MESHECH, TUBAL, AND COMPANY: A REVIEW ARTICLE

Edwin Yamauchi*

Noah's Three Sons: Human History in Three Dimensions. The Doorway Papers, Volume I. By Arthur C. Custance. Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1975, 368 pp., $8.95.

Arthur Custance, who has the M. A. in oriental languages and the Ph. D. in anthropology, has published 60 studies under the rubric of "Doorway Papers." He has gathered five of them in this volume, the first of a projected 10-volume series. These studies, which range from a short 11-page chapter on "Why Noah Cursed Canaan Instead of Ham" (pp. 142-152) to a 148-page essay on "A Christian World View" (pp. 218-365), were first published between 1957 and 1973.

The author's novel and far-reaching interpretation of history is founded on a tripartite division of mankind:

> My basic thesis is that the tenth chapter of Genesis, the oldest Table of Nations in existence, is a completely authentic statement of how the present world population originated and spread after the Flood in the three families headed respectively by Shem, Ham, and Japheth (p. 12).

His contention, supported by long lists of achievements culled from wide reading, is that "the contribution of Shem has been a spiritual one, of Ham a technological one, and of Japheth an intellectual one" (p. 43). This insight has been "quite unsuspected by most students of history up to the present time" (p. 12).

Custance would date the composition of the Table of Nations about the 20th or 19th century B. C. at the very latest (p. 79). He would date the Flood and "the events outlined in this Table of Nations" at about 2500 B. C. and not much earlier than 4000 B. C. (p. 119). That is, he holds that the Flood which destroyed all mankind save Noah and his family occurred at a relatively late date and that the dispersion of all mankind followed—a proposition which does not accord with anthropological data, as the author himself realizes:

> In this case, we are forced to conclude that ... all fossil men, all prehistoric peoples, all primitive communities extinct or living, and all civilizations since, must be encompassed within this span of a few thousand years. And on the face of it, the proposal seems utterly preposterous (p. 119).

Part of Custance's observations seem plausible enough. The children of Shem—the Jews, the early Jewish Christians, and the Arabs—have given to us the outstanding spiritual legacy of the great

*Edwin Yamauchi is professor of history at Miami University, Oxford, Ohio.

monotheistic religions. The Greeks, who are children of Japheth, have contributed the intellectual disciplines of logic and philosophy.

The author, however, goes further in his monochromatic conception of each division's peculiar gift. In his desire to reserve almost all technological inventions for the Hamites he minimizes the contributions of Jews to science by arguing that men like Einstein were renegades who were not true to their Jewish heritage (p. 303). He minimizes the contributions of the Greeks—such as Archimedes—to applied sciences by pointing out that the latter's inventions were reluctantly undertaken (p. 299). The author hardly does justice to the numerous inventions of the Hellenistic period (cf. M. Clagett, *Greek Science in Antiquity;* B. Farrington, *Greek Science)* or to the architectural and engineering achievements of the Romans (cf. M. Wheeler, *Roman Art and Architecture.)*

According to Custance, "The Hamitic people have all been, virtually without exception, technologically oriented and extremely adept, whether highly civilized or very primitive" (p. 11). But what does the author mean by the Hamitic people? On the assumption that the Table of Nations is a comprehensive catalogue of all the peoples of the earth (p. 103), he concludes that the Hamites must include all groups other than the Semites and the Japhethites. This means that the Hamites would include not only Africans but also Mongoloids such as the Chinese (pp. 11, 13, 74). As support for his thesis he is then able to cite a long list of interesting Chinese inventions (pp. 205-213). But it is anthropologically and linguistically impossible to divide up all the peoples living today into just three large divisions. The Chinese language belongs to the Sino-Tibetan branch of languages, which has no relation to such Hamitic languages as Chad, Berber or Cushitic. (See H. A. Gleason, *An Introduction to Descriptive Linguistics,* pp. 350-372.)

Elsewhere he seems to labor under the impression that the Hamites were essentially Negroid. He argues that the designation of the Sumerians as "black heads" must mean that they were Negroid just like the people of the Indus Valley (p. 72). Though he is aware that this conclusion is contrary to the skeletal evidence for the Sumerians, he does not seem to be familiar with artistic representations of them, which hardly portray them as Negroid.

One of the author's basic assumptions is that "nations also have personalities" (p. 45). Hence his basic categories are genealogical and racial rather than cultural. How then does one classify the contributions of the Hellenistic Jew, Philo? Or the Roman Hamite, Terence? Or the Muslim philosopher from Iran, Avicenna?

His authorities are sadly outdated. The references that he lists on page 80 bear the following publication dates: 1915, 1866, 1912, 1908, 1934, 1845, 1878, 1906, 1907, 1893! He is unaware of such important studies as: J. Simons, "The 'Table of Nations' (Gen. X): Its General Structure and Meaning," *Oudtestamentische Studiën* 10 (1954), pp. 155-184; Dr. J. Wiseman, "Genesis 10: Some Archaeological Considerations," *Journal of the Transactions of the Victoria Institute* (1954), pp. 14-25; D. J. Wiseman, ed., *Peoples of Old Testament Times* (Oxford: Clarendon Press,

1973; hereafter abbreviated as *POTT).*

Custance argues that for those who believe in Scripture, "even when its plain statements appear to be contradicted by the reasonably assured findings of secular research, it will not require the same kind of evidence to carry weight" (p. 53). A desire to accept the Scriptures as trustworthy authorities as opposed to critical hypotheses is, however, no warrant to grasp at the "slight" evidence which Custance accepts, for example, to speculate about Resen in Genesis 10:12 as the ancestor of the Etruscans—namely the similarity between a bronze Etruscan pedestal and objects from Nineveh (p. 111).

The author was aware that much of what he has presented would be considered "oversimplification" (pp. 28, 52). He is correct in this perception. He remarks that his thesis is "the kind of concept which is either beautifully true and correspondingly useful, or is bound to become self-evidently false and will simply die a natural death" (p. 10). Alas, in view of the widespread currency of the fantastic reconstructions of von Däniken and of Velikovsky, we must suggest that a third possibility is that the author's thesis, which strikes this reviewer as naive and simplistic, may by its very simplicity achieve an undeserved popularity among uncritical readers.

There are, for example, not a few entrenched misconceptions about the identification of various peoples in the Table of Nations held not only among the public but even by leading evangelical spokesmen. Take, for example, the following descendants of Japheth:

(1) The *Madai* (Gen. 10:2) are unanimously identified with the Medes. The *Māda* are first mentioned in Assyrian texts in 836 B. C. in the reign of Shalmaneser III. They are mentioned in the texts of every Assyrian king thereafter until Ashurbanipal. The date of their arrival on the Iranian plateau is a matter of dispute. R. Ghirshman places their arrival at c. 1000 B. C. on the basis of the evidence from Tepe Siyalk.[1]

More recently T. Cuyler Young, Jr., has argued for an earlier date c. 1300 B. C. from the evidence of the Gurgan plain southeast of the Caspian sea. He asserts that there is no major archaeological break in the Iron II (1000-750 B. C.) period comparable to the break at the beginning of the Iron I age.[2] Possibly linked to an early Iranian migration is the rich Iron I (14th-13th centuries B. C.) cemetery uncovered by E. Negahban at Marlik near the southwest shore of the Caspian sea.[3]

(2) Gomer (Gen. 10:2) is to be identified as the ancestor of the Akkadian *Gimirrai,* the classical Cimmerians. Custance takes seriously

[1]R. Ghirshman, *Fouilles de Sialk près de Kashan* (Paris: Geuthner, 1938-39); *idem, Iran* (Baltimore: Penguin, 1954).

[2]T. C. Young, Jr., "A Comparative Ceramic Chronology for Western Iran, 1500-500 B. C.," in *Iran* 3 (1965), pp. 53-85; *idem,* "The Iranian Migration into the Zagros," in *Iran* 5 (1967), pp. 11-34.

[3]E. Negahban, "Notes on Some Objects from Marlik," in *JNES* 24 (1965), pp. 309-327; *idem, A Preliminary Report on the Marlik Expedition* (Tehran: Institute of Archaeology, 1965).

Josephus' remark that they are to be associated with the Galatians and even suggests that the word Galatia may be derived from Gomer (p. 83). According to the Assyrian documents and Herodotus, the Cimmerians were pursued over the Caucasus by the Scythians at the end of the 8th century B. C. and the beginning of the 7th century. They turned west into Anatolia and wreaked havoc on the Phrygian kingdom. Their exact place of origin in Russia is uncertain, though M. Gimbutas has ascribed some tombs to them.[4]

(3) *Ashkenaz* (Gen. 10:3) has been identified as the ancestor of the Akkadian *Ashkūza,* the classical Scythians. These mounted archers from the Soviet steppes burst over the Caucasus in pursuit of the Cimmerians and settled in Media from 653 to 625 B. C. Herodotus' detailed account in Book IV about the Scythians has been remarkably confirmed both by archaeological discoveries and by the publication of cuneiform texts. The treasures of Ziwiyeh, south of Lake Urmia, contain a mixture of Scythian and Assyrian motifs.[5] Assyrian records indicate that the Scythians entered a temporary alliance with Esarhaddon.[6] Archaeological evidence has also been recovered of their raids as early as the 9th and 8th centuries B. C. at Yerevan in Soviet Armenia and at Hasanlu in Iran. Remarkably preserved materials in the frozen tombs of Siberia offer dramatic confirmation of their peculiarly savage customs. They smoked hemp, tattooed themselves, and took scalps from their captives.[7]

[4]M. Gimbutas, "Timber Graves in Southern Russia," in *Expedition* 3 (1961), pp. 14-22. See also A. Baschmakoff, "Le problème scythique et l'enigma cimmérienne," in *Revue anthropologique* 92 (1932), pp. 142-168; J. Harmatta, "Le problème cimmérien," in *Archaeologiai Értesitö,* Ser. III, 7-9 (1946-48), pp. 79-132; L. F. Hartman, "The Date of the Cimmerian Threat against Ashurbanipal according to *ABL* 1391," in *JNES* 21 (1962), pp. 25-37; C. F. Lehmann-Haupt, "Zur Chronologie der Kimmeriereinfälle," in *Klio* 17 (1921), pp. 113-122; T. Sulimirski, *Prehistoric Russia* (New York: John Baker, 1970).

[5]R. D. Barnett, "The Treasure of Ziwiye," in *Iraq* 18 (1956), pp. 111-116; R. H. Dyson, "Archaeological Scrap; Glimpses of History at Ziwiye," in *Expedition* 5 (Spring, 1963), pp. 32-37; R. Ghirshman, *The Art of Ancient Iran* (New York: Golden Press, 1964), pp. 99-125, 321-324; *idem,* "À propos du trésor de Ziwiyé," in *JNES* 32 (1973), pp. 445-452; E. Porada, *The Art of Ancient Iran* (New York: Crown Publishers, 1965), pp. 123-136; C. K. Wilkinson, "More Details on Ziwiyeh," in *Iraq* 22 (1960), pp. 213-220.

[6]H. W. F. Saggs, *The Greatness That Was Babylon* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1962), pp. 124-126.

[7]M. I. Artamonov, *Treasures from Scythian Tombs in the Hermitage Museum* (London: Thames and Hudson, 1969); M. Gryaznov, *The Ancient Civilization of Southern Siberia* (New York: Cowles, 1969); F. Hančar, "Die Skythen als Forschungsproblem," in *Reinecek Festschrift,* ed. G. Behrens and J. Werner (Mainz: E. Schneiderverlag, 1950), pp. 67-83; L. Levine, "Geographical Studies in the Neo-Assyrian Zagros," in *Iran* 11 (1973), pp. 1-28; M. Mellink, ed., *Dark Ages and Nomads c. 1000 B.C.* (Istanbul: Nederlands Historisch-Archaeologisch Institut, 1964); E. D. Phillips, *The Royal Hordes* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965); L. Piotrowicz, "L'invasion des scythes en asie antérieure au VIIe siècle av. J. C.," in *Eos* 32 (1929), pp. 473-508; J. Potratz, *Die Skythen in Südrussland* (Basel: Raggi Verlag, 1963); T. Rice, *The Scythians* (rev. ed.; New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1961); S. Rudenko, *Frozen Tombs of Siberia* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1970); T. Sulimirski, "Scythian Antiquities in Western Asia," in *Artibus Asiae* 17 (1954), 282-318; R. P. Vaggione, "Over All Asia? The Extent of the Scythian Domination in Herodotus," in *JBL* 92 (1973), pp. 523-530.

(4) *Meshech* and *Tubal* are the most controversial names in the lists of Genesis 10:2 and 1 Chronicles 1:5 of the sons of Japheth.[8] If their names had occurred only in these lists their identification might simply be an academic issue. But the names recur in the prophetic passages of Ezekiel 27:13, 32:26, 38:2 f., and 39:1. The Hebrew word for "chief" *(rô'š)* in Ezekiel 38:2 was transliterated by the Septuagint as a proper name *(Rōs),* giving rise to a widespread impression that "Russia" was intended. According to Custance:

> It may be observed that "rosh" ..., which in this passage is translated "chief prince," signified the inhabitants of Scythia. From it the Russians derive their name. Russia was known as Muskovi until the time of Ivan the Terrible, a name undoubtedly connected with Meshech (pp. 90 f.).

> Much later in history we meet the word Meshech in the form Muskovy. It is possible that the two famous cities of Moscow and Tobolsk still preserve the elements of the names Meshech and Tubal (p. 97).

These groundless identifications have unfortunately gained widespread currency in the evangelical world through many channels: the first and the second editions of the Scofield Reference Bible (see notes on Gen. 10:2 and Ezek. 38:2); the phenomenally popular book by Hal Lindsey and C. C. Carlson, *The Late Great Planet Earth* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1970), pp. 63-65 and *passim;* and the lectures of Campus Crusade evangelist Josh McDowell on numerous college campuses.[9]

The perpetuation of such identifications based on superficial similarities is completely untenable in the light of the clear evidence of cuneiform texts which locate *Mushku* (= Biblical Meshech) and *Tābal* (= Biblical Tubal) in central and eastern Anatolia.[10] The Mushki first appear after the collapse of the Hittite empire in the texts of Tiglath-pileser I (1115-1077 B. C.), who encountered 20,000 of them in the region of Kutmuhi on the Upper Tigris.[11] Ashurnasirpal (883-859 B. C.) received presents from the Mushki, whose capital was at Mazaca (classical Caesarea, modern Kayseri) in eastern Anatolia. [12] In 836 Shalmaneser III attacked Tabal, the region north of Cilicia. [13]

[8]A Meshech also occurs as a son of Shem in 1 Chronicles 1:17.

[9]Cf. L. Wood, *A Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1973), pp. 308 f.

[10]I am indebted for some of the following remarks to William Holcomb, who wrote an M. A. thesis on the subject of the Mushki under my direction.

[11]D. Luckenbill, *Ancient Records of Assyria* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1926), I, p. 74.

[12]*Ibid.,* I, pp. 138-144.

[13]P. Naster, *L'Asie Mineure et l'Assyrie* (Louvain: Bureaux de Muséon, 1938), pp. 7 ff.

Tiglath-pileser III assaulted Tabal in 732 when its king did not present the expected tribute.[14]

During the reign of Sargon II (721-705) the Mushki of central Anatolia were under the famous king Mita, classical Midas, whose touch turned everything into gold.[15] His capital was Gordion, which has been excavated by Rodney Young.[16] The Mushki allied themselves with Tabal and Urartu against Assyria. Sargon boasts of his success in suppressing Urartu and Tabal.[17] It was the Cimmerian invasion that forced the rebellious Mita to seek Assyrian aid in 709 B. C. A new text found at Nimrud (ancient Calah) by Max Mallowan and published by Saggs in 1958 gives us the dramatic news: "The message of Mita (Midas) the Mushkaean came to me," and "the Mushkaean has given his word to us; he has become our ally."[18] The Assyrian army advanced against the Cimmerians in Tabal in 706 and completely defeated them by 679. Sargon himself died in 705, possibly in a battle against the Cimmerians.

The king known to the Assyrians as Mita of Mushku was known to the Greeks as Midas of the Phrygians (Herodotus I, 14). The Phrygians were originally from Thrace in Europe. They are mentioned frequently in Homer's *Iliad* (II, 862; III, 183-185; X, 431; XVI, 719; XVIII, 288-292). Herodotus (VII, 73) knows that the Phrygians entered Asia Minor from Europe. They probably emigrated after the fall of Troy and the collapse of the Hittite empire. In areas of Anatolia there is an apparent occupational gap between the Hittite levels and those of the Phrygians.[19] In the deep pits at Gordion, Hittite and Phrygian pottery have been found together, indicating that the Phrygian influx was gradual and peaceful.[20] The Mushki who came from the east and the Phrygians who came from the west were fused into one kingdom, known to the Assyrians as the Mushki and to the Greeks as the Phrygians.

After the conquest of Anatolia by Cyrus in 546 and the subsequent reorganization under Darius (522-486), the remnants of the Mushki and of Tabal may be seen in the Greek names of populations who were

[14]D. J. Wiseman, "A Fragmentary Inscription of Tiglath-pileser III from Nimrud," in *Iraq* 18 (1956), p. 122.

[15]"Mita" occurs earlier in a Hittite text of the late 13th century as the name of a vassal in Armenia. Cf. O. R. Gurney, "Mita of Pahhuwa," in *Annals of Archaeology and Ahthropology* 28 (1954), pp. 32 ff.

[16]M. J. Mellink, "The City of Midas," in *Scientific American* 201 (July, 1959), pp. 100-104; R. S. Young, "Early Mosaics at Gordion," in *Expedition* 7 (Spring, 1965), pp. 4-13; *idem*, "Phrygian Furniture from Gordion," in *Expedition* 16 (Spring, 1974), pp. 2-13.

[17]D. Luckenbill, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 12, 21-23, 46-48.

[18]H. W. F. Saggs, "The Nimrud Letters, 1952," in *Iraq* 20 (1958), pp. 182-184, 202-207.

[19]E. Akurgal, *Ancient Civilizations and Ruins of Turkey* (rev. ed.; Istanbul: Mobil Oil Türk A. S., 1970), pp. 12 f.

[20]R. S. Young, "The Gordion Campaign of 1965," in *American Journal of Archaeology* 70 (1966), pp. 276 f.

included in the 19th satrapy in northeast Anatolia (Herodotus VII, 72)— the *Moschoi* and the *Tibarēnoi.*[21]

It is a reflection on evangelical scholarship when some of its spokesmen continue to adhere to the groundless identification of *rô'š* as Russia, and the association of Meshech with Moscow and of Tubal with Tobolsk, when we have had cuneiform texts and discussions of them that provided the true clarification of these names since the end of the 19th century.[22] It is true that some of these studies are in French or are in works that are not readily accessible or widely familiar. But less excusable and more indicative of a parochial vision is the ignorance of critical commentaries on the key Ezekiel passage that provide, if at second-hand, the correct interpretation of Meshech and Tubal.[23]

Happily there have appeared in recent times numerous evangelical studies and reference works that are well informed.[24] Hopefully this is a harbinger of things to come.

(5) *Gog* and *Magog* are difficult to identify. Magog appears in Genesis 10:2 and 1 Chronicles 1:5 as a descendant of Japheth. In Ezekiel 38:2 Gog, of the land of Magog, is the chief prince of Meshech and Tubal. In Revelation 20:7-9 Gog and Magog are mentioned in a passage describing the attack of Satan's army.

There is no cuneiform attestation for the land of Magog. Assyrian texts do speak of the king of Lydia as *Gūgu,* the famous Gyges (685-652 B. C.), who is credited with the invention of coinage. Excavations at the

[21]J. B. Bury, S. A. Cook, and F. E. Adcock, *The Cambridge Ancient History* (Cambridge: University Press, 1964), IV, map between pp. 194 and 195.

[22]R. D. Barnett, *Phrygia and the Peoples of Anatolia in the Iron Age* (Cambridge: University Press, 1967; II, ch. 30 of the revised *Cambridge Ancient History);* E. Cavaignac, "Mushki et Phrygiens," in *Journal Asiatique* 241 (1953), pp. 139-143; P. Dhorme, "Le pays bibliques et l'Assyrie," in *RB* 17 (1910), pp. 54-75, 179-199, 368-390, 501-520; 18 (1911), pp. 198-218, 345-365; É. Dhorme, "Les peuples issus de Japhet d'après le chapitre X de la Genèse," in *Recueil Édouard Dhorme* (Paris: Imprimerie Nationale, 1951), pp. 167-189; J. Garstang and O. R. Gurney, *The Geography of the Hittite Empire* (London: British Institute of Archaeology at Ankara, 1959); M. Jastrow, "Notes on Meshek and Tubal," in *AJSL* 13 (1896-97), p. 217; P. Naster, *L'Asie Mineure et l'Assyrie* (Louvain: Bureaux du Muséon, 1938); A. T. Olmstead, "The Assyrians in Asia Minor," in *Anatolian Studies Presented to Sir William Mitchell Ramsay,* ed. W. H. Buckler and W. M. Calder (Manchester: University Press, 1923), pp. 283-296; *idem, History of Assyria* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1923), pp. 143 f., 221-228, 266 f.; W. M. Ramsay, *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London: John Murray, 1890); A. H. Sayce, "The Early Geography of South-Eastern Asia Minor," in *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 43 (1923), pp. 44-49; G. A. Wainwright, "Tabal, Tibareni, Tebareni," in *OLZ* 39 (1936), cols. 479-481.

[23]G. A. Cooke, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Ezekiel* (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1936-37), II, p. 301; J. W. Wevers, *Ezekiel* (London: Nelson, 1969), p. 287; K. W. Carley, *The Book of the Prophet Ezekiel* (Cambridge: University Press, 1974), p. 255.

[24]R. H. Alexander, "A Fresh Look at Ezekiel 38 and 39," in *JETS* 17 (1974), pp. 161 f.; E. M. Blaiklock, *Pictorial Bible Atlas* (Grand Rapids: Zondervan, 1969), p. 45; John J. Davis, *Paradise to Prison* (Grand Rapids: Baker, 1975), pp. 138 f.; J. D. Douglas, ed., *The New Bible Dictionary* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1962), p. 811; C. F. Pfeiffer, H. F. Vos, and J. Rea, eds., *Wycliffe Bible Encyclopedia* (Chicago: Moody, 1975), II, pp. 1105 f., 1751; J. B. Taylor, *Ezekiel* (London: Tyndale, 1969), p. 244.

mound of Karniyarik Tepe at Sardis by Hanfmann and Detweiler may have uncovered the tomb of Gyges, as indicated by a reduplicated monogram.[25] Of Gyges the Assyrian king Ashurbanipal records:

> Gyges, king of Lydia, ... whose name the kings who went before me, my fathers, had not heard mentioned—Assur, the god who created me, revealed the honored name of my majesty to him in a dream, saying: "Lay hold of the feet of his highness, Ashurbanipal, king of Assyria, favorite of Assur."
>
> On the (same) day that he saw this dream, he sent his couriers to me to greet me, and the Cimmerians who had been disturbing his land, his hands took alive in battle. Together with his heavy tribute he sent them to Nineveh, my royal city, and kissed my feet.[26]

Later when Gyges forsook Assyria to ally himself with Psammetichus of Egypt, Ashurbanipal prayed for his death. When Gyges fell in battle, the Assyrian king duly recorded the fulfilment of his prayers.

Because the kingdom of Gyges did not extend to eastern Anatolia to encompass the areas of Meschech and Tubal, it is not possible to assume that Gog is identical with Gyges, the similarity of the names notwithstanding.

Since the location of Magog was unknown, interpreters have had a field day in identifying Gog and Magog with successive nomadic hordes from the steppes of Russia. Josephus, *Antiquities* I, vi, 1, wrote: "Magog founded the Magogians, thus named after him, but who by the Greeks are called Scythians." The Neofiti Targum identifies Magog as *grmnyh* (= *Germania),* which McNamara suggests is Germanicia of Commagene in southeast Anatolia.[27] In Jerome's day some took Gog and Magog as referring to the Goths *(Hebr. quaest. in Gen. 10:2).* Later generations identified Gog and Magog as the hordes of various Germanic tribes, the Mongols, the Huns, and so forth.[28]

D. J. Wiseman holds that the Table of Nations possibly "reflects the geographical horizon that could have been known to Moses at the

[25]G. M. A. Hanfmann and A. H. Detweiler, "The Tomb of Gyges ...," in *The Illustrated London News* (March 20, 1965), pp. 26 f.; *idem,* "Sardis through the Ages," in *Archaeology* 19 (1966), pp. 90-97.

[26]D. Luckenbill, *op. cit.,* II, pp. 351 f. Cf. A. Burn, *The Lyric Age of Greece* (New York: St. Martin's, 1960), pp. 104 f.

[27]M. McNamara, *Targum and Testament* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1972), pp. 194 f.

[28]J. G. Aalders, *Gog en Magog in Ezechiel* (Kampen: J. H. Kok, 1951); A. R. Anderson, *Alexander's Gate, Gog and Magog and the Inclosed Nations* (Cambridge, Mass.: The Medieval Academy of America, 1932); G. Cary, *The Medieval Alexander* (Cambridge: University Press, 1956); G. Hüsing, "Gūgu," in *OLZ* 18 (1915), cols. 299-302; E. A. Wallis Budge, " 'Gog and Magog,' Syrian Text by Jacob of Serug," in *ZA* 6 (1891), pp. 357-404; *idem, The History of Alexander the Great* (Cambridge: University Press, 1889), pp. 164-200; J. L. Myres, "Gog and the Danger from the North in Ezekiel," in *Quarterly Statement of the Palestine Exploration Fund* (1932), pp. 213-219.

Egyptian court in the fourteenth century B. C."[29] W. G. Lambert also suggests that the Amarna age (14th century B. C.) is "the most likely time for the transmission of the traditions from Mesopotamia to Syria-Palestine."[30] In view, however, of the relatively late appearance of some of the peoples discussed above, such a dating seems—in the light of the present evidence—to be overly optimistic with respect to the antiquity of the catalogue.

[29]*POTT*, p. xviii.

[30]*Ibid.*, p. 192.