

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 the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php

JOURNAL OF
THE TRANSACTIONS
OF
The Victoria Institute,
OR,
Philosophical Society of Great Britain.

EDITED BY THE SECRETARY.

VOL. XXXVIII.



LONDON :

(Published by the Institute, 8, Adelphi Terrace, Charing Cross, W.C.)

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED.
1906.

ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING.*

COLONEL MACKINLAY IN THE CHAIR.

The Minutes of the last Meeting were read and confirmed, and the Rev. John Urquhart was elected a Member.

The following paper was read by the Author :—

THE BIBLE PEDIGREE OF THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD, as attested and expanded by ancient Records and Traditions, and by early and long-lasting national Names.
By MARTIN L. ROUSE, Esq., B.L.

SECTION I. JAPHET AND GOMER.

A PRIZE was recently awarded by the Victoria Institute for the best essay that set forth the Bearing of recent Oriental Discovery upon Old Testament History. The subject of the following pages embraces that field of evidence within the wider one of pagan records and traditions at large, while it has the narrower aim of confirming only one section of the sacred history contained in the Bible. But it equally accords with the general objects of our Society; and it is meant only to be introductory to a much more comprehensive treatise, which, if my life is spared, I shall give to my leaders and fellow-workers here. Confiding, then, in your sympathy, I take the first step in tabulating my own and other men's researches upon an early and most important section of Bible History, to test its trustworthiness both by the unwitting agreement of the sculptors and scribes of Egypt and Shinar, and by that of the

* Monday, February 19th, 1906.

geographers, historians, and poets of Greece and Rome—a section, which until recent years, was little handled by scholars, and yet which should have a deep interest for the thoughtful in every nation; for it is the section which claims to prove that all nations are akin and, with the help of other Biblical allusions, to show what are the channels of their kinship.

It is many years since I first made the Tenth Chapter of Genesis a special study, endeavouring to find out what nations, ancient and modern, bore the names there ascribed to the immediate descendants of Noah's sons and, if possible, to assign an ancestor among these for every nation existing now. Having, to start with, only the clues given by Adam Clarke in his Bible commentary (for I had not then thought even of Josephus), I eagerly scanned Kiepert's Ancient Atlas, Smith's *Smaller Classical Dictionary*, and the *English Cyclopædia*, until I had modified and greatly expanded Clarke's identifications with a great network of evidence. The result was fourfold: firstly, I found that most of the nations identified were already of large size long before the Christian era (as we should expect them to have been, if they became distinct in language and government as early as that striking chapter tells us, namely, between the third and fourth generation after the Flood)*; secondly, that those which were stated to be descended from a particular son of Noah had, as a rule, a closer affinity in language with one another than with those whose descent was traced from a different son; thirdly, that they surrounded the plains of Shinar (whence the Bible states them to have become diffused), but surrounded no other region in a complete ring, leaving no gap, and in two rings beyond this, which would have been complete but for intervening seas; and lastly, that the great majority of existing peoples were embraced in the enumeration, so that further knowledge was likely to show that the rest were embraced also.

The reading since then of what old Josephus said upon the subject† of Professor Sayce's treatises‡ and of Dr. Pinches' remarks in his latest work§ besides a dip into De Morgan's account of his exploration in Elam, have much augmented my knowledge and have made those results more apparent, by

* Compare chap. x, 25, with ver. 5 and chap. xi, 10-16.

† In his *Antiquities*, Bk. I, chap. vi.

‡ In his *Fresh Light from the Ancient Monuments and the Higher Critics and the Monuments*.

§ *The Old Testament in the Light of Historical Records, etc.*

bringing to bear upon them more ancient records than those of Greece and Rome from lands nearer to what the Bible declares and observation proves to be the centre of the great dispersion. But such results if established confirm the absolute accuracy of the table; while a complete and accurate table of descents, considering that every head of a family in the second generation at least spoke a different language, could not have been *worked out* by original *investigation* as late as even a hundred years after the dispersion. It must, therefore, have either been *written down* by a patriarch within a generation or so after the event or else have been told to a later writer by the Great Disposer of events Himself.

What object could He have had, some might, however, ask, in either preserving or revealing a perfectly accurate pedigree of the nations? Surely that it might be evident to all who afterwards read His "oracles" and sacred history that He has indeed "made of one blood all nations of men," that the ancestors of all once had an equal knowledge of Him and access to Him, and that the history of His previous dealings with and promises to the patriarchs from Adam down to the sons of Noah belongs equally to all men. Among those promises there stands pre-eminent that of the hard-won victory of redemption, when "the woman's seed" should "bruise the serpent's head."*

Let us then unroll this ancient pedigree, examine this title deed, which, if it is indeed genuine, enables all men to claim descent from ancestors with whom for themselves and their heirs in all ages God made His first great covenants of grace.

At the very outset of the genealogy, a coincidence meets us in the name of Noah's own son Japheth.† It will be observed that the Bible gives Javan as the name of the third son of Japheth, and, after enumerating the sons of Javan, it says, "By these were the isles (or coastlands)‡ of the nations divided." Now this description possibly might be intended to apply to all the nations descended from Japheth, whose prime founders have just been individually mentioned, but it certainly does apply to the nations or tribes that sprang from the persons named in the last foregoing verse—the sons of Javan: for the Grecian people have from remote prehistoric times inhabited not only the

* Gen. iii, 15.

† This name is written as Jāphēth in its first two occurrences and thrice besides (including Gen. x, 1); as Jēphēth also five times (including Gen. x, 2), and as Jāphēt once (in Gen. ix, 27).

‡ Gen. x, 5, R. V. margin.

eastern and western *coasts* of the Ægean Sea, but the innumerable *islands* which lie between them; while every time that Greece is noticed in the Old Testament it is called Javan.*

But this Bible statement of the parentage of Javan, or the Greek nation, strangely tallies with the Greeks' own account of their origin. Ouranos and Gaia (Heaven and Earth), said they, had six sons and six daughters; and of this family only one—Tāpētos by name—had a human progeny†: marrying Klymēnē,‡ a daughter of Okeanos (the Ocean), he had by her Promētheūs and three other sons; Prometheus begot Deukalion (who was the Grecian Noah, saved with his wife alone through a world-wide flood); and Deukalion begot Hellēn, the reputed father of the Hellēnes or Greeks. Nay more—if we proceed a step further, we find that Hellēn himself had a grandson named Iōn; and in Homer's poetry the rank and file of the Greeks are commonly called 'Iaoves, or Jaōnēs§ (between the *a* and the short *o* of which, as in like cases, philologists read the lost digamma, making it 'IaFoves, or Javones); while Æschylus in his play of "The Persians" twice makes Xerxes' mother call the European Greeks by this name.||

The agreement in detail of the names of Javan's sons given in our chapters with those of the Grecian tribes scattered around the Ægean Sea and the Levant I hope to show in my next paper; but for the present this much is proved: the Greeks by their traditions, equally with the Bible record, claimed Japheth or Japet¶ as their first human ancestor: they

* The two clearest references under that name to its history being found in Dan. xi, 2, where Xerxes' invasion of it is foretold, and in Dan. viii, 5-8, 20-22, where a prophecy is made of the conquest of the Persian empire by a king of Greece, and the subsequent fourfold division of his own dominions.

† As for the other children of Ouranos and Gaia, Oceanus and Tethys intermarrying became the parents of all the nymphs of river and sea; and similarly Hyperion and Theia became the parents of Helios, Selēnē, and Eōs (the Sun, Moon and Dawn), Cœus and Phœbe of the goddesses Leto and Asteria, and Cronus and Rhea of Zeus, Poseidon, and other gods; Themis (by Zeus) bore the Hours and the Fates, while Mnemosyne (by Zeus) gave birth to the Muses; and, lastly, Crius (by Eurybia) begot Astræus, who in turn begot the Winds and the Stars.

‡ Reverting in the body of my text to the Greek κ in proper names in place of the often misleading Latin *c*, I have kept the γ for its original purpose, which was to represent the sound of the Greek υ, the same as that of the French *u*.

§ See Gladstone, *Homer* (Macmillan), pp. 102, 103.

|| Il. 178, 563.

¶ Cp. page 125, note †.

ascribed to him as immediate parents Heaven and Earth, which is just what after the lapse of ages would naturally be said of any one of the three patriarchs who first after the flood began to repeople the world; and they ascribed to him as consort a daughter of the Ocean, which was more natural still, seeing that in the ark he had lived with his wife on the bosom of the Ocean all the great while that it lay spread over the older world. That Noah, under the name of Deukalion, should be said to have been the grandson of Japhet instead of being his father, will not greatly surprise us, when we remember the vast gap in time (about 1500 years) that severs the Flood and the Dispersion from the earliest Greek writings in which we can read such traditions—those of Homer, which are placed roundly in 850 B.C., and those of Hesiod, which are fixed at about 735 B.C., and when we further perceive the legends to be so jumbled that sometimes Klymene is called the wife of Japetos, sometimes of his nephew Helios (the Sun) and sometimes of his son Prometheus. That the Grecian Noah and the Grecian Japhet, on the other hand, come so close together in genealogy points to an original agreement between the Greek narrative and the Bible.

Leaving Japhet himself, let us now look at his sons and named grandsons in detail.

The sacred text runs (in verses 2 and 3):—

“The sons of Japheth; Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras. And the sons of Gomer; Ashkenaz, and Riphath, and Togarmah.”*

Herodotus (who wrote his historo-geography about 450 B.C.) tells us of a nation called the Kimmerioi, who had formerly dwelt along the northern shores of the Pontos Euxinos, or Black Sea, and in the peninsula which we now call the *Crimea*, but who had been driven from their seats by the Scythians, and, passing round the eastern end of that sea, had overrun Western Asia in the reign of Ardys, king of Lydia (674 to 626 B.C.)† and had actually taken his capital, Sardis, near the Ægean Sea, but were at length driven out of Asia by his grandson Alyattes (615 to 559 B.C.)‡

* In the original Gōmēr, Māgōg, Mādai, Jāvān, Thūbhāl Mēshēkh, Thīras, Ashkēnāz, Rīphāth, and Thōgārmāh. The names always recur with this spelling, except that Thūbal is sometimes written with long *u* or short *a* and thrice with plain T, that Ashkenāz is written Ashkenāz in Jeremiah and Thogarmah Tōgārm-ah twice in Ezekiel, and that Riphath is also read Diphath (דִּפְתָח) in 1 Chron. i (but Josephus has Riphath).

† Her. IV. 11, and I, 15.

‡ Her. I, 16.

With the latter part of this story practically agree the annals of Assyria: King Esarhaddon, as they tell, when a people named the Gimmirâa had attacked his kingdom, under their leader Teispes, met them on his northern frontier and defeated them in a great battle (B.C. 677), and so forced them to turn westward into Asia Minor. A little later, Gugu (whom Herodotus called Gyges and the immediate predecessor of Ardys) sent an embassy to Assur-baniapli, Esarhaddon's successor, with costly presents and two Gimmiric chieftains whom the Lydian King had captured with his own hand, entreating his help against the Gimmirâa, who were then invading his land. But help was delayed, partly because it was difficult to find an interpreter of the Lydian tongue; and Gugu, though he found another ally, was defeated and slain by the invaders. His successor, Ardys, by swearing fealty to Assur-baniapli, obtained his help and ultimate victory over them. (Still it may have been reserved for Ardys's grandson to drive them out of the region).*

As regards the earlier part of the narrative of Herodotus, it is true so far as this, that the Kimmerioi did once inhabit the southern part of Russia, between the Don and the Tyras, or Dniester, including the peninsula which hems in the Sea of Azov: for Herodotus speaks of castles known to their successors as Kimmerian that flecked the region in his time, and of the grave of the royal tribe of the Kimmerioi, all slain in civil strife, which was still to be seen by the Tyras;† and Strabo (71-14 B.C.) says that in his day the chief port on the Palus Maeotis, or Sea of Azov, was called the Kimmerian Village, and states that the capital once stood upon the peninsula guarded by a rampart and a moat which crossed the isthmus;‡ and to our own time there stand the mounds of Eski Krim (Old Krim) marking the site of this prehistoric town. The Kimmerian straits and ferry no longer bear the names by which Herodotus knew them: but the Tartars, when they conquered the peninsula in 1236 A.D., called it Krim; and as Krim-Tartary it was known to the Russians until they regained its possession and, dropping Tartary, expanded Krim into Crimea.§

But the statement of the cause and manner of the Kimmerian invasion of Asia Minor, although Strabo accepts it, may easily

* Sayce, *Fresh Light*, p. 37, and *Higher Critics*, p. 124-125; Pinches, *Old Test. and Hist. Records*, p. 390.

† Her. IV, 12, 11.

‡ Strabo, XI, ii, 5.

§ Smith's *Dict. of Class. Geog.*, "Cimmerii"; *Eng. Cycl.*, "Crimea" and "Russia"; Chambers' *Cycl.*, "Crimea."

be confuted both on general grounds and through other details of Herodotus' own story.

The mountain chain of the Caucasus is 670 miles long as the crow flies, and for one-fourth of its length itself skirts the eastern shores of the Black Sea, while at the opposite, or south-western end, it all but reaches to the Caspian Sea. There is a pass at this point, called the Kaspiæ Pylæi (or Caspian Gates), which Herodotus distinctly says that the Kimmerioi did not cross, because the Scythians in pursuing them crossed it, got into Media, and lost their prey; and there is just one other pass, right in the middle of the chain, which is no less than 8,000 feet high.* What the Scythians were pursuing the Kimmerioi for it is hard to make out, when the latter had so readily vacated their lands for them; but hard indeed it is to conceive that this nation fled eastward for six or seven hundred miles from their enemies (as the maps will show), and finished by making this tremendous ascent with their women and children and household goods while all the time they knew that there were vast untenanted plains and forests to the west of them, which centuries later absorbed untold millions of men.

But again, Herodotus tells us that the Scythians came upon them from the east, that the royal tribe alone was bold enough to vote for battle, instead of flight, that discussion grew so hot that it ended in mortal combat between them, and the rest of the Kimmerioi, and that the royal tribe were all slain and buried in one common grave near the river Tyras. Now this river lay far to the west of the places that in this historian's time retained the name Kimmerian. It is therefore perfectly clear that these Kimmerioi fled from their enemies not eastward, but westward; so they certainly could not have been the same Gimmirâa, who in their raiding march are found *first*, far eastward in Assyria, and then far westward at Sardis; although they may have been related to them as New Englanders are to Englishmen now.

The question is whether there were not Gimmirâa already settled in Asia at the same time as the Kimmerioi occupied that southern tract of Russia.

Now, prior to Esarhaddon's defeat of this people, we find a prayer of his to the Sun-God, beseeching him for succour, because "Kastarit, lord of the city of Kar-kassi and Marmiti-arsu, lord of the city of the Medes," had revolted against him,

* Smith's *Dict. and Eng. Cycl.*, "Caucasus."

and their soldiers, together with those "of the *Gimmirâa*, of the Medes, and of the Minni, had captured the city of Kisassu."* But Media, as all know, lies to the north-east of Assyria; and it is generally agreed, and can be readily proved from cuneiform literature, that the Minni stretched from Media to the north of Assyria, while Kar-kassi was probably a town of the Kassi, who inhabited the chain of mountains east of Assyria and Babylonia; but whether it was there, or, as Professor Sayce thinks, in Armenia, it is manifest that the Gimmirâa had already been in the region just north-east of Assyria long enough to make friends with divers nations there; and, in the absence of evidence to the contrary, we may reasonably infer that even then it was their proper home. And, bearing in mind that our genealogy gives Ashkenaz as the eldest son of Gomer, when we find in a Biblical prophecy, Ashkenaz as a "kingdom" grouped in confederacy with "Ararat" (or Armenia)† "and Minni" and with the kingdoms "of the Medes,"‡ we are sure that the eldest branch of Gomer's descendants, at all events, formed at the time of the prophecy (about B.C. 600) a settled state in that very region, and had not been driven out of Asia. Their site is further fixed for us in the first century A.D. by Josephus, who says, "Of the three sons of Gomer, Ashkenaz founded the Ashkenazians, who are now called by the Greeks Rhëginians;"§ and, since there are only two places recorded in ancient geography whose inhabitants could have borne this name—Rhegium in southern Italy and Rhagæ in north-western Media, and the former was a city that had been founded by the Greeks themselves, the latter must be the city intended—a place important enough to bestow a well-known tribal name, for it was the greatest in all Media.

Again, the Armenians have always declared that they are descended from Haik, a son of Thogarmah and grandson of Gomer,|| while their northern neighbours the Georgians, whose language resembles theirs, maintain that they themselves are descended from a brother of his named Karthlos (their own name for themselves being Karthlians), and further that the Lesghians, who live just on the other side of the Caucasus and whose Grecian name was Legai, are sprung from a third brother called Legis.¶ But more, Josephus, who in his Greek

* Sayce, *Higher Critics*, 485.

† The Assyrian "Urardhu."

‡ Jer. li, 27, 28.

§ Ant. I, vi, 1, Dindorf's Greek text, which I quote throughout.

|| *Eng. Cycl.* "Armenia."

¶ Bryce, *Transcaucasia and Ararat*, 104 (*cp. Eng. Cycl.* "Caucasus," and Kiepert's *Atlas Antiquus*).

citation of Genesis x, 3, instead of Thogarmah has Thorgamēs,* says that he was the father of the "Thorgamaians, who, as the Greeks resolved, were called Phrygians"; and, in keeping with this, Herodotus tells us that in Xerxes' vast army, which was composed of contingents from all countries under his sway, "The Armenians, who are Phrygian colonists, were armed in the Phrygian fashion. Both nations," he continues, "were under the command of Artochmes, who was married to one of the daughters of Darius"; and this common equipment and command extended to *no other* contingent in that great array.†

Thus the third branch of Gomer's family are shown to have formed, long before our era, several of the large and well-established nations of Asia Minor, whose territory ran through three-fourths of the length east and west of modern Turkey-in-Asia. The prophet Ezekiel speaks of "the house of Togarmah of the north quarters."‡ The appellation is embedded in the description of a still future conflict; but whether it refers to Togarmah's tribes as they were located then or as they lie now, it is equally correct; for from beyond the Caucasus up to Ararat the Lesghians and Georgians are still spread, and, though the name of Phrygian died out with the Roman empire, the Armenians (who we may infer have absorbed their Phrygian kinsfolk) now stretch their name and nation in clumps and chains from Ararat to the Levant and to the Ægean Sea.

Of the second branch we have yet to speak, or speak more definitely. The statement of Josephus is, "Riphath founded the Riphathaioi, now called Paphlagōnes." Herodotus, after speaking of the vestiges of the Kimmerioi on the northern shore of the Euxine, says, "It *appears likewise* that the Kimmerioi, when they fled into Asia to escape the Scythians, made a settlement in the peninsula where the Greek city of Sinōpe was afterwards built."§ The language shows that this is only an inference drawn from his finding Kimmerioi or else

* *Bryce*. The final *h* in this name and in Elishah of ver. 4 he omits, simply because there was no proper way of representing it in Greek writing.

† Her. VII, 73.

‡ If we adopt the revised rendering (as I ought rather in consistency to have done) "in the uttermost parts of the north," we have concord again, though not so obviously; for the Armenians *now* are spread in abundance all over the southern coast-land of the Black Sea, which *then* would have been accounted "the uttermost parts of the north," much as Sheba in Southern Arabia was counted "the uttermost parts of the south" in the Saviour's time (Matt. xii, 42, and Luke xi, 31).

§ IV, 12.

their traces there, and from his "putting more faith," as he says,* in the story he gives of their expulsion by the Scythians and their arrival in Asia as invaders "than in any other account" of the founding of the Scythian empire. All we know is that he found that Kimmerioi had settled, and perhaps were still established on that peninsula; and that peninsula *is in Paphlagonia*.

But, turning our thoughts afresh to the northern shore, where Kimmerioi had dwelt in numbers before they made way for Scythians, it is remarkable that the name of Riphath, head of our second branch, finds a distant echo in the geography of the Greeks.

The Grecian poets from an early period, and the geographers and historians after them, speak of a range of mountains called Ripaian, from whose caves and hollows the cutting blasts of Boreas, or the north-wind, blew, and beyond which, according to some of the authors, dwelt the Hyperborei, secure from these rough gales, in calm serenity; and, while Lucan places in the range the source of the Tanaïs, or Don, it appears from the geography of Ptolemy and Marcian to be the straggling chain of low hills which divides the rivers flowing to the Euxine from those that flow to the Baltic.† Pliny and the writers that succeeded him have, it is true, spelt the name for us with initial *Rh*; but the writers that went before him all wrote it with unaspirated *R*‡ bringing it closer to Riphath, which is the more striking in that initial *r* goes without aspiration in only two other names or words in the Grecian tongue. That the Greeks should have shortened Riphathian into Ripaian, is not stranger than that they should abbreviate Skolotoi (the true name given by Herodotus)§ into Skythai (or Scythians) or that the Romans should know as Gauls a people who among themselves were known first as Galatai and then as Keltai.

The Ripaian Mountains, or Hills, were thus the natural northern boundary of the south Russian Kimmerioi, yet were too insignificant in themselves to have obtained a descriptive geographical name; but, just as Mount Alaunus is first heard of when the Alauni, or Alans, have first entered Europe, and is vaguely placed at divers points north of them by different writers,|| thus evidently taking its name from the people whose

* Her. IV, 11.

† Smith, *Dict. Class. Geog.*, "Rhipaei Montes."

‡ *Ibid.* § IV, 6. || Smith, *Dict. Class. Geog.*, "Alani."

boundary it was, so we may infer was it with the Ripaian Mountains—they were the northern border of the Riphæian Kimmerioi, and took their name from these, the children of Riphath, the second branch of Gomer's race.

But, while in eastern Europe the Kimmerioi did not extend northward beyond those hills, in the middle of our continent at least as early as Homer's time we find them settled much further to the north; for thus does the bard allude to them in his tale of the wanderings of Ulysses:—

Now she was nearing the bounds of the deep-flowing Ocean
 And there lie both the country and city of Kimmerian men,
 Who are covered with thick air and cloud. Nor ever does
 The gleaming sun look down on them with his rays,
 Neither when he mounts up to the starry sky,
 Nor when he turns back from heaven and moves towards earth.
 Arriving there we drove the ship ashore, and thence the tree-fruits
 Took. And we our very selves again did go against the stream of
 Ocean,
 Until we reached the land whereto Circe had directed us.

Odyssey I, 22.

It is evident that under this description Homer could not have meant to refer to the Kimmerians of Southern Russia; for the Grecian navigators who brought him news of these would at the outset have told him that they lived along the northern shore of the Black Sea, and it would have been unreason, transcending the most poetic fancy, to assume that they also lived on the southern shore of the distant Ocean. The idea of this expanse of water completely encircling the habitable world beyond doubt arose from the combined reports of Greek seamen sailing under adventurous Phœnician captains to and along the Baltic Sea and of those gatherers of amber who at an early period brought their precious ware from the Baltic down to the Adriatic Sea, telling how the Atlantic Ocean was continued north-eastward by the German Ocean, and that again eastward and northward by the Baltic, and further east (as rumour perchance added) by the Gulf of Finland. It was from such informants that Homer must have heard the tale which he elsewhere tells, of a land where a man who could dispense with sleep might earn double wages, as there was hardly any night. As Gladstone rightly infers, in his chapter on the great poet's geography, one of the travellers he talked with must have visited the far north in summer-time and the other in winter; and hence he places the land of twofold sunshine beside Ocean in the west and the Kimmerian land of gloom,

beside Ocean in the east* (for Ulysses half circled the earth upon Ocean's tide ere his bark returned to civilised shores and well-known harbours). Now, jutting out into what both Strabo and Tacitus describes as the northern reach of Ocean is the peninsula of Denmark, which Posidonius, who wrote about ninety years before the Christian era, and Strabo, who wrote ten years after it, and other geographers of those times knew as the Cimbric Chersonesus, inhabited in their time by the nation of the Cimbri, whose name is uttered by scholars generally as *Kimbrī*.† Of these people and their country Tacitus thus writes:‡ “The Cimbri nearest to the Ocean occupy the same bulge§ in Germany, now a little state but very great in renown; and the traces of their ancient reputation remain widely spread—camps on both shores,|| and enclosures by the extent of which you may measure the mass and the troops of the nation and the belief to be placed in the existence of so great an army.” These Kimbri, then, I believe to be the Kimmerioi of whom Homer wrote; and I may add that the belief that they were one people with the Kimmerioi of Southern Russia was held by Posidonius and Strabo, and is common among historians in our own day.¶

In speaking as he does of the decline of the Kimbri in power and population, Tacitus of course had in mind the mighty invasion of the more genial and fruitful regions of central and southern Europe in the years 113 to 101 B.C., when, in league with the Teutones, another northern people, but marching by a different route, the Kimbri passed into Noricum (or Austria Proper) and Illyricum, back into Switzerland, where they were joined by two Keltic tribes (the Tigurini and Ambrones), through Gaul into Spain (where they remained three years), and back into Italy. The whole host is said by Roman writers to have

* Gladstone, *Homer*, p. 60.

† Posidonius and Strabo, VII, ii, 1, p. 292, and presumably all other Greek geographers write the name *Κίμβροι*: and by philologists and reformers of the English pronunciation of Latin *c* and *g* are always uttered hard (as *k* and as *g* in *gun*), though it is arguable whether before *e* and *i* they were not sometimes uttered as in Italian they are, like *g* twice in *ginger* and *c* twice in *cicerone*.

‡ *Germania*, xxxvii.

§ The word is *sinus*, but refers to the *ingens flexus in Septentrionem* along which the Frisians and Chanci were spread (c. xxxv).

|| *Utraque ripa*, which probably means on both banks (of the Elbe at its estuary), although no river has been hinted at.

¶ See Smith, *Dict. Class. Geog.*, where it is simply dismissed as fanciful.

contained 300,000 fighting men; while they had with them a much larger number of women and children. The latter fact shows that they intended to settle in the south; but meanwhile they unscrupulously plundered the tribes whom they passed through. Four consular armies, besides lesser forces, were utterly defeated by the barbarians, usually by the Kimbri in particular; but Kimbri and Teutones were alike out-generalled by the famous Caius Marius, and were utterly annihilated, the women putting an end to their lives when they saw their husbands slain.*

The record of Cimbric settlement in Denmark or its near neighbourhood would seem to have been retained up to the present hour by a seaport on the southern coast of Sweden which from remote times has borne the name of Cimbrishamn, or the Cimbri's Haven; and in the little fishing village of Kivik, close by, there still stands an ancient monument "which has been supposed to be Keltic, but which is considered by Professor S. Nillson to represent ceremonies of Phœnician Baal-Worship."† That the Kimbri were of Keltic race we shall presently prove, and that the Kelts, as distinct from the Teutons, had a worship allied to the Phœnician is coming more and more to be believed; but, if the monument be truly Phœnician, not Keltic, it tends to show how early those regions were visited by ships from the East, and how Homer may have got his information about the northern Kimmerioi, or Kimbroi.

Moving again to the west, we come in this land of ours to a people who from time immemorial have called themselves Cymri or Gymri (pronounced Kŭmri and Gŭmri) and whom Englishmen proper know as Welsh, simply because to their early forefathers, as to the Germans now, *Welsh* meant *foreign*. The double form of the native name is accounted for by the fact that in the Welsh tongue the final letter of one word often determines whether the initial sound of the next shall be *k* or hard *g* (the same rule prevailing as to *d* and *t*); but, if the Welsh too belong to Gomer's family, we can the more readily understand how portions of this should in one country have been known as Kimmerioi and in another as Gimmirâa. And as for the *b* in Cimbri, or Kimbri, that is only like the euphonic *b* that the French and we English have inserted in *number* (once the Latin *numerus*) and that we have slipped into our own

* Smith, *Shorter Hist. Rome, et passim.*

† Murray's *Handbook of Denmark, Sweden and Norway* (1871).
"Christianstad."

words *nimol* and *slumerian*, turning them into *nimble* and *slumber*. Moreover, our own island presents us, at the same time, with an analogy to this change and a further link in the chain of evidence; for that part of England which lies north of the Mersey River and has the Pennine Mountains for its eastern wall, and which the Anglo-Saxons failed to conquer for about four hundred years, was known to them as Cumerland, or Cumbreland, and as Cumberland a large section of it is known to ourselves to-day. One with the Welsh too, during that conquest, as both language and history show, were the men of Cornwall and of Brittany;* so that the name Kumri also applies to them.

And further, as is generally known, the literature ancient and modern of the native Irish and of the Highland Scots and the vestiges of the old Gaulish tongue that have descended to us prove that Erse, Gaelic, and Gaulish were nearly related to Welsh, so that the whole of France and of the British Isles was once inhabited by a homogeneous people speaking a language akin to modern Kumric, a language which we call Keltic. That the Welsh should differ in appearance and somewhat in language from the Erse and the Gaels is accounted for by a presumed early colonization of south-west Britain from Spain, an idea first mooted by Tacitus, who says; "The dark faces of the Silures and their usually curly locks, coupled with the fact that Spain lies over against them, create a belief that ancient Iberians crossed over and took possession of this region as a settlement."† But in spite of foreign admixtures, when Sir Richard Garnett examined a list of Erse monosyllables given in an Irish grammar he found that out of 270 no fewer than 140 had the same sense and origin as words of like form in the Welsh tongue, while 40 more were clearly related to Welsh words.‡

A year ago, for a second time, there was held a representative gathering of all the branches of the Keltic race that still have a distinct existence. The gathering-point this time was Holyhead, in the island of Anglesey; and, after a cordial interchange of speeches and the singing of a united anthem, whose verses were in Kumric, but its chorus in all their languages, the representatives set up a pillar of six large stones in honour of

* Who are descended in part from the British followers of Maximus, who crossed over to Gaul in a vain attempt to establish his claim to the empire, and in part from fugitives from the war with the Anglo-Saxons.—Knight's *Hist. Eng.* I, 54, 55.

† *Agricola*, XI.

‡ Chambers's *Cycl.*, "Welsh Language."

their six "nations"—Erse, Gaelic, Welsh (or Kumric), Manx, Cornish, and Breton.

But, turning back into the heart of Europe, we shall have further reason to conclude that the Kimbroi belonged to the same Keltic race as the Kumri. Cæsar and Tacitus both tell us that the Helvetii (the ancestors of the French-Swiss) were a Gallic tribe;* and whereas the Kimbri marched apart from their German allies, the Teutōnes, in that mighty trek of which we have spoken, they induced two tribes of the Helvetii to march in their own company. Why was this, unless, unlike the Teutōnes, these could understand the same words of command as themselves—unless, in short, they themselves were Kelts like these Helvetians?

And, again, we shall find, partly from history and tradition and partly from stronger evidence, that the Keltic race, to which both Kumri and Kimbri belonged, preceded all other races as colonists of Central Europe from the Volga to the Rhine.

It would be natural to infer, after reading of the incursions of the Germans into Gaul which prevailed in Cæsar's time,† that the invasion of Italy by the Gauls in the sixth century B.C. and their settlement there over the whole great basin of the River Po‡ was due to a previous retreat of the rearguard of the Keltic race before German invaders; and accordingly we find a tradition expressed in Strabo (A.D. 14) that the Boii, who were among those settlers of northern Italy, had previously dwelt in the Hercynian Forest (a sylvan region which in those days covered the centre and west of Germany and the northern half of Austria), while Tacitus is both positive and explicit, stating that they were driven from that forest home by the Marcomanni, but had bequeathed their name to it, for it was still called Boiemia (Bohemia).§ And, in like manner, Tacitus tells us that the Helvetii had dwelt between the Rhine, the Maine, and the Hercynian Forest until they were driven southwards by the Germans.||

Again, a century before the Christian era and perhaps right up to it, there were Keltic tribes on the Ister, or Danube; for Strabo says that, before entering Helvetia, the Kimbroi had

* Caes., *De Bell. Gall.*, I, 1 and Tacitus, *Germ.*, xxviii.

† Caes., *De Bell. Gall.*, I, 31, 32.

‡ Forming Cisalpine Gaul (see Smith's *Smaller Hist. of Rome*, pp. 45, 47, 113, 114).

§ Strabo, VII, ii, 2 (p. 292), Tacitus, *Germ.*, xlii and xxviii.

|| *Ibid.*

descended to the Danube and to the Scordistian Kelts, and then had fallen upon the Teuristai and Tauriskai, Keltic tribes also; and, while the abode of the Tauriskai has been fixed by geographers as in Noricum, the Scordisci have been located in in Pannonia (or Hungary).

And what of our stronger evidence? The names of rivers and large streams in the Old World must clearly be all ancient and mostly primeval. Long before a conquering tribe had time to reflect upon a change of name for a river in their newly-won territory, even if they cared to change it, they would have used it so often in transactions both warlike and peaceful with the conquered tribe, that they would insensibly have adopted it, although in some cases, regarding what was really a descriptive name as a proper name, they would have added a word for *river*, *brook*, or *water* thereto, which in due time in the mouths of after-generations would coalesce with the first into a single name once more. Thus, if we find the river-names of Central and Eastern Europe sometimes to be identical in form with common river-names of countries certainly Keltic, and if we further find them nearly always to be made up of apposite Keltic words (modified indeed in many cases through the careless repetition of many generations, but still perceived by comparison with one another to have had that origin), we shall be sure that the Kelts once dwelt over the whole vast area, and that they were its first reclaimers and cultivators. Now this is just what we do find: or rather—to make our case stronger still—we mostly find the ancient river-names of that great region to have their origin and significance in that form of Keltic speech which is still known as Kumric. Selecting from the admirable compilation and argument of Isaac Taylor some of his most salient evidences, I now proceed to prove this by a sufficient number of illustrations, leaving the reader, if perchance he be still dissatisfied, to peruse the vast number of tabulated names by which Taylor establishes his case.*

And, first, let us examine the land of the Kumri and of its next neighbours, along with the ancient home of the Kimmerioi in Southern Russia. In Welsh, or Kumric, *rhe*, and in Gaelic *rea*, means *swift*; and accordingly in England there is a stream

* Isaac Taylor, *Words and Places*, chap. ix, his aim is not quite the same as that of the present writer; he says nothing of Gomer, the Kimmerioi, or the Kimbri, but simply proves that the Kelts were the first race to pass through middle Europe from east to west and to colonise it.

called Rhee in Cambridgeshire and another called Rhea in Staffordshire; in both Ireland, Scotland and England there is a stream called Rye, and in England, besides, one called Rey and two called Ray. With this nomenclature compare the name by which the Volga was known to classic writers—the Rha—and it is seen to be Kumric.

Again, according to Armstrong, says Taylor, *don* is a Breton (and therefore Kumric) word for *water*, and formerly existed in Gaelic, while *tain* is a Gadhelic (that is, northern Keltic) name for the same element*: and so in England, in Scotland, and in Ireland, there is a River Don; in Ireland there is a stream called the Bandon; in England and in Scotland a Dun and a Dean; and in England, besides, a Dane; while there are also in England a Teane, a Teign, and a Teyn. With this compare the names of the other three chief rivers of Southern Russia both in their modern and in their classic form—the *Don* (or *Tanais*), the Dnieper (or *Danapris*), and the Dniester (or *Danastris*), as also the *Donetz*, the name of a large tributary of the Don.

Let us now examine the known Keltic lands along with middle Europe.

Whereas we have the *Roden* in England, and the Rhodanus (mod. Rhone) in Switzerland and France, we have the Rhadanau in Germany.

In Kumric *dwr* (pron. doer) means *water*; so we have the Adour in England and France, the Douro in north-western Spain, where we know the Kelts were settled, and the *Durdan* in Normandy; and we have the *Oder* in the heart of Germany.

Rhin is a Kumric word connected with the aforesaid *rhe*, and means that which runs; and so we have the Reinach in Switzerland, the Rhine in that country and Germany, and the Rhin in Germany alone.

Then *avon* in Kumric means *river*; and so we have six Avons in Scotland, two in Wales and Monmouthshire together, and six in the rest of England, four Avons in France in the river-systems of the Loire and Seine, two Avens and an Aff in Brittany, and an Avaenoge in Switzerland†: and similarly we have the *Donau* (or Danube) in Germany and Austria, the *Rhanadau*

* Isaac Taylor, *Ibid.*, p. 138, note, Gadhelic means belonging to the northern group of Keltic tongues—Erse, Gaelic, and Manx.

† Observed and added by the writer: it flows into the Lake of Geneva between Lausanne and Morges.

in Germany, the *Moldau* in Bohemia, the Drave (= *Dur-avě*) and the Save (= *Is-avě*) in Southern Austria and Hungary.

Wysg in Kumric means a current, and *wisge* in Erse and Gaelic water; and so we have the river Wissey in Norfolk along with such hybrid and suggestive names in the Fen country as Wishford, Wisley, Wistow and Wisbeach; while we have also Islas in Scotland, an Isle in Somerset, an Isle and an Isac in Brittany and an Isère in France proper; and similarly we have the Isella (the modern Yssel) in Holland, German streams called Isen, Isar, and Eisach, and Ister (= *Is-ter* or *tur*) the classic name for the Danube, perhaps given to it at a different point in its course better known to the Romans. Again, we have *-is* as an ending to river-names in known Keltic lands such as the Ligeris (now the Loire) and the Atesis (now the Adige); and similarly we find the Scaldis, or Scheldt, and the Vahalís, or Waal, in Holland, the Albis,* or Elbe in Germany, and the *Tanais*, or Don, in Southern Russia.

Lastly, *cam* means *crooked* in Kumric; and we have two river Cams, a Camil, a Camlad, and a Cambeck in England and a Camlin and a Camon in Ireland: and, in like manner, we have the river Kam in Switzerland and the Kamp and the Cham in Germany.

It is manifest, both from these geographical records as well and from the stories of Herodotus and Strabo, that the Keltic movement, carried on for many hundred years† before the Christian era, was from east to west. Yet Julius Cæsar (50 B.C.), in speaking of the religion and sway of the Druids in Gaul and especially of their acting as judges in all disputes, writes thus: "It is thought that this lore of theirs was discovered in Britain, and thence brought over into Gaul, and now they who wish more carefully to obtain the knowledge mostly go thither to learn it."‡ And, when we pass over to Britain, we find that the centre of Druidism was in that part of the island where the people have always called themselves Kumric: for it was in Mona, or Anglesey, in northern Wales; and a hundred years latter Suetonius overthrew for a time the power of the Druids for kindling insurrection by a wholesale slaughter of them in that island.

* Probably meaning *white water* (Taylor).

† Probably two thousand, for by the recent astronomical calculations of Lockyer and Penrose founded upon the orientation of Stonehenge, it was found to have been erected about B.C. 1600.

‡ *De Bell. Gall.*, VI, 13.

What do these facts indicate? That the Kelts who bore the name of Kumri were the eldest branch of the original Keltic nation—a “royal tribe”—who, as was natural, were more respected than the other tribes, and were deemed to have best preserved the early traditions of the race. And, in that case, it is reasonable that we should find them keeping the name of its original progenitor. Yet why, someone might ask, were they not called Riphathi instead of Kumri, if, as the writer has striven to show, they were descended from Riphath’s branch of Gomer’s family? Possibly because Riphath had died long before his father;* and his children and grandchildren had become the special delight of the patriarch Gomer. The writer has had among his acquaintance (and surely his experience cannot be singular) children left orphans at an early age and brought up by an uncle or a grandfather whom they called “father” to the end of his days. We can hardly suppose that in those early times, before apostasy began, and only two generations after men had been sent forth with a fresh promise of fruitfulness “to replenish the earth,”† that anyone was left an orphan in childhood or youth; still, when contemporary patriarchs were having their first children at thirty or forty years old, and living four hundred years after, if Gomer lived only 340 years in all, and Riphath, his second son, was born when he was 60, and himself died at 140, Gomer, through outliving his son by an equal period of 140 years, would have woven far more ties with Riphath’s descendants to be remembered by than Riphath himself would have done.

But, whatever was the cause, there is a remarkable allusion in the Bible itself confirming the historic fact. Let us turn again to that prophecy, already quoted from, touching a mighty invasion of Israel’s land just before the final reign of righteousness will be established there, and we shall find in the enumeration of Israel’s foes “Gomer and all his bands”‡ immediately followed by “the House of Togarmah of the north quarters and all his bands,”‡ but no other son of Gomer or branch of his race by name. What are we to infer from this? That, whereas a nation or a group of nations, in the last ages of human rule, was to show by their name or else rightly to claim

* Even, as in the next chapter, in another genealogy, we read that Haran died before his father Terah’s migration.

† Gen. ix, 1.

‡ Ezek. xxxviii, 6 (R.V., *hordes* . . .).

descent from Togarmah,* there was to be another set of peoples who were descended from one or possibly from both his brothers, but whose name or claim would betoken only that they were descended from Gomer himself. And this we have proved to be the case; for the Armenians and Armenio-Phrygians rightfully affirm Togarmah to be their ancestor (as the Georgians also claim, though probably with less reason, for themselves and the Lesghians),† but, on the other hand, while a goodly portion of the Kelts have been and are known as Kimbri, Kumri, or Gumri, no other grandson of Japheth is pointed to by the name of the rest, and geography concurs with ancient history in proving that they once all bore the name of Kimmerioi or Gimirâa, the children of Gomer.

The expression "and all his bands" (or "hordes," R.V.), which is used to describe only the contingents sent by Gomer and Togarmah to that vast army, is not out of keeping with the present distribution of the Armenians, who, besides being abundant in Armenia proper and Asia Minor, are very numerous in Turkish towns on the western side of the Bosphorus, and are thickly scattered in Russia;‡ but, as applied to the Gomerites proper or Kelts, the description accords well indeed with their status and geographical positions, for, besides forming six or seven§ peoples separated from one another by intervening nations of different origin, they are the chief basic element in the great Romance nations—the French, the Spanish and the Italian.

And here I would say something as to a theory which is

* In both Ezek. xxvii, 14, and here the name is written with *T* instead of *Th* in the Hebrew text.

† To judge by the comparison of languages made in Adelung's *Mithridates*, by means of the versions of the Lord's Prayer, the English *Cyclopædia* is wrong and the Georgian speech is not akin to Armenian, nor by the Welsh version with the Georgian version can we find any resemblance to Welsh; but Adelung admits that many Armenian words have worked their way into Georgian, and it may be that Armenian conquerors, long before the Christian era, infused these together with an aristocracy that passed on Armenian traditions at the time when Georgia appears to have been in vassalage to Armenia—at the time of the Babylonian and early Persian empires (*Eng. Cycl.*, "Armenia").

‡ Which fact may also be covered by the descriptive phrase, "from the uttermost parts of the north," as the R.V. has it (see *ante*, p. 131 footnote †).

§ To the six aforesaid ought to be added the Walloons in Belgium, who are descended from the old Belgic Gauls, who number two millions, and whose language contains more Keltic words than any other dialect of French (*Chambers' Encycl.*, "Walloons").

based almost wholly upon the misunderstanding of an Assyrian allusion to the northern kingdom of Israel. The theorists say that the Assyrian inscriptions called the Ten Tribes of north and east Canaan "Beth Khumri," or that they so termed the tribe of Ephraim, at all events; and that some time after these northern Israelites were carried into exile, they, according to the statement of Esdras (in Book II, chapter xiii), "crossed the Euphrates by the narrow passes" (that is, where it works through mountain gorges), "for the Most High showed signs for them," and thence made their way by "a year and a half's" marching (as that writer again tells) to "a further country, where never mankind dwelt," even as they had resolved to do; and this region truly is called "Arsareth," as Esdras tells, for is there not a river in Poland by that name, and were not the Kimmerioi once living near to it, as Herodotus and Strabo declared? But the Kimmerioi had, before their migration to more westerly regions, been so long settled in southern Russia that they left extensive ruins there for Herodotus to gaze at; they had time also to bestow their name on a country which is distinctly off the route of this alleged Israelite march—the peninsula of the Crimea, and to protect it with a vast trench across the isthmus of Perekop; it is hard, therefore, to comprehend how they could be identical with those rapid emigrants of Israel. Still harder is it to understand, if the theory be true, how Homer, who, by the researches of scholars, is determined to have written about 850 B.C., or more than *a hundred years before the final capture of Samaria*, wrote of Kimmerioi, settled long *before his time* on the very borders of the northern Ocean.*

But, as a fact, the name Beth Khumri has not yet been found applied to a people as distinct from the country they were in. When speaking of a great victory in the sixth year of his reign over Irkhuleni, King of Hamath, and his allies at Qarqara, Shalmanezer II. of Assyria mentions among these and their equipments 2,000 chariots and 10,000 men belonging to Akhabbu mât Sir'ilâa,† and that this means Ahab, King of the land of Israel, is proved both from the geographical position of Qarqara, the royal city of Hamath, and from the fact that twelve years later Shalmanezer records his then victory over Khaza'iln (Hazeal) and his besieging him in Damascus,‡ and his receiving

* Sayce, *Higher Critics*, p. 390, etc.; Pinches, *Old Test. and Hist. Rec.*, p. 329.

† Sayce, 395, 396; Pinches, 336, 337.

‡ Though unsuccessfully, for God had decreed that he should be king over Damascus and be a scourge to Israel.

tribute from Jaua, son of Khumri. That is, evidently, the Jehu of the Bible who was the contemporary of Hazael and the near successor of Omri, the founder of Samaria. This is the only Assyrian notice as yet found of a force of Israelites fighting outside their country; and we see that the name there applied to them is Sir'ilâa, not Beth Khumri. But where the capital or the territory of northern Israel is mentioned, there we find the latter expression used. Thus King Sargon (the Sargon of Isaiah xx) tells how he has settled Thamudites and other colonists in Bit Khumri,* and Tiglath-Pilezer III. speaks thus: "The country (mât) of Bit Khumri [I occupied]; all its men [as well as their possessions] I carried away to Assyria. Pekah, their king [I] slew, and I appointed Hoshea to be king over them."† And lastly, Adad Niraii III., grandson of Shalmanezer II., when enumerating his vassal states, speaks of the land of Khumri simply, without an intervening Bit. Both Sayce and Pinches hold that Bit Khumri means not the house or people of Israel, for calling whom by the name Khumri there is otherwise no cause known to anyone, but "the house of Omri"—that is, Samaria, the city which Omri built and made his capital.‡ It certainly could have had no other origin, as the fact that Jehu was called a son of Khumri by contemporary Assyrians also shows: and if the Anglo-Israelites, accepting this origin, say that the name was afterwards extended to the people themselves, and borne with them upon all their travels and through the ages, it would be strange indeed and contrary to the usual decrees of God, who wills not that the name of the wicked should be had in remembrance, especially on the lips of His earthly people; for we read of Omri in the inspired record that "he did that which was evil in the sight of the LORD and dealt wickedly above all that were before him."§

As for Jehu's being called a "son of Omri," when he had obtained the throne by slaying Omri's grandson, it is probable that the Assyrian royal scribes did not trouble their heads about such details; he reigned at Samaria, which had been founded by Omri (a powerful king, as the Moabite stone proves, for he had made Mesha's predecessor his vassal); therefore in the thought of the scribes Jehu was a son of Omri. And yet after all he may have been a descendant through the female line from that king, and have obtained his captaincy, as Amasa obtained his chief captaincy from Absalom, because he was a relative;

* Sayce, 544, cp. for spelling, Pinches, 332.

† Sayce, 410; Pinches, 352, 354.

‡ 1 Kings xvi, 23, 24.

§ 1 Kings xvi, 25.

and we remember that the "queen," or queen-mother, of Belshazzar, when addressing him, spoke of Nebuchadnezzar as his father, whereas he was certainly not a paternal ancestor, though the founder of Babylon's greatness and probably the father of Belshazzar's mother (as recent discovery tends to show).

I would add that two records are found of the paying of tribute by Jehu to Shalmanezzer II. In the first, after telling how he shut Hazael up in Damascus and then ravaged his country, the Assyrian King says, "In those days I received the tribute of the Tyrians, the Sidonians, and of Yaua, son of Khumri." In the second, on the famous Black Obelisk which stands in the Nimrood Central Saloon, at the British Museum, is seen the Assyrian king with attendants behind him receiving the ambassador of Jehu, followed by other Assyrian officials, who is prostrating himself before the king, and underneath are the words, "The tribute of Yaua, son of Khumri; silver, gold, a golden cup, golden vases, golden vessels, golden buckets, lead, a staff for the hand of the king (and) sceptres I received."* And the face of the northern Israelite ambassador is the face of a modern Jew, with the same strongly marked aquiline nose: which shows how silly is the contention that these features are peculiar to the true Jews only; while, as for the further absurd supposition that they came upon them as a mark of disgrace after they had sinned more grievously than the northern Israelites, the same features are conspicuous upon all the figures of Jews that are so abundant in the Assyrian bas-reliefs of the siege of Lachish, when the mass of the northern tribes had already gone into exile for their sins, and the revivals of true religion among the Jews proper under Hezekiah and Josiah were yet to come.

The tribute that Jehu paid to Shalmanezzer II. was indeed a heavy one, although perhaps we are to understand that it was a danegeld once levied rather than a tax annually paid, and that Shalmanezzer took away these treasures from Jehu, just as Shishak had taken away Solomon's golden shields from Rehoboam; but it incidentally shows how rich in gold the land of Israel had once been in Solomon's days (as the Scripture tells us), and for a good while after.

And the Assyrian word for *silver* here used—namely, *caspi*—suggests the origin of a well-known geographical name which the Greek and Latin writers were not able to trace. The

* See Pinches, pp. 336, 337; and British Museum monument and printed Assyrian guide-book (p. 25, and Plate II).

Assyrian Kings held sway over Media and Upper Asia as Herodotus tells for 520 years;* and they therefore were in frequent political and commercial intercourse with the shores of the Caspian Sea, and through them much of its trade and its fame must have passed to other countries.

Did they not bestow on it this name of Caspian because of its silvery appearance, even as the first Spanish colonists of Buenos Ayres bestowed the name of Rio de la Plata, or Silver River, upon the broad expanse of water that flowed past their new home?

We have spoken of Togarmah and the spread and present position of his family; we have done the same by Riphath; and we have dealt somewhat but not sufficiently with the position and early movements of Ashkenaz. Far from sufficiently; for Ashkenaz is the progenitor of some of the mightiest of our modern nations, as I shall briefly show.

It is remarkable that the Pontos Euxinos, or Black Sea, bore still more anciently the name of Pontos Axenos.† The Greeks, as trading navigator and colonists, deeming the appellation to be of ill-omen because *axenos* was the Greek for inhospitable, changed it to *euxenos*, or according to the Ionic dialect *euxeinós*, hospitable. But it seems little likely that, as has been suggested, they gave it the first name because of barbarous tribes that dwelt upon its shores. The Greeks, who sailed about and colonized every island in the Ægean Sea in prehistoric times and were in friendly intercourse with the Troad close to the Sea of Marmora by the time of Solomon at least,‡ could hardly at any historic period have called the Black Sea the Inhospitable. Surely the voyage of Jason in the Heroic Age long before the siege of Troy, as far as Colchis at the remote end of the sea, would lead us to conclude this. Rather do I prefer the suggestion to be presently borne out by a good array of facts, that the name is that of Ashkenaz slightly inverted, as *ask* was by our Anglo-Saxon forefathers, and still is by some of our ordinary fellow-Englishmen slightly inverted into *ax*; and I hope to show a similar change presently in the name of descendants of Ashkenaz.

Again, Strabo speaks of a time long anterior to the one fixed by Herodotus when raids by the Kimmerioi were frequent. He says that Homer might well have sung of this people, seeing that in the poet's own time and earlier they had ravaged Lower

* Book I, 95.

† See Smith's *Class. Dict.*, and Liddell and Scott's *Lexicon*, *sub voce*.

‡ *i.e.*, at the time of the transactions that led up to the Trojan War.

Asia. And in another place he says that they invaded "now Paphlagonia, now Phrygia, until Midas is said to have met his death by drinking the blood of a bull," a statement that wears a fabulous look and makes one think that he is speaking of the first Midas, King of Phrygia, who is alleged to have been contemporary with Silenus, the teacher of Bacchus, and to whom are ascribed sundry marvellous and incredible adventures. Lastly, there are distinct traces left in geographical and regal names of a very early migration of the Ashkenazian branch of Gomer's family, which we have seen to be really indicated by Herodotus and Strabo.* In Bithynia on the borders of the Propontis (or Sea of Marmora) there was a Lake Ascania; in south-western Phrygia there is another; and midway between them lay Troas, in whose royal family we find in the days of the Trojan War a prince Ascanius. Now princely names are specially apt to be repeated after very long intervals: thus we have a thousand years intervening between Sargon I. of Agade, and Sargon II. of Nineveh, and many hundred years between Tiglath Pilezer I. and Tiglath Pilezer II. of Assyria; and again we find Ramses II. of Egypt calling one of his sons Khamus after his god, Khem, or Kham, whom we know to have been his ancestor Kham, the son of Noah.

Again, bearing in mind our before proved point of the common descent of the Phrygians and the Ashkenazians from Gomer, it is remarkable that some of the classic poets should call the Trojans Phrygians, so much so that as Phrygia Minor it is marked upon Kiepert's ancient maps.

What then do we conclude? That these two lakes bore the same name through being at or near the northern and southern boundary of the tribe of Ashkenaz, when a portion of it first migrated westward from the plains of Shinar, while another moved eastward to the Caspian Sea; and further that the royal house of Troy were probably descendants of the eldest stock of the western Ashkenazians, and repeated the name of their ancestor at intervals.

Now if Ashkenaz found the descendants of Tiras (or the Thracians, as Josephus affirms, and I hope in an after essay to prove, them to be) already in occupation of the plains of Thrace, with a rearguard in Bithynia (as they are abundantly proved to have had by allusions in Herodotus and Strabo), and if the Riphatheans had already (as is likely from their reaching Britain before 1600 B.C.)† spread themselves over the south of Russia,

* Strabo, I, i, 10, and iii, 21.

† *Vide ante*, p. 140+.

there was only one route left for the remaining branch of Gomer's race, namely, northward into west central Russia. Thither, then, they went; and, finding Germany but little occupied, they spread over that country. But the vast bulk of its surface was then covered with forest; so, to avoid the labour of clearing their ground of trees, the early settlers beyond doubt first tilled the soil and built homesteads along the green glades by river and sea. And thus their advanced guard, moving along the southern shore of the Baltic Sea and thence from island to island at its western end, presently found themselves in Sweden. Accordingly we find the most fertile southern part of that country known from time immemorial as Scania, and the islands of Denmark, together with this province, known to later Latin writers as the Islands of Scandia (an epenthetic *d* having crept in, such as helped to change Normannia into Normandie or Normandy).*

Crossing thence to Germany, whose people have the same "Teutonic" basis to their language as the Swedes, we find the inhabitants of the ancient State of Dessau to have long claimed descent from Ashkenaz of the Bible; and, in keeping with this claim, a ruler of theirs in the twelfth century, who held for a while the Saxon estates of Henry the Lion, the founder of our House of Brunswick, added to his baptismal name of Bernard that of Ascanius, declaring that his ancestors came from Lake Ascanius in Bithynia. But the claim is supported by stronger testimony from outside; for the Jews of Russia, Germany, and other countries have, from time immemorial, known the Germans as Ashkenazim.

It was thus a wave of Ashkenaz's race from *Asia Minor* that first drove a wedge of Teutonic life and institutions into what we now know as Germany, but which was then (as I have before shown) thinly peopled with Kelts, or Kunri; and it was the same wave that first colonized southern Scandinavia, where in the time of the historian Tacitus (A.D. 100), we find a settled people called the Suii, or Swedes.

But far away, on the northern borders of Media, a rearguard of the same great family remained behind. We have already fixed the position of this people, who formed the Biblical kingdom of Ashkenaz, and who as allies of their neighbours, the Medes, caused so much trouble to King Esarhaddon of

* And such as transformed *tener* (Lat.) into *tendre* (Fr.) and *tender* (Eng.), and *Allemannus*, *Allemanna* (L.) into *Allemand*, *Allemande* (F.)

Assyria. They dwelt near Rhagae in classic time, as Josephus (A.D. 75) showed us—a great city which, as I have said, lay midway along the southern shore of the Caspian Sea. Now at that point there begins a chain of mountains which runs eastwards along the shore of that sea, and far eastward beyond it, forming a natural southern boundary to the territory of the Bactrians and of the Sakai, who in the time of Herodotus (A.D. 450) were spread over southern Turkestan, as the Massagetæ were over northern;* and Ammianus Marcellinus (the Emperor Julian's librarian and historian, who wrote about A.D. 350), after saying that they came next to the Sogdians, who dwelt on the march of the Oxus, further states that they were overhung by the Ascanimian Mountain or range of mountains.†

Now on their eastern border there could have been no mountain, for all is flat up to the Caspian Sea; and, again, the range that lay north of them he names just afterwards by its well known name of Imavian; and the range that lay beyond them to the west he is most unlikely to have used as a boundary mark for defining their position, even if he knew the name of so remote an elevation: like other topographers, he, of course, tried to help his readers to fix the position of the country by mentioning its relation to some nearer object with which they were familiar. We must therefore conclude that he knew the long *southern* range aforesaid by the name of Ascanimian. Again Strabo (about A.D. 1) speaks of irruptions of these Sakai by which they "gained possession of Bactriana" on one side of the Caspian and on the other, of "the best district of all Armenia" which "took from them the name of Sakasēne."‡

We have thus a range of mountains called in classic times *Ascanimian* ending westward at Rhagae, around which we know dwelt descendants of Ashkenaz; and we find at the outset of the Christian era a little north of them, cut out of the neighbouring kingdom of Armenia and just south of the Caucasus Mountains, a country called *Sakasēne*. Whether Strabo be right or wrong in stating this to be a colony of the Sakai (who are called by Herodotus a Scythian people, and who still dwelt in Turkestan late in the fourth century, or long after the

* Cp. Her., I, 153, III, 93, VII, 64, with I, 204 and 205, the Araxes here spoken of is really the Oxus probably called in full Rha Oxos. See Rawlinson's Herodotus, I, 120.

† Ascanimia Mons; but the Apennine Range is called Mons Apenninus, and so on. Amm. Marc., XXIII, 60.

‡ Strabo, XI, viii, 4.

Sakasanoi seem to have migrated from their own country) one thing cannot remain doubtful—the Sakasanoi, both from their position and their closely related name, must have formed part of the Rhaginians, or eastern Ashkenazians (the change from Ashkenaz to Sakasen involving little more than an easy inversion of an unaccented syllable and the dropping of a short vowel prefix, which is a very common phenomenon). Now let it be borne in mind that the Saxons are not mentioned in that most detailed description which Tacitus gives of the peoples of Germany in his own day (about A.D. 100)—not even although he includes in his account Denmark and Sweden, where, he says, dwelt the Cimbri and the Suii. He mentions the Angli, but no Saxones; and these first appear in history when Caransius was appointed, about A.D. 280, to guard our eastern British coasts against the pirates, and was termed *Comes litoris Saxonici*, Count of the Saxon Shore. At some time after the Christian era between the first century and that date, a second wave of the great family of Ashkenaz, calling themselves Sakasanoi, or rather Sachsen, marched northward through the Caspian gates into European Scythia, and thence onward with the tide of their German kinsmen, the Goths, into northern Europe, where the country they occupied has, like its motherland, always borne the simple title of Sachsen. In company with Angles and Jutes from Holstein and Denmark, some of them advanced further still over the stormy ocean, and, conquering and blending with the Kumri, formed the great English, or British, race.

A most curious fact will end my tale. The Israelites (as they call themselves) or Jews (as, in my view, we miscall them) who for centuries past have dwelt in Russia and Poland, have always spoken not the Russian or the Polish tongue among themselves, but an old form of German mingled with a little Hebrew which is now known as Yiddish (that is Jüdisch, its German name, pronounced as most common Germans pronounce it). Why is this, except that the Israelites who were living in the cities of the Medes* to which Assyrian power had once banished them, migrated in the wake of the Ashkenazim across the plains of Russia into their present abode?

* II Kings xvii, 6.

DISCUSSION.

A MEMBER asked the lecturer how he accounted for the name Teuton, and whether it would be dealt with in his next paper ?

Mr. ROUSE.—I do not know ; I will try to find out. In the next paper I will deal with the other descendants of the sons of Noah. The name Teuton was given by the Romans to a tribe of Germans, not to the whole race. The origin of the name Germania is probably Gomerania, the land of the Gomeri, who were its first inhabitants.

Colonel ALVES.—I should like to ask a question. The Saxon race is a fair race, it is fair-haired, and there is this characteristic about it—that it is amenable to self-government. Now apparently the Celtic race do not seem to be good at self-government ; perhaps that may be a detail ; but also as a rule they are a smaller race than the Saxons—and dark-haired. The Welsh, for instance, are a small race, dark complexioned, living in a cool climate without a strong sun ; there is nothing to darken the skin, they live side by side with the Saxon races. How is it if these are all descended from the same son of Noah, how is it that you have a fair-haired race and also a smaller, fiery, dark-haired race ? These differences cause me to doubt that the Saxons were descended from Askenaz.

Mr. ROUSE.—With regard to what the last speaker has said, I should say that if he carried out that argument to its legitimate conclusion, all the people in the world should be either fair-haired or dark-haired, since all descended from a common father, Noah. But why the descendants of two brothers who have kept apart or who should get apart for many, many ages should not have developed certain characteristics peculiar to each family I cannot tell.

Again, Colonel Alves said to us that the Celtic race were smaller. That is true of the Welsh and of many of the Bretons ; but if you go to the Irish and Scotch you find very tall men indeed : the inland men are very tall, fine fellows, and the Highlanders are the finest men on this side of those famous Caucasians. The Highlanders are about as fine a race as you can find in the world, and they are

mainly Celts.* But in the first place people who live in pent-up mountains tend rather to be smaller as a rule. The Swiss mountaineers are not at all large people, nor are the Tyrolese and Piedmontese.

Colonel ALVES.—The Teuton race is generally rather stolid: you will find this characteristic in the North of Ireland, and amongst the Norwegians, and so are the lowland Scotch; on the other hand, the more dark-haired races are of fiery temperament.

Mr. PILKINGTON.—I would like to make one remark of interest about this very subject. I attended some years ago a lecture by Professor Wilson in Scotland, who was the first to introduce the notion of our Israelitish origin. Some Jews got up with the idea of confuting his arguments, and one of them took the same point spoken of; but he showed that Leah was dark and Rachel was as fair as any fair woman in England. Another Jew who tried to confront Professor Wilson asked him, How do you make out it is possible that we English can be descended from the Israelites when the prophet says, "The people shall dwell alone and not be numbered amongst the nations"? The apt reply of Professor Wilson's was, "Who can count the dust of Jacob?" I wish to say this paper is a very interesting one. I had no idea such an interesting paper would be produced. It just shows what a wonderful book the Bible is, and if only people would uphold it how wide is its testimony to meet every aspect of life.

I greatly value this Society; I have never regretted coming into it. In respect of the difficulties of this paper and of those likely to follow, I think there will be much room for study.

Professor ORCHARD.—We cannot separate without expressing our thanks—our hearty thanks—to the learned and erudite author of this paper, who has taken us on a tour through many countries and ages and has shown us what I may call almost a photographic view of the principal philological and historical features of Gomer, his sons, and Thogarmah. The more our knowledge increases the more we find difficulties connected with the Bible to vanish. It has been so with the history of the Creation. Only the other day I met an acquaintance, a Professor, who mentioned that there was an

* Some of the clans are not Celts, as, for example, the Gordons.—E. H.

inaccuracy in the 10th chapter of Genesis. Further knowledge will no doubt come to him and readjust his opinion on that point.

The CHAIRMAN.—We have only again to thank the author for bringing this important subject before the Institute.

Mr. ROUSE.—I value your esteemed praise exceedingly. I do not know any other Society in England whose esteem and praise I value more.