

The Archaeology of the Book of Genesis.

BY THE REV. A. H. SAYCE, D.D., LL.D., D.LITT., PROFESSOR OF ASSYRIOLOGY IN THE UNIVERSITY OF OXFORD.

Chapter x.

I. We return to the series of tablets entitled *Annâti talidât*; see note on 6^o.

2. Japhet here takes the place of Shem as first in the list of Noah's sons. This is because Shem was the ancestor of Abraham, whose genealogy was intended to follow this chapter. Hence the Hebrew writer interchanges the place of Shem and Japhet, keeping Shem to the last so that Abraham's genealogy could be attached to the account of his descendants. The insertion of the story of the tower of Babel between chaps. 10 and 11¹⁰ has, however, somewhat obscured the consecutive order of the narrative. It was necessary to explain the origin of the dispersal of the descendants of Noah 'over the whole earth' (9¹⁹), so that 'the nations were divided in the earth after the flood' (10³²), and there was no other place in which the story which explained it could be introduced.

The table of nations in this chapter is geographical, not ethnographical. The known world is divided into three zones, the principal tribes and nations in each of the three being grouped together under a common ancestor. Hence the name of Sheba occurs twice, under the heads of Ham (v.⁷) and Shem (v.²⁸), the Sabæans of Southern Arabia, which was in the zone of Shem, having extended their power and settlements to Northern Arabia, which was in the zone of Ham. So, again, Elam is included among the sons of Shem, although the native population of Elam was non-Semitic in both race and language. But it had been conquered at an early date by its Semitic neighbours in Babylonia, and was therefore regarded as a brother of Assyria, which was also a Babylonian province, just as Canaan is regarded as a brother of Mizraim, or Egypt, as being in the Mosaic age an Egyptian province, although in race and language the Canaanites were Semites and not Egyptians. Of the three zones, the northern was assigned to Japhet, the middle to Ham, and the southern to Shem. The conception of the world being, like that of the Babylonians, of a circle surrounded by an ocean, and the starting-point being Babylonia, the point

of view was from south-east to north-west. The geographical grouping naturally involved also a political grouping (as in the case of Canaan and Egypt).

Gomer is usually identified with the Gimirrà of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Kimmerians of classical writers, who migrated from their original quarters on the Dniester and the Sea of Azof, and attacked the Assyrian empire in the age of Esarhaddon. They first appeared in Asia Minor and destroyed the Milesian colony of Sinôpê, though the date of the event is uncertain. According to Eusebius (*Chron. Armen.* p. 303, ed. Mai), Sardes was captured by them for the first time in 1078 B.C., but it is probable that there is a confusion here between the Kimmerians and the Thracophrygian tribes.¹ The first contemporary notice of them is in the elegiacs of the Greek poet Kallinos (*Fr.* 2), who is supposed to have lived about 715 B.C. In 677 B.C. Esarhaddon defeated their leader Teuspa in Khubusna on the northern border of Cilicia, and drove them westwards towards Lydia. Gyges of Lydia sought help against them from Assur-bani-pal, but he was killed in battle with the invaders, and Sardes is said to have been taken by the barbarians under Tugdammê,—called Lygdamis in the text of Strabo,—whom Assur-bani-pal terms 'a limb of Satan.'² Tugdammê was killed fighting with the Assyrians in Cilicia, and followed by his son, Sanda-ksatru.

If Gomer means the Kimmerians, the insertion of his name in the text of Genesis cannot be earlier than the eighth century B.C., when the Gimirrà first became known to the Assyrians and their neighbours. Another explanation of the name, however, is possible. In a letter to his father, Sennacherib, while still crown prince, calls the

¹ The statement rests on the assertion of the Lydian historian Xanthus (*Strab.* iii. p. 149) that Lydia was invaded by the Kimmerians before the time of Homer.

² Literally, 'offspring of Tiamât.' Assur-bani-pal's words are *Tugdammêi sar Umman Manda tabnit Tiamati*, 'Tugdammê, king of Nations, the offspring of Tiamât.'

Cappadocian district in which Guriania, the modern Gurun, was situated, Gamir, and Gamir is still the Armenian name of Cappadocia. The Gamir of Genesis, therefore, may have been the Cappadocian Gamir which was identified with the Gim-irra or Kimmerians when they appeared upon the historical horizon of Western Asia.

In Ezk 39^b Magog is the land of Gog (where, however, the Septuagint has Gog), and the gloss in 38^l shows that the editor of Ezekiel's MS. believed that Gog came from 'the land of the (*sic*) Magog.' Magog would thus be the Ass. *mat Gugi*, 'the land of Gog' or Gyges. If so, the insertion of the name in the text must belong to the age of Gyges, *i.e.* to 700-650 B.C. In the prophetic writings, however, the language of the text was modified from time to time to make it suit the political circumstances of the period, as, *e.g.*, in Is 16, and we may therefore expect to find similar modifications or insertions in the historical books of the O.T. The latest date to which an insertion could be referred, as well as the earliest, would thus be fixed. If Gomer and Magog, for instance, represent the Kimmerians and the land of Gyges, they would not have been introduced into the text earlier than 700 B.C., or much later than 650 B.C. Ezekiel already quotes the names in an archaistic sense.

But again it is quite possible that the original reading was not *mat Gugi*, Magog, but *mat Gagi* or *Gaga*, 'the land of Gaga,' which occupied an important position in Asia Minor in the Mosaic age. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets, Amon-hotep III., writing to the Babylonian king, Kadasman-Urbe (KNUDTZON, i. 38), quotes the latter as asking whether the princess shown to the Babylonian ambassadors was really his sister or the daughter 'of a Gagayan (*mat Ga-ga-ya*), or a Khali-galbatian (Cappadocian), or from the land of Ugarit' (on the Gulf of Antioch); and in the North Syrian geographical lists of Thothmes III. and Ramses III., Gagati or Kaqth is thrice mentioned. In a Boghaz-Keui tablet, moreover, the Hittite monarch, Khattu-sil, calls himself king of the country of Gaga(s). The change of *mat Gaga* into *mat Gugi* would be paralleled by Egyptian usage; in the Ptolemaic list of foreign countries at Kom Ombo, for instance, Punt becomes Pontos, and Barbar, Babel.

Madai is the Medes, Ass. Madâ. We first hear of them on the Assyrian monuments about 840 B.C.,

when they are called Amadâ, and found by an Assyrian army in Media Atropatênê. The name is first written Madâ in an inscription of Hadad-nirari IV. (810-781 B.C.). A knowledge of the name, therefore, would not have reached Palestine until after that date. But the Median empire did not extend to the frontiers of Asia Minor until after the fall of Assyria, and even then the association of the name with the other sons of Japheth is difficult to understand. Geographically the Medes would have belonged to Shem. Hence, as there was a Matiana in Cappadocia (Hdt. i. 72; Hecataeus, *Fr.* 188), it seems simplest to suppose that a people of Asia Minor was originally denoted here, which in the age of the later geography was naturally identified with the better-known Medes who lived in the other Matiana or Media Atropatênê. In the Hittite tablets of Boghaz-Keui, Mitani (northern Mesopotamia) is called Matti-waza.

Javan, the 'Ionian,' is coupled with Tubal and Meshech (as in Is 66¹⁹), and must therefore be looked for in south-eastern Asia Minor. This is further shown by v. 4, which defines the territory of Javan as extending from the Gulf of Antioch and Cyprus to Rhodes. In accordance with this the Periplus Maritima states that 'Ionia' was situated at the mouth of the Pyramus, while Antioch was founded on the site of Io-polis. The suffix of Ya-van is Asianic, and meets us again in the names of Cata-onia, Lyca-onia, and Mæ-onia. It would seem, therefore, that the original seat of the Ionians was on the south-eastern coast of Asia Minor. This will explain why the genealogists made Ion the son, not of Hellen like Dorus and Æolus, but of Xuthus, 'the tawny'-skinned. The name is found in the Tel el-Amarna tablets where Rib-Hadad, the governor of Gebal, writes (KNUDTZON, 108, 15-19): *nadnu amelûti Sirwa û amelûti Yi-i-wa-a-na ana mat Suri ina luqi ina yunê sâmanî abes ipsu annû*, 'they have given the Sirwa people and the Ionians to the land of Suri (*i.e.* to the Hittite king) in captivity (?), doing this deed in eight days.' The position assigned to Javan in Genesis accordingly indicates the Tel el-Amarna age, before the name 'Ionian' had made its way to the further West.

Tubal and Meshech are the Tabalâ and Muskâ of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Tibareni and Moschi of classical writers. Next to the Hittites they were the most important tribes of eastern Asia Minor; and after the fall of the Hittite empire

in the twelfth century B.C., the Muskâ made themselves masters of the Assyrian provinces on the upper waters of the Euphrates. In the time of Sargon and Sennacherib the territory of the Tabalâ adjoined Cilicia, while the Muskâ inhabited the highlands to the east of them. Later they were compelled to retreat to the north, where their original seats seem to have been. In this tenth chapter of Genesis they already appear in the same position as in the prophetic books of the O.T., that is to say, as representatives of eastern Asia Minor in place of the Hittite monarchs of Boghaz-Keui. This points to a period not earlier than about 1200 B.C., and probably not later than about 1150 B.C., when they had driven away the Assyrian garrisons and become for a short while the leading power in the eastern part of Asia Minor.

Tiras seems to be the Tursha of the Egyptian monuments who along with the Aqaiush (Achæans), Luku (Lycians), Shardaina (Sardinians), and other

nations from the coasts of Asia Minor attacked Egypt in the reign of Menephtah, the successor of Ramses II. The Achæans here take the place of the Biblical Javan. The king of the Tursha, 'of the sea,' was among the prisoners of Ramses III., after his defeat of another invasion of Egypt from the north (about 1200 B.C.), along with the kings of the Hittites, the Amorites, the Shardaina and the Philistines of Krete; and in the geographical lists of Ramses III. at Medinet Habu, Tursi (which can hardly be Tarsus) is named by the side of Malth or Malatiyeh. The name of Tiras was no longer intelligible to the later geography of the prophetic books of the O.T., and accordingly it is changed to פֶּרַס, Persia, in Ezk 27¹⁰ 38⁵, and Tarshish in Is 66¹⁹ (where Pul replaces the Phut of Ezekiel).¹

¹ The Kush of Ezk 38⁷ represents the Kusâ or Cappadocians of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Kas of the Tel el-Amarna tablets and Hittite monuments, and is therefore not the Cush or Ethiopia of 30⁶.

Contributions and Comments.

Psalm cxxi. 1.

MR. WEIR has rendered a service in calling attention to the difficulty at the beginning of Ps 121. Fuller consideration, however, is necessary for reaching a satisfactory conclusion.

Obviously, in the text of the Authorized Version, v.¹ directly contradicts what follows; the Psalmist is represented as saying, 'I will lift up mine eyes¹ unto the hills [rather "mountains"], from whence cometh my help'; the next verse, however, states that this is precisely what he does *not* do, for he looks not to anything material and earthly, such as a mountain, as a strong defence against his foes, but far higher, even to heaven itself, where the Almighty is enthroned, 'My help [is] from the Lord, the maker of heaven and earth.' In the remainder of the Psalm, there is maintained the fullest confidence in the protection of a personal God.

How, then, can we best solve the difficulty in v.¹? How may this plain contradiction be removed, and the opening portion of the Psalm be brought into

¹ Cf. Ps 123¹, 'Unto thee I lift up mine eyes, O thou that dwellest in the heavens.'

harmony with what follows? First—as has been pointed out—the latter part of v.¹ is undeniably a question, 'Whence cometh my help?' (not a relative clause, stating a fact, 'whence cometh my help'). We cannot stop here, however, but must further proceed to deal with the opening clause, and ask why this also should not be treated as a question—though a rhetorical question to which a negative answer is expected²—'Shall I lift up mine eyes to the mountains [looking there for defence and safety]?' There is no difficulty in the fact that the interrogative particle ה does not appear at the beginning of the clause: though the full form שֶׁהָיָה, instead of שֶׁהָיָה, would at once determine the meaning, there are many passages in which the determining particle is absent, while the context clearly shows that the sentence is interrogative; see Gn 27²⁴ ('Art thou . . . ?'), 1 S 16⁴ 21¹⁶, 2 S 16¹⁷ ('Is this . . . ?') 18²⁰ etc.

The view that *both* clauses of v.¹ are interrogative is not new; it was taken by at least some of the learned men who gave us the Authorized Version, where the alternative rendering in the margin is,

² Cf. the force of the prefixed *nimi* in Latin, and ἀρα μή, μή, or μὴν in Greek.