

# Theology on the Web.org.uk

*Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible*

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:



Buy me a coffee

<https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology>



PATREON

<https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb>

[PayPal](#)

<https://paypal.me/robbradshaw>

---

A table of contents for *Journal of Biblical Literature* can be found here:

[https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles\\_jbl-01.php](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jbl-01.php)

## THE TENTH CHAPTER OF GENESIS

A. H. SAYCE

OXFORD, ENGLAND

**I**N the early days of my literary career, that is to say in the year 1874, I contributed to the *Theological Review* (Jan. 1874) an article on the Ethnographical Table of Genesis. The chief object of this was to identify the names of Gog and Magog and thereby fix the earliest date at which the chapter could have taken its present form. Gog I identified with Gugu of Lydia, the Gyges of classical history, Magog being "the country of Gog." Consequently the Ethnographical Table must have received additions and insertions as late as the seventh century B. C.

I see no reason for revising my identifications. No other Gugu except the Lydian Gyges has turned up in the history of Asia Minor, and Ezek 38 2 restricts the age of Gog to that of Gyges. It is true that the prophet calls him "the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal," but these were the Asianic nations best known to the Jews and were consequently the representatives for them of the other nations of Asia Minor. The word *rôsh*, which was already a difficulty to the Septuagint translators, implies that he was at the time the paramount ruler in Asia Minor; and the Assyrian inscriptions have informed us that Meshech and Tubal were governed by a number of minor kings. In the time of Tiglath-pileser I., for example, Meshech was ruled by at least five kings.

In Ezekiel the words "land of the Magog" are attached to the name of Gog. They must be a marginal note which has made its way into the text to the detriment of Hebrew grammar. That they have not been derived from the book of Genesis is

clear from the article prefixed to "Magog." And it is also clear that the use of the article implies that "Magog" was regarded as a people or country. Hence I still hold to my old belief that the name has come from an Assyrian *mat-Gugi* "land of Gyges" and should be punctuated מגוג.

Magog is stated in Genesis to be the son of Japheth, his brothers being Gomer, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech and Tiras. It has long been recognised that Gomer represents the Gimirrà of the Assyrian texts, the Kimmerians of the Greek writers. A letter of Sennacherib, when still crown-prince, to his father, which has been published by Harper (No. 146), gives the name as Gamir; at the time when the letter was written Gamir was a district in which Guriania, the modern Gurun, was situated. The Kimmerians must therefore have been settled there for some time. In the age of the Odyssey they were to be found on the shores of the Black Sea, and according to Eusebius (*Chron.* p. 303, ed. Mai) a horde of them captured Sardes for the first time in B. C. 1078. The statement has been questioned and it has been suggested that Eusebius or his authority confused the Kimmerians with Moschians or some other invading tribe from the east, but the reference in the Odyssey and the existence of a country known as Gamir before the beginning of the seventh century B. C. gives support to the Christian Chronicler. And it must be observed that the Biblical Gomer is Gamir, not Gimirrà, the country and not the tribe.

Madai is evidently the Manda of the cuneiform inscriptions. Its identification with the name of the Medes, which seems to have been hitherto unquestioned, is impossible; the Medes belonged to a different part of the world. *Umman Manda*, "the Horde," as Delitzsch interpreted it, was the original expression, corresponding with the Goyim or "nations" of Gen. 14 1, but the abbreviated *Manda*, "Multitude," could be used alone. The term is found already in the Hittite version of the invasion of Asia Minor by Naram-Sin (B. C. 2650), and the Hittite Code of Laws makes express mention of the *Umman Manda*. The similarity of the names *Manda* and *Madâ* or *Medes*, and the fact that they both represented invaders from the north, caused them to be confounded together by the later Babylonian scribes,

and the Manda of the Hittite texts accordingly became the Madai of the book of Genesis and the Matiènê of classical geography. Perhaps the confusion of names was assisted by the extension of Median supremacy to the Halys in the period which followed the fall of Nineveh.

The name of Javan—the Ionian Greeks—can be traced back to the 13th century B. C., but has not been met with as yet in the Tel el-Amarna tablets or the Hittite texts. Antioch stood on the site of a city called Iônê, and the *Periplus Maritima* tells us that the sea which washed the eastern coast of Cilicia was known as the Ionian. The name itself was Asianic, not Indo-European; formed by the Asianic suffix *-wan*, and the Greek genealogists made Iôn the son of the “tawny”-skinned Xuthus, in contradistinction to the Leuco-Syri or “White Syrians” of Cappadocia, and the nephew, not the brother, of Doras and Æolus.

Tubal and Meshech have long since been identified with the Tibareni and Moschi, the Tabalâ and Muskâ of the Assyrian monuments, who like the Kimmerians were to be found on the shores of the Black Sea as well as in the south-eastern part of Asia Minor. They were included among the hordes who poured down upon the Hittite Empire and northern Syria and attacked Egypt at the beginning of the 13th century B. C. The Massoretic form of the name Tubal, it may be observed, is due to an association of the Tibarenian iron-smiths with Tubal-Cain “Tubal the Smith” where I see a “conflate” reading from an earlier cuneiform text, *tibira* being the Sumerian word for “smith” which has been glossed by the Semitic Cain.

On Tiras I can throw no certain light. Is it the Taruisa of the Hittite texts, which Dr. Forrer identifies with Troy?

The sons of Gomer are said to be Ashkenaz, Riphath and Togarmah. The old identification of Ashkenaz with Ascanius has been given up, and of late it has been the fashion to identify the name (as first suggested by myself) with the cuneiform Asguza, whom Winckler made the Scyths of Greek history. But Asianic names like Tarkhu-na-zi (“he of the land of Tarkhus”?) throw doubt on this, and it is therefore possible, after all, that the name is to be attached to the stem Aska, from

which Ascanius and the name of the tribe Aska-êni were derived. At any rate the place or people must have been in the neighbourhood of Gamir, and the fact that Jeremiah (51 27) associates Ashkenaz with Ararat and Minni indicates the vicinity of Armenia.

About Riphath we know nothing; even the reading is doubtful. But the site of Togarmah has now been settled by the Hittite texts. We learn from them that it stood between Carchemish and Harran, though considerably to the north of either. In the cuneiform tablets of Boghaz Keui the name is written Tegarama and Tagarama, and Delitzsch long ago identified it with the Til-Garimmi of the Assyrian inscriptions where the native name has been Assyrianised.

We now come to the sons of Javan. Elishah has been long recognised as the Alasiya of the Tel el-Amarna tablets which is generally believed to be Cyprus, though I am inclined with Mr. Wainwright to see in it the Aleian plain of south-eastern Cilicia. Tarshish is Tarsus, not Tartessos which was at the other end of the Mediterranean. The first mention of it in the cuneiform texts is on the Black Obelisk of Shalmaneser II. where the Assyrian king states that he had captured Tarzi in the 26th year of his reign. Kittim, Kition, is Cyprus, which makes me doubt the identification of Elishah, Alasiya, with that island, and Dodanim must be read Rodanim and identified with the Rhodians. The Hebrew form of the name will have come from an Assyrian Rudânu.

Such were the nations of the Mediterranean world known to the Jewish scholars of Jerusalem. It will be seen that apart from Magog they are confined to Rhodes, Cyprus and Cilicia and the districts south-west of Armenia. The latter, like Magog, were known through their attacks upon the Assyrian empire; the others must have been known through trade. Meshech and Tubal, however, were not only traders; they were also formidable enemies of the Assyrian kings and under the Moschian Mita or Midas had joined with Ararat in a war which at one time threatened Assyria with destruction. This was in the reign of Sargon II. when the name of Meshech would have become familiar to the populations of Western Asia.

It was commerce, on the other hand, which led to acquaintance with "the isles of the Gentiles." The name must have originated when as yet intercourse with them was by sea only, and consequently goes back to an early period of history. Among the islands the Cilician coast would naturally be included; hence the secondary meaning of "coastland" given to the Canaanite word 'i.

The sons of Ham were better known than the sons of Japheth, and the fact that Canaan is made a brother of Cush and Mizraim indicates that the geography is that of the period when Canaan was united to Egypt. The French excavations at Jebel have shown that, in the time of the earliest Egyptian dynasties, the Egyptians were already in possession of Gebal where they were building sanctuaries and shipping the timber of the Lebanon to the Nile. In the age of the Twelfth dynasty the princes of Gebal were proud to call themselves the vassals of the Pharaoh; when the Hyksos conquered Egypt the union between Egypt and Palestine became closer than before, while under the Eighteenth dynasty, and, as recent discoveries have proved, under the Nineteenth also, Canaan was practically an Egyptian province. Ramses III. of the Twentieth dynasty still claimed sovereignty over the country; it was only after 1200 B. C. that the age was past when Canaan and Egypt could be termed brothers.

Ludim is made the first-born of Mizraim. If the name is not corrupt it is difficult to see what it can represent except the Lydian mercenaries of Psammetichus I. and his successors. In this case it ought to be conjoined with that of the Libyan mercenaries or Lehabim instead of 'Anamim (possibly "the people of On," a name, however, differently spelt elsewhere). But these again are separated from the other native populations of the country, the Naphtuhim of Memphis,—the city of Ptah—, the Pathrusim of Upper Egypt, the Casluhim and the Capthorim. There must, therefore, be something wrong with the text unless we fall back on the old suggestion that Ludim represents the Egyptian word for "men" (*r-tu*). But this will not explain the insertion of the Libyans between the 'Anamim and Naphtuhim; moreover 'Anamim with a superfluous *m* (supposing On is meant) indicates a corrupted text, and in v. 22 we

have a Lud which is certainly incorrect. The mention of Caph-torim is borne out by Sir Arthur Evans' discoveries which show that an intimate intercourse existed between Egypt and Krete from a very early date and make it probable that Kretan colonies were established in the Delta; indeed this would certainly have been the case if his view is right that the submerged harbour found by Jondet at Alexandria is of Minoan origin. As for Casluhim the name is found among the geographical cartouches on the walls of the temple at Kom Ombo.

It is noticeable that while Sidon is "the first-born" of Canaan no mention is made of Tyre. Does this point to a period when the power and trade of Tyre were under eclipse? It will be remembered that Homer also knows of Sidon to the exclusion of Tyre. Abibal, the father of Hiram I., seems to have founded a new line of kings at Tyre; it is therefore possible that the city had previously been for awhile under the dominion of Sidon. However this may be, the mention of Heth as the second son of Canaan is in accordance with what we now know to be historical fact. As far back as the Abrahamic age Canaan and Syria had been overrun by Hittite armies; Damascus was captured by the Hittite king Telibinus (about 1800 B. C.) and Hittites came to settle in the conquered land. When the Tel el-Amarna correspondence was carried on, Canaanite towns were governed by Hittite officers and defended or attacked by Hittite soldiers. The Hittite element in the population was almost as important as the native Canaanite.

Even more important were the Amorites, who are represented on the Egyptian monuments as a blond race with blue eyes. I have lately given reasons (in *Ancient Egypt* Sept. 1924) for believing that they were related to the Mitannians of Mesopotamia and had come from the highlands of Asia Minor, and many years ago in my Presidential Address to the Anthropological Section of the British Association I pointed out their racial connection with the blond, long-headed Libyans of northern Africa. I should now identify them also with the neolithic population of Palestine. Though Jerusalem, it will be remembered, was in "the land of Canaan," its father was an Amorite and its mother a Hittite (Ezek. 16 s).

Jerusalem was in the hands of the Jebusites when the Israelites entered Palestine and for a time was known to the latter as the city of Jebus. There is no trace of such a name in the Tel el-Amarna correspondence; at that time Jerusalem still retained its old Babylonian title Uru-Salim "the City of Salim," and it was governed by a prince who seems to have been of Mitannian, that is, Amorite, lineage, if we may judge from the fact that the name of Kheba, "the queen of heaven" and goddess of Aleppo, was involved in it. The point, however, is uncertain, since Kheba or Khebe was incorporated by the Hittites into their own pantheon. At the time Jerusalem was threatened by the Khabiri, who we now know were mercenary Hittite troops, some 1200 of them formed the body-guard of the Hittite kings at Boghaz Keui. It is probable that the city was captured by them eventually; in this case they will have been the Jebusites of the Old Testament. The name Jebus, with final *-s*, has a Hittite appearance, and it will be noticed that in the list in Genesis the Jebusite is coupled with Heth.

"Girgashite" has been compared with the Egyptian Karkeah, the name of one of the northern tribes who attacked Egypt in the Mosaic age; but the name should more probably be read Kalkesh and identified with Cilicia. On the other hand a suggestion made to me by Dr. Cowley is attractive, that the Hivite is the Akhæan of Greek history. We have learned from the Hittite records that in the 14th and 13th centuries B. C. a prominent part was played in the politics of Asia Minor by a people called Akhkiyawas who came from the West and at one time possessed a fleet of 100 vessels. I believe Dr. Forrer is right in identifying them with the Akhæans, and it is tempting to see the same name in the Hivites, or rather the Ha-Khiwwi, of Scripture.

However this may be, the selection of the four names which typify Phœnicia is curious and can be explained only on the supposition that they represent a confederacy which had its centre in the naval port of Arvad. If so, we are taken back to the Tel el-Amarna age or earlier, before the place of Arvad had been taken by Sidon and Tyre. Zemar, too, which occupies a conspicuous place in the Tel el-Amarna letters, almost



disappears from sight in later history. On the other hand, Arka and Sin are unknown to the letters, while along with Zemar the western campaigns of the Assyrian kings made their names known to the Assyro-Babylonian world. The rise of Hamath appears to belong to the age of the Nineteenth Egyptian dynasty.

The sons of Shem introduce another difficulty. The excavations at Susa have shown that Elam was Semitic before it was "Anzanite"; Asshur had become a Semitic capital before the days of Khammurabi, and about the "Semitic" character of Arphaxad and Aram there has never been any question. But who was Lud? The introduction of this name among the sons of Shem in the region of the Tigris can be accounted for only on the supposition that the text is corrupt. I would suggest that לוד is due to the inadvertence of a copyist who has transferred the לו of the preceding line to the line below. Cp. also v. 13.

The ethnographical Table, it will be seen, is geographical, not ethnological or philological. The various places and peoples enumerated in it have been cleverly grouped under the three sons of Noah who, like the three sons of Adam or the three sons of Lamech, must belong to old Semitic tradition. Just as the three sons of Adam, Cain, Abel and Enosh, represented the three classes of primitive Babylonian society—the artisan, the agriculturist and the "gentleman" called *amêlu*, "the man," in the Cappadocian tablets—so the three sons of Noah represented the three zones of the known world which were repopled after the deluge. In Sumerian Babylonia the zones were four in number, but the Western Semite had the Mediterranean on the west side of him and accordingly divided the continent into three zones only.

Iapetos, we learn from Stephanus of Byzantium, was a Cilician deity, and was therefore marked out as a representative of the North, though it is possible that the signification of the Babylonian *ibbu*, *ibbitu* "white" had some influence on the selection. Shem is the Samu, Sumu of the First dynasty of Babylon, the god from whom the Aramæans and south-eastern Arabs traced their descent. The name of the founder of the Babylonian dynasty was Sumu-abi, "Sumu is my father." *Sâmu*

meant "red" in Babylonian, a colour suggested by the sun-burnt skins of the Semites.

In Ham the Egyptian Qem, "Egypt," is usually seen; if this is correct, the change of the initial letter would be due to the influence of the Semitic *khâm* "hot," not inappropriately associated with Cush and Mizraim. From the words of the old song, however, quoted in Gen. 9 26, 27, we may gather that Canaan and not Ham was originally the representative of the third geographical zone. Canaan was to be "the servant of Shem" which was fulfilled in the days of Khammurabi, if not in those of Sargon of Akkad and his grandson Naram-Sin, while Japheth from Asia Minor was to "dwell in the tents of Shem" and make Canaan his servant. Since the geographer of the tenth chapter makes Heth a son of Canaan it is clear that in his belief, at any rate, this could not refer to the Hittites of the first Hittite empire; we must therefore see in it a reference to the second Hittite or Moschian empire, the Cilician empire of Solinus, which arose about 1200 B. C. Then for the second time the armies of Asia Minor occupied the Aramæan "tents" of Syria and Mesopotamia and reduced Canaan to servitude (cp. Judg. 3 8).

I conclude, accordingly, that the geographer of the tenth chapter of Genesis lived after this date. The mention of Tarshish points to the same period; so, too, does the mention of the Philistines as well as of Hamath, the rise of which to importance was not earlier than the close of the Nineteenth Egyptian dynasty. But it does not follow that he must have lived as late as the time of Gyges. This would ignore an important characteristic of ancient (and also modern) oriental literature, modifications, namely, of their language and insertion of new facts. It is a characteristic which is too often neglected by Biblical critics, in spite of plain evidences to the contrary. The Psalms, for instance, have undergone repeated changes, sometimes resulting in an unintelligible text, like the Babylonian psalms where in many instances we can now compare the earlier and later texts, while Isaiah expressly tells us (16 13, 14) that he had been quoting an older prophecy, uttered concerning Moab "long ago," to which he "now" made an addition suitable to

his own time. The ethnographical table of Genesis, originally accompanied, perhaps, by a map similar to the early Babylonian map of the world in the British Museum, was just the document to which additions were likely to be made with increasing knowledge.

That such additions were actually made we know. It has long been recognised that the passage relating to Nimrod is a later insertion. The Cush who begat Nimrod was not the Cush of Southern Arabia; he was the Kassite who in the Tel el-Amarna age had come to denote Babylonia, not the Kas of an earlier geography which came from an Egyptian source.

But insertion though it is, the passage belongs to a period when Nineveh still existed and was in fact at the height of its power. It was "a great city" for it included Calah and other suburbs as well as Resen from which Sennacherib derived part of his water supply. The insertion, therefore, cannot be later than the first half of the seventh century B. C. And before that time the rest of the chapter must have already assumed substantially its present shape. If we were inclined to speculate, we might conjecture that Nimrod and Gyges owe their introduction into it to the same hands and that the scribes who were busy re-editing the old texts in the royal library of Jerusalem in the reign of Hezekiah (Prov. 25 1) continued their labours in the reign of his son.