

# 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](https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_jtvi-01.php)

## 800TH ORDINARY GENERAL MEETING

HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM B, THE CENTRAL HALL,  
WESTMINSTER, S.W.1, ON MONDAY, APRIL 20TH, 1936,  
AT 4.30 P.M.

Owing to the unavoidable absence of LIEUT.-COL. LANE through illness, THE CHAIR WAS TAKEN BY LIEUT.-COL. ARTHUR KENNEY-HERBERT.

The Minutes of the Meeting of April 6th, 1936, were read, confirmed and signed, and the HON. SECRETARY announced the following elections :— Member: the Rev. H. A. Edwards, L.Th.; Associates: John Arthur Thompson, Esq., M.Sc.; H. R. Kindersley, B.A.; J. D. Bradley, Esq., Ph.D., D.D.

The CHAIRMAN then called on Mr. G. R. Gair, M.A., to read his paper on "The Races and Peoples of the Early Hebrew World."

---

### *THE RACES AND PEOPLES OF THE EARLY HEBREW WORLD.*

By G. R. GAIR, M.A., Director of the Institute of Anthropology,  
Edinburgh.

INTRODUCTION.—THE ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND CONTROL  
OF RACIAL AND NATIONAL CHARACTERISATION IN THE  
MOST ANCIENT EAST.

THE regions constituting the world to the first ethnographer located somewhere in the "Fertile Crescent" were those that stretched, so far as thought and rumour could penetrate, either to the Northern Mountains, or westwards to the Great Sea, and its island peoples, or to the eastwards and the mountains which encircled an ancient homeland, mystically enwrapped by tradition and peaks of snow amidst wastes of desert plains as well as lands of Eden, or else to the south, on the left hand, the mouths of great rivers pouring outwards and encompassing with the ocean the whole lands of Arabia, until

they appear, on the right, in the Gulfs of Suez and Akaba, beyond which was Egypt and the romantic land of Punt. This, then, was the ancient world of the Mesopotamian, Babylonian, Syrian, and Hebrew for many ages, until eventually Cretans, then Phœnicians, Greeks, Macedonians, and finally Romans enlarged it by a series of gigantic adventures.

Physical environment so affects the lives of men, modes of life, family, and national individuality, that, we must realise, the world of ancient man was a thing not inseparable from himself. Therefore we cannot hope to appreciate the national, racial and cultural phenomena without attempting a regional understanding of the material basis which must ever lie at the root of any truly ethnological survey. Arid mountains, devastatingly hot winds, rivers of sudden regimen, hot marshes, genial pastures and all the other phenomena of nature affect man considerably as individual factors; but in their sum total they go to make regions of character which act as a mould in which the elements of race and culture solidify into ethnic units.

The ancient world, as we have already indicated, may be thought of as being composed of several well-defined regions which we can name:—The Northern Mountains; The Eastern Mountains and Irania; The Fertile Crescent, including Palestine and Babylonia; Arabia; Egypt and the Eastern Sudan and Somaliland. That is to say, we have: the centre—the plains and valleys of the Tigris, Euphrates and Orontes, and the coastal zones of the West and East; around these heartlands, starting from the north and turning clockwise—The Anatolian Mountains of the North; Irania and its mountains, the sea, and then Arabia, then the sea and then Africa, and again sea—the Great Sea, with its islands and coastlands.

The Northern Mountain system includes what is loosely termed Anatolia (Asia Minor and Western Armenia) and the Caucasus. Beyond that lay the Russian Steppe, with its barbarous peoples, and, to the westwards, Thrace and the Ægean, and, beyond that again, the Danubian lands. But all these lands of the beyond were but dimly seen and known. This zone of mountains straddled all the northern horizon of dwellers in the south, for it was a region of great mountains and extensive plateaus, with a general east-west trend, making movements difficult from the south, and cutting off any really intimate links with the Black Sea and the Southern Russian

steppelands. The *Ægean* and Thracian lands were in more intimate contact with Anatolia, for the mountain trend, so exclusive to southern contacts, gave access, up the western valleys, to the interior from the coast.

Responding to these conditions is the vegetation. Mediterranean plants grow along the coasts of southern Anatolia, but in the interior there is a plateau steppeland, mainly treeless, with here and there, where there is a stream or river, a fringe of sorry-looking willows. The interior is thus a pastoral country, supporting, in 1927, 10,000,000 sheep, 11,000,000 goats, 7,000,000 cattle, 1,000,000 asses and mules, and 500,000 horses, while the coastlands have all manner of Mediterranean and sub-tropical activities, localised into definite regions—olives here, tobacco there, and figs at another place. This resulted in the growth of small states from early times along this coastal zone.

From the earliest times minerals must have formed an attraction of no mean value, and Anatolia does not lack these. Copper, so essential to the earliest chalcolithic and bronze cultures, is mined with great success at Arghana Maden, in the south-east of the plateau, and it is also known near Trebizond in the Taurus. Silver and gold are found at Bulgar Maden (near Konia), while silver, lead, and zinc occur at Balikesir.

In striking contrast to these mountains and plateaus are the low-country regions lying to the south, for which the Taurus, anti-Taurus, the Armenian complex, and the Mountain of the East, form an encircling arc. Here we have the "Fertile Crescent" of ancient times, and to-day much of the Asia of the Arabs. To the south of this zone of great fertility, in parts homogeneous, in language and religion, there is an inner arc formed by the higher land of the great plateau of Arabia. Thus the lands of Israel, Syria, Assyria, and Babylonia form a narrow zone from the Western Sea to the Persian Gulf, sweeping in a northern arc between great mountains, on the one hand, and a desert plateau on the other. This is a land of transit and movement, in spite of the great civilisation it has raised, since it is a corridor between two regions of sterile necessity. Starting from Babylonia one passes along the crescent through Mesopotamia, into the plains of Aleppo, and the steppe of Syria, which gives way to Central Syria and finally to Palestine.

To the east of these lands there rises up the great plateau of Irania, comprising Persia, Baluchistan and Afghanistan. The

northern edge is formed by the lofty Elburz Range, which drops sharply to the Caspian and merges eastwards into the Alla Dagh and into the mass of Afghanistan, which drops just as sharply to the lowlands of Turkestan. The southern and western edge is formed of parallel ranges which rise sharply from the plains of Mesopotamia and Chaldea, from the Persian Gulf, the Gulf of Oman and the lowlands of the Indus. Between these edges of north, south and west, there lies the tableland of Irania.

Beyond Irania, to the northward, lies Turkestan, through which the Oxus and the Syr Darya flow from the mountains. There is a country of desert-like lowlands, fringed by a green belt at the immediate foot of the mountains, and where the rivers provide artificial irrigation. Indeed, the part that forms the Caspian littoral can be said to be the only part of Persia with a dense vegetation. On the steppes of Turkestan, agriculture is entirely dependent on irrigation, and rain is rarely seen. Here, and on the Iranian plateau, the climate is rigorous; January temperatures are below freezing, and over 80° F. is experienced in July, while the rainfall ranges between 3 and 6 inches for most parts.

Of the mineral resources of Irania, excepting the great petroleum reserves, little is known. Copper is, of course, found in the Hindu Kush, lead in Hazara, and lapis lazuli and rubies in Badakhshan.

Here, then, to the east, is another land of towering mountains, wide plateaus, salt deserts, and, here and there, wooded slopes like islands in the general desiccation, with ribbons of fertility along watercourses, in valleys and in oases. Such a region might well limit the perspective of dwellers in Mesopotamia and be the end of their world eastwards.

To the south of the "Fertile Crescent" lies the great plateau of Arabia in all its broad million square miles. This is as much an individual region as Anatolia or Iran; indeed, probably more so, and the inhabitants are justified in calling their homeland "The Arabs' Isle." In spite of the scarcity of rains Arabia is not entirely desert, much of it being rather steppeland, with oases here and there, as in the Nejd, and even more so in Yemen. On the steppes the people follow their camels from hollow to hollow where coarse vegetation is found, or from water hole to water hole in the manner of the true Bedouin life. In

the innermost parts of Arabia, surrounded by deserts, are a number of almost contiguous oases, Jebel Shamar, watered by the drainage of two mountain systems, and maintaining towns and villages. There is a peripheral zone of the "Isle" consisting of Yemen, Hasra, Oman, and parts of the southern littoral which, owing to the monsoons and mountainous hinterland, were the true Arabia Felix of the ancients.

This Arabia is the breeding-ground of wild tribes which have poured constantly upon the civilisations in the centre of the ancient world, and has been torn by internal internecine tribal warfare and feuds for wells, oases and other causes. Yet a region not entirely bereft of civilisation, for it was from an Arabian culture the Queen of Sheba came to commune with Solomon, one of the kings of the heartlands.

Lying beyond Arabia, across the Red Sea, is Egypt, the regions of the Upper Nile, and the lands of coloured men. Yet not really beyond Arabia, in an absolute sense, since these countries are hinged to the western end of the "Fertile crescent," and have intercourse, if they choose, through the Isthmus and across the Gulf of Suez, and along the shores of the Mediterranean from the Nile Delta to Palestine, Syria and even farther afield. This direct access to the spheres of Babylonian cultural influence is plainly evident from the flow and the ebb of Egyptian conquests to and from the Euphrates. The old world knew of four main African lands; Egypt or Misraim, the Libyan coasts, the Red Sea coasts, and Ethiopia. Of these Egypt claims priority of attention as an historical culture and a geographical unit. Egypt consists of the Lower Nile basin from the Wadi Halfa, to the east of which are the Red Sea coastlands and Sinai, and to the westwards the Libyan Desert. The Egypt of history is located mainly upon the cultivated lands in the northern half of this valley and in the Delta. This remarkable country is bounded by cliffs of limestone for its upper part as far as Cairo. These cliffs rise to 1,500 feet and the valley is constricted within as narrow a space as one and a-half miles in some parts, and nowhere is it more than six miles wide. This is nothing more than a rift valley through which flows the Nile. Rainfall is of little value to agriculture and the life of Egypt is symptomatic with the movements of the Nile.

Excepting for good building stone, Egypt, to-day at any rate, is almost devoid of minerals, while wood hardly exists.

The whole economy of life in all ages has been dependent upon the agricultural resources of the valley and delta, and upon communications. Alexandria is but a modern representative of the trading communities and ancient nomes of the Delta, and from the mouths of the Nile trade was maintained with Palestine, Syria and Egypt, and inmost Africa. Cairo, at the apex of the Delta, represents the focus of the internal trade routes, from which the caravans departed to the interior. The Nile from the Delta to the First Cataract, the traditional boundary of Egypt—a distance of 750 miles—was the ancient highway. Here, at Elephantine, was the typical border market of Egyptians and Ethiopians under the control of the northern power. Its governor (2600–2000 B.C.) was known as the “Keeper of the Door of the South.” Through this outpost there was admitted into Egypt gold, silver, ostrich feathers, ebony, and skins and ivory from the Sudan. From the lands of Punt, on the shores of the Red Sea, came gums, woods, myrrh, and spices. In the opposite direction there passed punitive expeditions, traders, and conquering Pharaohs, who succeeded in establishing their sphere of influence as far as the second cataract, 140 miles farther south.

The sterile Delta, the eastern and western deserts, and black Africa made Egypt so self-contained and isolated a unit, that, although they first helped to make her a great consolidated state, they bore within themselves the germs of her decay, by producing an intensely unprogressive isolationism. As a consequence, Herodotus remarks that the Egyptians “observe their ancient customs but acquire not new ones” (*Herod.*, xi, 79). This separation from the rest of the world was really so complete that, although able to maintain constant intercourse with the Mediterranean and Syro-Mesopotamian worlds, the Egyptian culture formed no continuum with the outside, except on rare occasions, when under the influence of strong imperialistically-disposed Pharaohs. On the other hand, Egypt had another contact, by way of a back door to Chaldea and the Most Ancient East; or was it the original front door? This was by way of the Red Sea ports. Myrrh, spices, indigo, tin and bronze came from the Orient by their means. Indeed, tin was known to the Egyptians by the Aryan name of *Kastira*, which may be an indication of the source of the metal supplies—although some would look to Malacca. Anyway, it would seem certain that

Oriental objects entered Egypt, not so much from the north, as from the piedmont country skirting Abyssinia, and thence by the Atbara river to the Nile. This route was being plied busily by the time of Pharaoh Sahure, 2750 B.C., whose fleet sought out ancient Punt—or modern Somaliland. It was from Punt itself, or the goods assembled at its *entrepôts*, that ivory, gold, spices, perfumes, woods, apes, myrrh, trees, and peacocks came. But, in spite of all these contacts, they were those of merchants or middlemen and occasional travellers, and not so much the intimate acquaintance of one or more mercantile peoples. Six days' journey over deserts was an insurmountable barrier, even with the existence of an excellent Egyptian road and State-cleaned wells, to the establishment of a zone of cultural transition.

Farther to the west of Egypt there was Libya—the Phut of the early Hebrews and the Syro-Mesopotamians. From the Delta to the Atlas, there stretches 1,600 miles of a coast ill-supplied with villages, anchorages or ports—a coast consisting of a dreary and monotonous shore-line unrelieved by headlands, estuaries, bays, or lagoons, and affording but precarious roads for shipping. These were coasts which were feared by early navigators, so much so that Marcus Cato preferred the difficulties of an overland march to the coastal voyage. This coast is in the track of the arid trade winds, and, owing to its low relief, the resulting aridity is intensified, except in Cyrenaica and around Tripoli, where higher land causes a certain precipitation.

These, then, are the countries which comprised the world as it was understood by well-informed men in Assyria, Babylonia, Egypt, and Palestine. Yet this world, as it was known to them, was not wholly as it is at present. Climates and conditions have been modified, often to a very considerable degree, since those far-off days. The modern geography but forms a skeleton to the environments of old, and before we can fully appreciate the habitat of the peoples we must understand better the conditions prevailing at any given stage of history. Thus, in the heart of our ancient world we have stories of the Noachian Deluge and the Babylonian Epic, and what is more, repeated evidences of flooding discovered by archaeological work at Kish and at Ur. And this flooding is on an abnormal scale as measured by the modern regimen of these rivers. Parallel stories come from Greece and Persia as well; while throughout this region

the remains of former civilisations, in desert surroundings, witness far more strongly than theoretic discussions to the once greater pluvial conditions in the Mesopotamian and Babylonian plains, and the hill regions to the north and east from whence their rivers flow. We find old lake strands, desiccated springs and former trade routes through what is now impossible country, or roads around former obstacles (such as lakes or rivers) where now none exist. Ruins of ancient civilisations merely illuminate this conception. For example, there are the ruins of Palmyra, now in the Syrian desert, and only able to support one-tenth of its former population. Yet this Syrian desert, from the Mediterranean to the Euphrates, was once as populous as the rural parts of England. In the arid and irregular range of limestone heights, between the Orontes valley and the Euphrates, there are remains of the walls of former fields, terraces of masonry, roads, and ruined buildings and small towns. Perhaps the most forceful picture is to see these rock-strewn hills of Syria, almost devoid of soil and unable to support any vegetation, and yet all around ample evidence of ruined oil and grape presses, while the names of the places and the inscriptions speak of wells and springs where none exist to-day. Much the same sort of thing is true of arid Northern Mesopotamia; there, in ancient times, existed the by no means inconsiderable power of the Mitanni, while throughout the whole of Mesopotamia and Babylonia there is no more eloquent document of the present desolation of the Near East than the contract tablets relating to the sales, mortgaging and letting of fields and gardens where there is nothing at all. To the east of Jordan in Moab we read of civilisation in what is now desert. There is the case of the King of Moab, Mesha (2 Kings iii, 4, 5), who paid the King of Israel an annual tribute consisting of the wool of a hundred thousand lambs and a hundred thousand rams. In a Nabataean inscription from the rock-hewn tombs in a Wādy debouching into the Wādy Mūsa, very near Petra, the capital of ancient Edom, we have similar indications of change, for it talks of the gardens, and the feast-garden, and the wells of water.

#### THE NATIONS OF THE ANCIENT WORLD.

Against this background of physical environment, modified to some degree by different climatic conditions, moves the races

and peoples of ancient times. Amidst these surroundings we must locate the earliest peoples known to the Hebrews and surrounding peoples as contained in that ancient account in Genesis x, and any parallels.

This is the earliest Hebrew document purporting to be an ethnological survey, and as a result gives us a clear insight into what really was their world. The great importance of this document moved Sir William Ramsay (*Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation*, Gifford Lectures, 1915-6. London, 1927, p. 1) to refer to this account in his Gifford Lecture in Edinburgh, by saying—"More than twenty years ago, writing (in 1915) to a great European scholar, I said that the chief problem which now lay before us as historical investigators was to answer the question, Who were the sons of Yavan, the old-Ionian, who represented the Greek race in the early Semitic tradition (Genesis x, 4)?"

Within this document, which is but a chapter of moderate length, we obtain a clear impression of what were the vital ethnic realities to the ancient mind. The presentation is made by the genealogical method, and there are few superior vehicles for expressing relationships, whether they be genetic, or of neighbourhood, or but of culture, or, as is more likely in ethnology, an intimate blend of all. The linking of sons together as the offspring of the father implies within the very sonship some vital relationship to each other and to the parent stock.

The narrative unrolls itself in three great sections—the sons of Japhet-Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiraz; the sons of Ham—Cush, Mizraim, Put, and Canaan; and the sons of Shem—Elam, Ashur, Arpachshad, Lud, and Aram. This is the main structure of a survey which intends to analyse the relative congenity of many peoples known to the ancients.

This account purports to be ancient and that can only be tested by the validity of its contents. It should be remembered that the date of its construction and the accuracy of its story is not in any way limited by theoretical strictures of *textual* analysis, based upon the use of particular forms of speech, words, or dialect. But it can only be judged by the reliability of the account which it seeks to convey. Prof. J. L. Myres has adopted a similar position in his analysis of Greek Folk Memory (in an excellent chapter—the 6th—of *Who Were the Greeks?*). What

he says is equally applicable to this case: "If the result is coherent, it must be so for one of two reasons, either amazing ingenuity among the sixth century chroniclers 'must be postulated,' in which event we have still to ask how they knew on what historical assumption to proceed, or a living, accurate folk-memory of ancient times. And if the result coheres also with sources of information quite beyond the knowledge of those chroniclers, the conclusion seems unavoidable that Greek folk-memory was historically trustworthy; that it enables us to explore aspects of Greek antiquity for which we have not yet other evidence, and, in particular, to select the right localities wherein to look for such evidence as Schliemann selected Troy and Mycenæ, and Sir Arthur Evans selected Cnossus" (J. L. Myres, *Who Were the Greeks?* California, 1930, p. 307.) If the Biblical story is accurate for the ethnology of the second millenia B.C. or earlier, then it is reliable, whether the account is due to an accurate transmission by folk-memory, or derived from earlier sources still, and cannot be the redaction of seventh-century B.C. editors, who had no other means than this, and its parallel versions, of knowing what were the ethnic relationships.

There is, of course, always the possibility of accretions—the result of the degeneration of an intelligent understanding of the narrative, due to the archaism of its meaning, and the subsequent "modernisations" of over-zealous editors. These do not, however, destroy the value of the tale, and such inconsistencies as are due to such a course are not valid criticism against the whole. Therefore the date of the writing down of the completed text concerns us much less than the period to which the account, as a whole, relates. The date and value of the account can only be ascertained by the degree of accordance, or otherwise, that is displayed with the facts of ethnology and its related sciences.

There are many points which lead to the placing of the narrative in its true place in racial history. First of all it is manifestly old—no such date as 500 B.C. will serve, but rather some date between 1000 and 2000 B.C., or perhaps even earlier. Its own claim supports such an early dating for the principal facts of the story. Again, its nomenclature, as will appear, is definitely ancient. For example, it implies that Javan inhabited Asia Minor and the Greek coastlands in very early times. Yet there is no trace of these old-Ionians (but for the survival of the name in one of the Greek states) during the historical times of Greece

and Israel. Further, "Ionian" to the Greek world had a very limited extension as compared with its meaning in these passages and in the usage of the Hebrews, Persians and Assyrians, where the original meaning was retained. Prof. Myres,\* naturally following the usual view, which has been held up till now purely upon "critical" grounds, states that the document belongs to the seventh century B.C., and implies that the name Javan is only introduced to the Hebrews (and presumably other Eastern peoples) at this time by the spread of Ionian settlers eastwards along the coasts of southern Asia Minor. Yet he admits that there is no reason to believe that they had any such hold on these districts to justify the ascription of them to the "Children of Javan." This admission seems to destroy completely the whole theory, if that is not already destroyed by the established use of the name by the Assyrians a century earlier.

From Gomer, brother of Javan, comes Ashkenaz, whom we would conclude should belong to the same sweep of peoples as the "Ion" group. Sir William Ramsay† points out that Ashkenaz is an eponymous hero of Asia Minor, and therefore must typify the general mass of the people. Jeremiah (li, 27) uses the same expression for a part of Asia Minor in the triplet: Ararat, Minni and Ashkenaz. Which serves to make clear the Hebrew location of this people in the Anatolian group of nations along with Ion. This ethnic unit would appear to be an old one, and its occurrence here seems to be no mere lingering on of a mere archaism. For if it were we should expect to find it interlarded with a matrix of later ethnological facts. In this there are, for instance, no Achæans or Dorians blended with Javan, and no Phrygians with Ashkenaz. Thus Homer (who wrote, according to Ramsay, about 820 B.C., or, according to Sayce, about 1000 B.C.) evolved such a jumble of old and new when he produced Askanios as an ally of Priam and Troy, and enemy of the Achæans.

Facts such as these set an early date upon portions, if not the whole of the narrative. At the least they show the use of a very early series of names combined with an ignorance of later events. Thus, for instance, there is a significant omission of Tyre among

---

\* *Who Were the Greeks?* California, 1929, p. 137.

† *Asiatic Elements in Greek Civilisation.* London, 1927, p. 2.

the states of Palestine, although Zidon, Gerar, Gaza and other places are mentioned. Now Tyre was founded in the thirteenth century B.C., and by the tenth century was a mistress of commerce under Hiram. She eventually fell under Assyria in the eighth century. Again besieged, by the Babylonians between 585-572, later subjugated by the Persians in 538 B.C., she was at last reduced by Alexander in 332 B.C. From the thirteenth century this state made some noise in the world, so that no Israelitish scribe could fail to note her among the peoples. Indeed, those that were anything like contemporary with her spent much time denouncing her—"O thou that dwellest at the entry of the sea, which art the merchant of the peoples unto many isles," etc. (Ezekiel xxvii). No, they knew all about Tyre; and Zidon and Arvad faded into insignificance before her magnificence. The omission of Tyre in the early Hebrew ethnography means clearly that she had not yet risen to her world-importance. Therefore that account must be prior to the tenth-century exploits of Hiram.

Among other evidences of antiquity is the delightful story of Nimrod. "And Cush begat Nimrod: he began to be a mighty hunter before the Lord: wherefore it is said, like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the Lord. And the beginning of his kingdom was Babel and Erech, and Accad, and Calneh, in the land of Shinar. Out of that land he went forth into Assyria and builded Nineveh, and Rehoboth-Ir, and Calah, and Resen between Nineveh and Calah (the same is the great city)" (Genesis x, 8-12). This story is unknown at present in any other ancient piece of literature. Rationalising the elements we find that from the people or State of Cush there came a "mighty hunter" or conqueror, Nimrod. He subdues Babylon, Erech, Accad, and Calneh—states of Chaldea on the lower Tigris-Euphrates, and, at that time, situated close to the shores of the Persian Gulf. Then, marching northwards, the "Cushite" Nimrod subdued what came to be known as Assyria. The older idea that this Cush is the later "Ethiopian" Cush is entirely erroneous. Judging by the name of the state and its location in the narrative, the simplest identification is with Kish. The history of that state is so closely parallel to the elements of the Nimrod episode that all doubt is removed. Kish was one of the old Semitic states (and it will be found that the "Hamites" of chapter x are ethnically Semites) and

was probably the cradle of the Semitic peoples in Babylonia. Near Kish itself is Jemdet Nasr, which witnesses the same early development. There, painted pottery of an early period has been found, and this is taken to imply a period preceding the second period of Sumerian civilisation, and so witnesses to the early occupation of this neighbourhood. According to the dynastic lists of the Sumerian kings, the First Dynasty after the "Flood" ruled at Kish, and this dynasty is earlier than the first at Ur in the south. The bas reliefs from Kish illustrate bearded men in decided contrast to the shaven heads of the southerners at Al Ubaid. This indicates a Semitic stock in the neighbourhood of Kish; and to the south lay non-Semites. This early importance of the region of Kish and its Semitic character, as expressed by statuettes and dynastic lists, seems to rest upon undoubtedly solid foundations. For we now find, as has already been pointed out,\* that the most archaic pictographs at Kish support the traditions embodied in the dynastic lists. Further, if any more evidence is required, the names of this first dynastic period are Semitic, and the towns of the north of Babylonia, Kish, Sippar, Akshak, Opi, and Agade (which latter gave its name in the form of Akkad to the whole of Northern Babylonia) were traditionally the homes of Semite rulers.

Thus we learn of the very early development of Kish, with its earliest known wheeled vehicles, and of the oldest written documents from Jemdet Nasr nearby. The expansion of the Kish group first embraced Babylon, then spread to the south, and, finally, expanded northwards to include the later Assyria. This is a pure parallel of development as accurately outlined in this story. A great advance under a real or mythical leader, or leaders—"Nimrod"—carries the expansion of the small state of "Cush" to embrace Babylon, and then to march south to Erech and Akkad and Calneh, and finally northwards to Nineveh Calah, and Resen. Here, then, we have a relation of events so ancient, and so involved that they could not have found the parallel in the unwarranted creation of a seventh-century scribe. Further, at so late a period, no writer would have called any part of Babylonia by the name of Cush, since at that time Cush was generally used for a different region—Ethiopia. This story is evidently much earlier, and shares with the accounts

---

\* By Childe. *The Most Ancient East*, p. 16.

of Javan and of early Palestine in days before Tyre all the unmistakable evidences of great antiquity. Consequently we can take such a document as an original source for our present knowledge of early Syro-Mesopotamian ethnology, and relate the main theme with what we actually know from our sources of ethnology in ancient times.

#### THE SYNTHESIS OF SYRO-MESOPOTAMIAN ETHNOLOGY.

The ethnological structure of this ancient account, if done into modern and scientifically precise language, is very concise and gives a clear insight into the relative position of the numerous peoples known to the ancients of the civilisations along the Euphrates.

Men are to be put in three divisions. All these men are of one original ancestry, in spite of the numerous differences among them. In the first place there is a northern group of peoples, who are located in the Anatolian mountains, and Armenia, and beyond to the isles and coastlands of the west. There are "Gomer, and Magog, and Madai, and Javan, and Tubal, and Meshech, and Tiras," and their subdivisions—all of which can be identified. Then there follows a second great racial and cultural group, which comprehends all the native stocks of Babylonia, Chaldea, Palestine, Egypt, and the Red Sea coasts, and inner Arabia. Indeed, the heartlands of the then known world including Palestine, the Red Sea lands, Egypt, and Libya beyond. Palestine receives most intimate treatment, whether at the hands of a later editor is hard to aver or deny, although, in the former case, the omission of the Hebrews altogether, in the enumeration, is a significant difficulty. We read: "And Canaan begat Zidon his first-born, and Heth; and the Jebusite, and the Amorite, and the Girgashite; and the Hivite, and the Arkite, and the Sinite; and the Arvadite, and the Zemarite, and the Hammathite; and afterwards were the families of the Canaanite spread abroad, and the border of the Canaanite was from Zidon as thou goest towards Gerar, into Gaza; and Gomorrah and Admah and Zeboim, unto Lasha" (Gen. x, 15-19). This concentration upon the cities of Palestine, and the equal intimacy with the ancient cities of Mesopotamia and Babylonia, locate the final collation in Syro-Mesopotamia.

The third group of nations are much less easily defined, both in this account and in history. Its distribution, while greatly influenced by geography, does not fall into any of the broad classifications, such as the Northern Mountain block of Japhet peoples or the plains, riverside and desert-dwelling Hamites. On the contrary, it lies between the two, and, in the west, is settled along the foothill zones south of the Taurus and north of the Syria steppes. From thence it was spread eastwards over northernmost Assyria, into the Iranian plateau. A closer study than present space allows would make this abundantly clear; but even at a glance this is partially apparent from the use of such names as Elam and Ashur for peoples in this third group. These are the people of Shem—a term used by the ancients in all innocence of the great confusion which theological notions, coupled with immature ethnology, were to create by its so-called "Semitic Race" which has very little real connection with the Biblical peoples of "Shem."

A tripartite division of the known peoples is the basic conception. A plainly distinguished block of mountain and sea states, non-Semitic in culture, Anatolian in affinities, presumable proto-alpino-Armenoid in race, and possibly with strong Hittite linguistic features. There is also an as clearly marked-off block of southern states located in north-eastern Africa, Arabia, and the "Fertile Crescent." Semitic in culture in the east, Hamitic in the west, in race probably all dark, slenderly-built whites approximating to Sergi's Eurafrican stock, and what is called "Semite" in the East and "Hamite" in Northern Africa, both of which are probably but different divisions of the southern white-brown race. From their location we are told that there was a third division lying between these Eurafrican and Alpino-Armenoids—a relatively smaller group which maintained itself only along the piedmont to the north of the "Fertile Crescent," but was more strongly represented to the east in Irania, and approximated to Iranian types; so that, it is probable that in the Shem group we are dealing with early proto-Aryans and possibly with a proto-Nordic racial strain. This assumption certainly seems to be justified from some of the detailed evidence which may be adduced from the study of the peoples of this region, especially as these peoples of the western piedmont, such as the Mitanni, have undeniable traces of Aryan antecedents.

It will be seen that ancient Hebrew ethnology was bound to be limited within the confines of those geographical regions which have been outlined : and that this ancient account does indeed limit itself to those regions. It is therefore within the mould of the physical environment of the "Fertile Crescent," and the piedmont to the north of it, Arabia, Egypt and Libya, and the Anatolian and Iranian mountain systems that the peoples developed ; and from this any knowledge of the intimate unity of mankind was conceived, or emphasised. The peoples outside of those habitats were scarcely known, and are not included in this description. As all the peoples of these regions were white, the story becomes an ethnographic survey of an important section of the "Caucasian" stock at an early period of the history. It is significant that chapter x ignores the existence of the Negroid and Mongoloid races, although to many of the civilised peoples of ancient times, one or the other of these coloured stocks were known.

#### DISCUSSION.

The Chairman, Liéut.-Col. ARTHUR KENNEY-HERBERT, said : Our subject, "The Races and Peoples of the Early Hebrew World," practically resolves itself into a study of Gen. x.

Mr. Gair's treatment of this subject may be considered in three sections :—(1) the geographical environment of the ancient world ; (2) the determination of the historic value of Gen. x ; and (3) the conclusions which he deduces from his examination of the chapter.

(1) The geographical environment is an essential detail of Old Testament study too often neglected. As an example of the importance of this aspect I might draw attention to a paper on the long day of Joshua, read before this Institute by the late Mr. Walter Maunder, the well-known scientist and astronomer. It was the geographical data, as handled by Mr. Maunder, which made his argument so convincing.

The geographical environment delineated by Mr. Gair forms a valuable basis for the further study of the ultimate distribution of the peoples and nations mentioned in Gen. x.

(2) The value of the record tested by modern methods.

A paper is entitled to the support of the Chairman. It is unfortunate that I was detailed at the eleventh hour for this duty, for I find myself utterly out of sympathy with the author in his handling of this section of his subject. It is, to say the least of it, painful to be told that Gen. x, to satisfy the modern mind, must be tested by the methods adopted by Prof. J. L. Myres in his analysis of Greek Folk Memory. To me this is like measuring the universe with a six-inch theodolite. The inference to be drawn, if the record on examination be found coherent, is even more startling. We have to thank the ingenuity of the compilers or the accuracy with which the data to be memorised was passed from generation to generation.

In fact, accuracy may be due to any cause but the real one. The passage dealt with in this paper is part of the Torah, of which our Lord Himself said: "Not one jot or one tittle shall pass away until all be fulfilled." Against our Lord's personal guarantee of the veracity of Gen. x, we may set modern opinion as summed up in the the paper—"the date and value of the account can only be ascertained by the degree of accordance or otherwise that is displayed with the facts of ethnology and its related sciences."

(3) The practical conclusion is that "we have a relation of events so ancient, and so involved that they could not have found the parallel in the unwarranted creation of a seventh-century scribe." Knowing this on our Lord's authority, I must confess that the results of modern methods are very disappointing.

Arguing as a fundamentalist, I assume that the knowledge revealed to us in Gen. x is necessary knowledge, revealed because man could not otherwise have found it out. In so far as revelation has not traced this history down to modern times, again I assume that man, if he sets about it in the right way, should be able to complete the intervening history, therefore special revelation is unnecessary.

But what can it advantage us to know the modern names of the peoples and nations once called Gomer and Togarmah, Meschech and Tubal? Ezekiel xxxviii and xxxix answers this question, and in view of the fact that the prophecies of these chapters may be fulfilled in the near future, it is important to recognise the nations which will combine to attack the Holy Land.

Some read in these ancient names Russia, Germany and Turkey. If it be so, here is a combination which the modern politician will have to reckon with. It is a pity if the Science of Ethnology cannot trace the past down to the present and thus throw valuable light on the coming European conflagration which so many leading statesmen wisely foresee and anticipate with dread.

It is a pity that the natural tendency to accept without proof the suggestions of eminent men should have invaded the citadel of true knowledge. We are building up a "totalitarian" science which must be supported even by the exclusion of individual opinion and by the suppression of the inconvenient. Therefore, although our Lord has vouched for this record of Gen. x, that it is the truth, the whole truth, and nothing but the truth, the last verse of the chapter must be swept aside to give place to modern theories about "the Negroid and Mongoloid" races.

I have much pleasure in proposing a vote of thanks to Mr. Gair for the information which he has collected for us in the paper which he has read so lucidly.

Lieut.-Col. F. MOLONY said: I gather that, in the latter part of Mr. Gair's paper, he sought to prove that the tenth chapter of Genesis was written at a very early date.

To me the most interesting part of this learned lecture is the detailed evidence, given on page 5, that Bible lands enjoyed a much wetter climate in ancient times than they do to-day. This must have very greatly facilitated the desert journeys described in the Bible: for instance, Balaam's, the exile to Babylon and the return, and that of the Magi.

Some fifty years ago a survey expedition was sent to Sinai, and all its members held that the Exodus followed the traditional route *via* Wady Feiran and Jebel Katerina. The large mass of animals which must have accompanied the Israelites could not be fed on that route to-day. And this fact has caused some to doubt the record, or suppose that the route must have been altogether different.

We read of no miracle having been worked to feed the animals; but in view of the probability that Moses knew the ground thoroughly, and of the evidence which Mr. Gair has given us of

change of climate, it seems probable that the Israelites had little difficulty in finding pasture as they journeyed.

AUTHOR'S REPLY.

The Chairman raises many questions which time and space will not allow me to answer except to say this : That I consider that he has completely misunderstood the paper ; that his remarks about science and ethnology are based upon an entire disregard of all scholarship ; and that his inference that my views are in opposition to the teachings of Our Lord is unwarranted as nowhere, in anything I have ever written, is such a view to be found.