A TRIP TO FAIRYLAND. BY THE REV. JOHN MORGAN. (Elliot Stock. Crown 8vo, pp. 95.) A pleasant volume of verse; not poetry, nor pretending to be; wholesome verse, however, and it will do something to make the world that reads it better.

SMALLER BOOKS.

1. FOUR PRIZE SERMONS. (Rochdale: Champness. 8vo, pp. 68.) Three great texts; four good sermons on them.

2. OBJECTIONS TO FOREIGN MISSIONS. (Elliot Stock. Fcap. 8vo.) Objections that are still urged and urged repeatedly; but this man can answer them.


4. THE BLOOD-RELATIONS OF THE SOUL. BY JOHN KEMPSTER. (Clarke. pp. 16.) A lecture that will appeal to the student of science, and perhaps win him to the feet of Christ.

---

Archaeological Commentary on Genesis.

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

X. The tenth chapter of Genesis is a geographical chart of the world as it was known at the time of its composition. It is not ethnological, and consequently throws no light on the racial relations of the populations to which it refers. Ethnologically there was no relation between Javan, the Greeks, and the people of Tubal and Meshech, or between the Elamites who spoke an agglutinative language and the Semitic inhabitants of Assyria and Aram. So, again, the Canaanites and Egyptians were not allied either in race or in language, and the Hittites, who are classed under the head of Canaan, were an intrusive, non-Semitic people from the north. The genealogical form of the chapter, moreover, according to the usage of Hebrew idiom, is geographical, not ethnological; when Isaiah, for instance (xxxvii. 22), speaks of 'the daughter of Jerusalem,' he means the inhabitants of Jerusalem, whatever may have been their descent; and when Ezekiel (xvi. 3) says that the 'father' of Jerusalem was an Amorite, and its 'mother' a Hittite, the expression is similarly geographical.

The known world is divided into three zones, northern, central, and southern; the northern zone being assigned to Japhet, the central to Shem, and the southern to Ham. There are only two exceptions to this rule, and these are exceptions which prove it. Canaan is assigned to the southern zone instead of the central, and is made the brother of Mizraim. But this is because in the Mosaic age Canaan was a province of Egypt, and therefore geographically and politically connected with the latter country. Sheba and Havilah, again, are counted twice, once among the descendants of Ham, a second time among those of Shem. But we now know that the kingdom of Sheba extended from the southern coast of Arabia to the northern desert of the Peninsula, and so belonged to both the southern and the central zones.

The age to which the chapter takes us back is indicated by the position given to Canaan. It is a position that was true of it only during the age of the eighteenth and nineteenth Egyptian dynasties. Syria was conquered by the monarchs of the eighteenth dynasty, and it was finally lost to the Pharaohs under the immediate successors of Ramses II. of the nineteenth dynasty. Ramses II. was the builder of Pithom, and the Pharaoh of the Oppression; and the Mosaic age thus marks the limit of time during which the chart in its original form could have been compiled. After that age no one would have dreamed of coupling Canaan and Egypt together.

The mention of the Philistines would suit the same period. It was in the time of Ramses III. of the twentieth dynasty, shortly before the Hebrew conquest of Canaan, that they seem to have first settled in Palestine. To the same period also, as we shall see, probably belongs the notice of Nimrod.
On the other hand, the notice of Gomer and his sons, and probably of Magog and Madai as well, must belong to a much later epoch. Gomer is the Gimirra of the Assyrian inscriptions, the Kimmerians of the Greeks, who first made their appearance on the horizon of Asiatic history and geography in the seventh century B.C. And Madai or the Medes seem not to have been known to the Assyrians and their Western neighbours till the ninth century B.C.

The compiler of the chart shows a considerable knowledge of Egypt. But he shows an equally considerable knowledge of Canaan and Southern Arabia, and there are several indications that his geography was not derived from an Egyptian source. Had it been so, for example, mention would have been made of the land of Pun or Punt, on either side of the Straits of Bab el-Mandeb, which played an important part in Egyptian trade and literature from an early period.

The continuity of the chart is broken by the episode of Nimrod, which has nothing in common with the rest of the chapter except the geographical notes attached to it. But even these are not in harmony with the character of the chart, as they describe the foundation of cities in the two countries of Assyria and Babylonia instead of the geographical position of countries and tribes. Moreover the two countries in question are misplaced from the point of view of the rest of the chapter, as they ought to be included in the central and not in the southern zone, and accordingly the chart itself makes Asshur and Arphaxad the sons of Shem. The episode is clearly an insertion, occasioned by a confusion between Cush or Kas, the Egyptian name of Ethiopia, and Cush or the Kassites of Babylonia. Like the Gimirra, the Medes spoke an Indo-European language.

As the Gimirra were in contact with the Medes in the east, so they were in contact with the Ionian Greeks in the west, and accordingly the name of Javan, 'the Ionian,' comes after that of Madai. In the earlier Egyptian inscriptions the name is written Huinivu, which becomes Uinim in demotic, and as far back as the age of the fifth and sixth dynasties the Mediterranean was already known as 'the circle which surrounds the Huinivu.' In the Tel el-Amarna tablets mention is made of an Ionian (Yivana) who was serving in the territory of Tyre, and Dr. W. Max Müller has shown that the name of the people who were included among the subject-allies of the Hittites in their war with Ramses II., which has been read 'Iliion' and 'Meonia,' is really 'Yevan,' the Ionians. In the latter Assyrian inscriptions, Cyprus is called the land of the Yaavnâ or 'Ionians.'

Between the names of Gomer and Madai that of Magog is inserted. In Ezekiel (xxxviii. 2), Gog is associated with the land of Magog, and consequently it is possible that the latter is the Assyrian mat-Gugi, 'the land of Gugu,' or Gyges; i.e. Lydia. Gyges sent an embassy to Assur-bani-pal at Nineveh in B.C. 677 they attacked the north-eastern frontier of Assyria, but were defeated, and the main body of them forced to turn westward into Asia Minor. Others turned southward and overran the kingdom of Ellipi, where they established themselves in the city of Ekbatana. Those who marched westward sacked the Greek colony of Sinope and devastated Lydia.

Madai, the Assyrian Madâ, are the Medes of classical history. Inscriptions of Esar-haddon speak of the Medes and the people of the Minni and Saparda or Sepharad joining with the Gimirra in attacking Assyria, and as Ellipi adjoined the Median territory, the mention of Gomer or the Gimirra would naturally be followed by that of Madai or the Medes. The Medes are first referred to in the Assyrian texts about B.C. 840, when they are called the Amâdâ and placed in Media Atropatene. The name is written Matâ on the monuments of Samas-Rimmon II.; but his successor Rimmon-nirari III. (B.C. 810-781), who invaded their territory, makes it Madâ, and from this time forward no other form of it is found. Greek writers confounded Madâ with Manda, 'nomads,' the name under which the Gimirra in Ekbatana were known to the Assyrians. Like the Gimirra, the Medes spoke an Indo-European language.
to ask his help against the Gimirra; subsequently he withdrew his allegiance from Assyria and assisted the Egyptians in shaking off the Assyrian yoke. As a punishment for this, according to Assur-bani-pal, Gugu (Gyges) was afterwards defeated and his head cut off by the Gimirra, who occupied a large part of Lydia and besieged the capital, Sardes.

Tubal and Meshech are the Tabali and Muskâ of the Assyrian monuments, the Tibareni and Moschi of classical geography. In the Assyrian period the Tabali inhabited South-Eastern Kappadokia adjoining Kilikia, while the Muskâ were to the north-east of them in Lesser Armenia. But in the classical age they had retreated northwards towards the shores of the Black Sea. Both the Tabali and the Muskâ were divided into a number of tribes under independent chiefs.

What Tiras represents is unknown. It may be 'the Tursha of the sea' of the Egyptian monuments, who took part in the invasions of Egypt by the northern barbarians in the reigns of Meneptah, the son of Ramses u., and of Ramses iii.; or it may be Mount Taurus, which formed the southern boundary of the Tabali.

3. Ashkenaz seems to be the Asguza of Esarhaddon, who places it between the Medes and the Mannâ (east of the Kotur mountains in Armenia), since in Jer. li. 27, 28, Ashkenaz is similarly associated with the Minni and the Medes.

3. Elishah seems to be Hellas. Tarshish is probably Tartessos in Spain, near the modern Gibraltar, the farthest limit of Phoenician voyages in the Mediterranean, whence the name of 'ships of Tarshish' given to merchant-vessels. Kittim is Kition in Cyprus, now Lamaka. Kition was a Phoenician colony; but as the Greek element was predominant in Cyprus, Kition, which represented Cyprus to the Canaanite and Hebrew, is considered to be a son of Javan. For Dodanim we should probably read Rodanim or Rhodians.

6. Cush is the Egyptian Kas, the Ethiopia of the Greeks, south of Egypt. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets it is called Kâsî; in later Assyrian, Kûsî.

Mizraim, Egypt, is 'the two Mazors,' Mazor being the name of the Delta in the Old Testament (Isa. xix. 6, xxxvii. 25, where the A.V. mistranslates 'defence' and 'besieged places'). Mazor denoted the line of 'fortification' which protected Egypt from attack on the Asiatic side, and is thus synonymous with Shur, 'the wall,' a Semitic translation of the native Egyptian name. In the Tel el-Amarna tablets Mazor appears as Mizir, Mizri, which is applied to the whole of Egypt. This form of the name continued in use in Babylonia, but in Assyria it was superseded by Muzri, through a confusion with the name of the district of Muzri north-east of Nineveh. Southern or Upper Egypt was properly Pathros in Hebrew (Isa. xi. 11), the Egyptian Pa-to-ris, 'the land of the south,' Paturissu in the later Assyrian texts; but it was included in the dual term Mizraim.

Phut is mentioned in a fragment of the annals of Nebuchadrezzar which records his campaign against Egypt in the thirty-seventh year of his reign. He there says that in the course of his campaign he defeated 'the soldiers of Putu-Yâvan' (Phut of the Ionians), which was 'a distant land in the midst of the sea.' In the inscription over the tomb of Darius Hystaspis at Naksh-i-Rustem Putu (Persian, Putiya) is named among the Persian provinces between Yavanu, the Greeks, and Khûs or Cush. As in the annals of Nebuchadrezzar, so in the Old Testament (Ezek. xxx. 5), Phut is described, along with Lud, the Lydians, as serving as mercenaries in the Egyptian army.

Canaan, 'the lowlands' of the sea-coast of Palestine and the valley of the Jordan (Num. xiii. 29), is called Kinakhna and Kinakhkhi in the Tel el-Amarna tablets, where the meaning of the name has already been extended so as to include the whole of Palestine. Kinakhkhi is the Khna of Greek writers. Canaan for several centuries was under the government or influence of Babylonia, but it was conquered by Thothmes iii. of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty (B.C. 1503-1449), and organised into an Egyptian province. It was finally lost to Egypt in the closing days of the nineteenth dynasty, after which date it could not have been coupled with Mizraim geographically and politically, or included in the southern zone of Ham.

7. As the sons of Cush, enumerated in this verse, properly belonged to the Arabian side of the Red Sea, it is clear that South Arabian settlements had already been made in Africa, and that the name of Cush had been in consequence extended from Africa to the opposite coast of Arabia. Mr. Bent
has found Sabean inscriptions at Yeha (the ancient Ava) in Abyssinia, which date from the eighth century B.C. according to Professor D. H. Müller, or the sixth century B.C. according to Dr. Glaser. The names of Seba and Raamah are found in an early Minean inscription of Southern Arabia, and Havilah was the great ‘sandy’ desert of the Arabian peninsula (see Gen. xxi. 18). Sheba is the Saba of the native inscriptions, the Sabaeans of classical geography, who inhabited Yemen, the south-eastern portion of Arabia. Numerous inscriptions and other monuments of the Sabaeans have been preserved, more especially on the site of their capital, Marib (now Mârib). Among their seaports were Muza near Mocha, and Adana (Aden). Inscriptions show that the kings of Saba were preceded by Makarib, or ‘high priests.’ The kingdom, however, went back to an early period: Tiglath-Pileser III. of Assyria received tribute from it, as did also Sargon from its king Ithamar in B.C. 721. At that time the authority of its kings reached from the extreme south to the north of Arabia, touching Babylonia on the east and Gaza on the west, and thus extending along the caravan-roads by which the spices of Arabia Felix were brought to the north. The visit of the queen of Sheba to Solomon shows that the Sabean kingdom was already in existence in the tenth century B.C., and that it stretched sufficiently far to the north to be in communication with Palestine. That queens were permitted to rule in Arabia, we know from other sources: the annals of Tiglath-Pileser III. mention two queens of ‘the Arabs,’ and in the time of the eighteenth Egyptian dynasty the people of Punt—who were either the inhabitants of Southern Arabia or Arabian emigrants to Somalia—were governed by a queen. The Sabaeans were known in Babylonia as early as the age of Abraham, since a contract-tablet of the time of Khammurabi (Amraphel) mentions among the witnesses Sabâ, ‘the Sabean.’ Dr. Glaser and Professor Hommel seem to have shown that the kingdom of Saba was preceded by that of Ma’in, whose name was preserved in that of the Mineans of classical geography, and who spoke a dialect differing from that of Saba. Minean inscriptions are found on sites interspersed among those of Sabean cities, a fact difficult to explain except on the supposition that Saba superseded Ma’in. Moreover there is no reference in the Sabean texts to the kingdom of Ma’in. Of the thirty-three Minean kings whose names are known to us from inscriptions, three have been discovered near Teima (the ancient Tema, Gen. xxi. 15), in North-Western Arabia, showing that the power of Ma’in must have been acknowledged throughout the larger part of the Arabian peninsula, and an early Minean inscription refers to the frontier of ‘Egypt.’ As there is no allusion to the kingdom of Ma’in in Genesis or elsewhere in the Old Testament, it would seem that its place had been taken by Sabaeans before Gen. x. was compiled.

Dedan is mentioned in Minean and Sabean texts. It was properly a district in Southern Arabia, but the Dedanites formed part of the caravans which made their way northward and traded with Palestine.

1 His son bears a Babylonian name. The contract is dated in the year when Rim-Agu or Eri-Aku, the Arish of Genesis, destroyed Dur-iliu.

---

The Great Text Commentary.

THE GREAT TEXTS OF ST. JOHN’S GOSPEL.

AN Exposition.

JOHN vii. 17.

‘If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of
the teaching, whether it be of God, or whether I speak
from myself’ (R.V.).

‘If any man willeth to do his will.’—As in
vi. 67 and viii. 44, ‘will do His will’ is too weak;
it is not the simple future, but the verb ‘to will.’
If any man willeth to do His will.—Plummer.

An appeal to the original language of this gospel at once determines that the declaration is, not that if any man will actually perform, or continue to perform, the will of God, he shall ‘know the doctrine,’ but that if any man sincerely wish to perform that will, he shall discover the divine original and descent of the doctrine.—Butler.

He who lacks fundamentally the moral determination of his mind towards God, and to whom, therefore, Christ’s teaching is something strange,