tul-garimmu beachte man den Text genau. Tul-garimmu wird als mit Kammanu gleichwichtig behandelt, muss also wol ein bedeutendes Stadtgebiet gehabt oder erhalten haben; jedenfalls wurde es Hauptstadt der neuen Provinz, welche nun wol Tul-garimmu genannt wurde."

Elamitic, and perhaps in other dialects, is suffixed (Hommel, "Geschichte Bab. u. Assyrien," p. 589 sq.). Garma might then be the land of the mountains or highlands. As to the "to," it may be the Egyptian article, as in to-neter; but it is better to take it as a possible transliteration of the z, which we find in Za-gros. The s of Zagros is the Greek nominal ending. Za-gar, according to Sir Henry Rawlinson, means "beyond the mountains." Togarmah would then be the "land beyond the mountains." As to the possibility of z passing through Egyptian into t, see Mariette, "Les Listes Géographiques," pp. 6, 7.

The fact that Ashkenaz is mentioned in Jer. li, 27, along with Minni and Ararat, fixes its locality as being in the vicinity of Armenia. Lagarde says that Ashken is a proper name and az a patronymic ending in Armenian ("Gesamm. Abhandlungen," p. 254). Since, in Esarhaddon's expedition against the Gimmerai, he mentions along with the inhabitants of Minni the country of the Asguzai, some have thought that the name and position of the latter prove their identity with the Askenaz of the text (Budge, "Esarhaddon," pp. 46, 47). If this identification be accepted, the fact that the Asguzai are now first and for the only time mentioned on known monuments certainly does not prove that they did not exist before this time any more than it proves that they did not exist after this time. Other monumental records not yet read may mention them, but more probably they were so distant and inaccessible that, like the Khazi and Bazi mentioned above, the Assyrian monarchs, and the Egyptian as well, were never again brought into direct contact with them, and hence, according to their custom, do not inscribe on their monuments so much as their names. It has been thought by some that the name can be recognized in the river and the lakes in Asia Minor called Ascanius. If so, their name and their nation must have been widely scattered long before Esarhaddon's time, and a knowledge of them could easily have reached Egypt through commercial channels or from travelers. Are we to suppose that the travels of the Mohar and the records of the voyage to Punt and the letters of Tel-el-Amarna are the only ones that were ever written?

Magog is thought by Gesenius to mean the Scythians, though others have supposed that it is purely a geographical term (W. L. B., in Smith's "Dictionary of the Bible"). It is generally thought to denote the Caucasus or the Caucasians. Brugsch thinks the Caucasians are the Kaikasha of the inscriptions of Menephtah and Rameses III ("History of Egypt," ii, 124). Before Menephtah's time, according to him, they occupied the whole of the delta as far as Cyrene (*id.*, 125). He asks if they may not be prisoners of war brought by Rameses II from Asia. Homer mentions a people called Kankones. They lived over the sea, and he speaks of them along with Karians, Pelasgoi, Lykians and Mysians. In the confederacy against Rameses II, the Dardani, Leka (Lycians) and Masu (Mysians?) are mentioned as allies of the king of the Hittites (Chabas, "Recherches," p. 48).

Under Rameses III, the Shardanas (Sardinians) and Kahak or Kaikasha (which, according to Chabas' "Récherches," p. 55, are the same) are represented as quiet (*id.*, 71). The Sardinians are allies of the Achaians and Leucrians and Pelasgoi (*id.*, 37). We thus see a possibility, perhaps even a probability, of identifying the Kaukones of Homer and the Kahaks or Kaikasha of the Egyptian inscriptions. If, however, we accept Brugseh's identification of the Kaikasha with the Caueasians and the common opinion that Magog is the Caucasus, we can easily see that Moses could have mentioned them. If neither the Kaukones, nor the Kahaks, nor the Kaikashas, are the Caueasians, the latter might still have become known to the Egyptians; first, certainly and directly, if the expedition of Thothmes III reached as far, and especially if he founded a colony in Colchis, as Herodotus reports; secondly, through the Phœnician traders; or, thirdly, through prisoners of war or invaders from the north who were settled all along the coast of the delta. The ma of Magog has long been supposed to mean land. See above under Kittim and Togarmah. Shalmanassar II speaks of a land called Ma-Zamua, which is elsewhere called land of Zamua, to which Prof. Hommel remarks: "Zu beachten ist noch der aloridische Vorsatz *Ma* vor *Zamna* in dem einen Bericht (wo der andere einfach *Zamua* hat) was offenbar Land bedeutet" ("Geschichte Bab. u. Assyrien," p. 597). So Friedrich Delitzsch contends that the ma of Magog means "land" ("Paradies," p. 246).

As to the names not discussed as yet, it may be said (1) that Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah and Zeboim present the same difficulties against making the account to be written in David's, or at a later time, that they do to one who would hold that it was written 1300 B. C. (2) If we take Ebers' views, the sons of Mizraim can be identified with names well known in the time of Rameses II (see "Ägypten u. die Bueher Moses," Vol. i, pp. 91-218, and Lepsius' article in "Herzog" on "Ägypten"). If we do not accept his views, we cannot see how a lack of knowledge as to what is meant by them is an argument for a late rather than for an early date for the chapter. Is it not a sensible view to suppose that the Israelites, while in Egypt, would be more interested in the sons of Mizraim than at any subsequent time? They may have called these sons by the same or by different names from those with which the Egyptians denoted them. The Semitic languages, so far as we know, present no traces of the common Egyptian names, Zahi, Asebi, Shashu, Tehennu, Mashuashas and many others, while the Egyptians do not use Mizraim, Aram, and perhaps not Canaanite. Besides it was a custom to give the same name to different extents of territory (see Meyer, "Gesch. von Ägypten," on Zahi, p. 240; on Rutenun, p. 226. See also the Einleitung to Winekler's "Sargon," p. xxix, on Tul-garimme, and Esarhaddon's treatment of Yahlu. Compare "History of Esarhaddon," by Budge). Different names were given by the Egyptians themselves to the same territory (see Meyer, "Geschichte," p. 228, on Shasu and Menti, and

Chabas, "Recherches," p. 59 *sq.*, and frequent instances in his "Études"). If, however, it were claimed that in order to maintain that this enumeration of the sons of Mizraim was written 1300 B. C., we must identify the names with such as are found on the Egyptian monuments at that time, we can only answer with an *et tu Brute*: "Before you can expect us to believe that this enumeration was written a couple of hundred years before or after 700 B. C., it might be well to find some more evident similarities between the names in it and those given in Assurbanipal's account of his Egyptian campaign" (see "Annals of Assurbanipal," col. i, l. 90 *sq.*, V. R., Table I).

(3) There are so few notices of any of the sons of Cush or Joktan, and so few of them have certainly been identified, that we think that no argument as to their antiquity can well be made at present. So far as published, the discoveries made in Arabia by Douthet, Euting and others have thrown no light upon those of these names which were hitherto obscure (see Prof. Sayce, in the last two numbers of the *Academy*, for September, 1889). Upon some of the names, however, we would like to have the following questions answered: May not Seba be the Sauu of the "Völkertafel," p. 55? This name is mentioned as early as the time of Usartesen III, of the twelfth dynasty. According to Meyer, it was a mountain district; according to others, an important sea-port on the Red Sea (see Meyer, "Gesch. von Ägypten," p. 184). May not Havilah be the town or district called Auhul, in Rameses II's time (see "Les Listés Géog.," p. 62, and "Die altäg. Völkertafel," p. 60)? May not Sabtah be the Asbitæ who were among the peoples that attacked Egypt in the reign of Rameses III, along with the Libyans (Brugsch, "History," ii, 141)? Their name is spelt Sptti, and it is said of them that they "lie to the west of the mountains of the oasis of Farafrah" ("Die altäg. Völkertafel," p. 74). Though on the monuments as yet discovered, Sheba is mentioned first in the reign of Tiglath-Pileser II, is it not wise, in view of what has been found out about Tabal (see above), to refuse to accept this mere negative testimony as settling the antiquity of a nation? This general remark may be made upon the sons of Mizraim, Cush and Joktan, that a man living all his life in Egypt and Arabia would be much more likely to have more accurate information about them than any one of whatever age who had not done so. The Arabs before 1300 B. C. sent caravans to Egypt, which would pass through Midian (Chabas, "Recherches," p. 61). As Meyer remarks, the Bedwin were the commercial middlemen between Syria and Egypt ("Geschichte von Äg.," p. 228), so that a man living among them would have a knowledge of all nations of whose commercial products they were cognizant. At any rate, it is best for us who attempt to criticise the antiquity of this record of the sons of Cush and Joktan and Mizraim to remember that that may be true of each of them which Chabas says is true of Ponn and Toneter: "Nous sommes probablement moins avancés dans la connaissance de

cette région qu'on ne l'était à l'époque de Rameses III. Il y a un vaste champ d'explorations fécondes" ("Études," p. 61).

(4) As to Gether we can only ask if it may not be the city mentioned on the tablet transcribed and translated in "T. S. B. A.," 1888, p. 494?

(5) As to the other names mentioned in this chapter, nothing is known from external sources.

IV. The names of the nations important in the later history of Israel, or of the surrounding nations, and that yet are omitted from this list, prove its early composition. The omission of India, Sinim and Persia prove conclusively that it was written before 550 B. C.; the omission of Minni (Man) and Cutha and Sepharvaim and Carchemish, and the lands of Ararat (Urartu), Meliddu, Kui and Dilmun, that it was written before 750 B. C.; while the omission of Sobah, Tadmor, Tiphseh, Maachah, Geshur, and of Laki, Kummuch, Nairi and Patinai, and the subordinate position given to Sheba and Ophir, and the failure of any mention of so many of these countries in the numerous records which we have from the time between 1000 and 750 B. C., all push back the date of the composition of the chapter to a period preceding the age of David and Solomon (see on the above the annals of Assurbanipal, Esarhaddon, Sargon, Assurnatsirabal, Tiglath-Pileser I and others).

Do not these facts, together with the facts and probabilities of the preceding heads, justify the position of those who maintain that the tenth chapter of Genesis may, at least, have been written as early as 1300 B. C.? Do they not show, further, that, as far as our knowledge goes at present, this chapter was more probably written then than at any other time?

ROBERT DICK WILSON.

ALLEGHENY.