

PART II

THE NEAR EASTERN AND EGYPTIAN CULTURES

CHAPTER 4

BIBLICAL DATING AND THE RACIAL SCHEMA OF GENESIS 10

In the Old Testament, when God destroys the world with a flood, he preserves Noah, and uses Noah and Noah's children, Ham, Shem and Japheth, to repopulate the earth. The names of Noah's children and their children are the names of the ethnic groups of the Near East in the 12th and 13th century B.C. as they were known to the Egyptians that the Hebrews had dwelled among. Yet, the Egyptian origins of this system have been obscured by the tradition of "scholars" who followed the Jew Josephus, and similar Rabbinical commentators. Josephus wrote his commentary on the racial schema of Genesis 10 long after the Egyptian language and the many of the peoples they described had ceased to exist.⁴⁶ This Jewish pseudo-scholarship has been the root of great misunderstanding over the centuries, and a discussion of it may be helpful to those seeking to understand the racial categories of the Bible. As well as an investigation of the flood story, when it was authored and from whence it was derived.

DATING THE FLOOD AND DATING THE BIBLE

Dating events in the Bible begins with establishing historical points of reference.

⁴⁶The Egyptian language had a formal existence until the 4th century A.D., when the last known hieroglyphic inscription was made, but the Greco-Roman understanding of Egyptian was extremely limited. While there may have been someone in Egypt contemporary with Josephus who could read the old inscriptions, Josephus clearly did not know him.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

For instance, in the fifth year of Rehoboam, Pharaoh Shoshenq I of Egypt (c. 945-924 B.C.) invaded Samaria. This is a definite date that can be related to



The Great Flood

the Biblical text. Another is that the date of the pharaohs named in the Exodus, who are generally thought to be Ramesses. The first Ramesses reigned 1292 B.C.; the second 1279-1213 B.C.; the third through to the eleventh Ramesses reigned c 1187 B.C. – 1075 B.C. This is another definite date, though some scholars contend the pharaoh

of Exodus is not actually Ramesses, but one of his predecessors. This view stems from the desire to make the somewhat conflicting Biblical statements that the Jews were in Egypt about 430 years historical; as we shall discuss, it is likely not.

Other points of reference that can be used are the first date that the Jews, as the Apiru, are known in Egypt – about 1340 B.C.;⁴⁷ the dates of the Hittite empire, about 1400 to about 1180 B.C.,⁴⁸ and its time in Canaan, about 1340 B.C. to about 1276 B.C.,⁴⁹ and the date of the Phillistine invasion of Palestine and Egypt, which occurred in two waves, the first c. 1210 B.C. and the second c 1180 B.C.⁵⁰ Utilizing these dates, known from archaeological and other research, it is known that there are some problems reconciling the timeline of the Biblical account with observable facts, particularly during the reigns of

⁴⁷From the Amarna letters; they are known in the Middle East as early as the 18th century as traders in Aram (Syria) doing business with Babylon.

⁴⁸Hittite culture stretches back to at least the 17th century, the date of the Hittite Old Kingdom; there is a prior civilization dating back to at least the 19th century that some have contended was not truly Hittite.

⁴⁹The Hittites invaded Canaan, both in person and through proxies, during their war with the Mitanni, and ended their occupation at the Battle of Kadesh. Hittite colonies likely remained in Palestine until the early Biblical period.

⁵⁰The sea peoples, or Peleset / Palestinians (among other tribes), who began their campaigns after the fall of Troy.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

the Judges. However, there are also internal inconsistencies with the Biblical timelines that confirm that the dates given should not always be taken literally.

As an example of the Biblical inconsistencies, one should look at the genealogy of the Hebrews in Egypt. Levi is alleged to have lived 137 years. His son Kohath, 133 years. Their son was Amram, father of Moses, Aaron and Miriam. During these three generations, the 430 years of captivity would have passed. Levi was between the ages, broadly, of 40 and 80 when he entered Egypt; Kohath likely reproduced in a similar timeframe; Moses was 80 when he began the Exodus; thus Amram must have been about 150 years old when Moses was born, if one accepts the Biblical dates literally. There is an irrationalist approach that states that whatever is written in the Bible must be taken as literally true, even if it is not within the normative realms of possibility, but this approach is not useful to the study of the Bible as history, and is not required by the Christian religion.⁵¹

Accepting that the pharaoh who drove the Israelites out of Egypt was Ramesses, and, noting the death of a pharaoh during Moses' lifetime, the life of Moses can be placed during the beginning or the end of the reign of Ramesses II (c. 1279 – c. 1213 B.C.). Equating the Biblical Pharaoh Pithos with Ptahsetimeren I, or Sety I, leads one to prefer the beginning of that reign. Accepting that Joseph entered Egypt at a time when a single pharaoh reigned at least 16 years, that this pharaoh was succeeded by a Ramesses, and that the Temple of Ammon existed, was empowered, and was somewhat estranged from the governorship during Joseph's term in office, Joseph enters Egypt during the reign of Horemheb or possibly Ramesses I, c. 1319 B.C. – 1292 B.C., and the year of his birth, 2174 years after the creation, is about 1336 B.C., placing

⁵¹Given that the Bible's account of the history of the Near East matches pretty well with contemporary historical records, there is no need to cheapen the Bible's account by not recognizing its errors. The Old Testament of the Bible was written by men who were fallible, and there is no Biblical indication that the histories presented are the literal word of God. Thus it is not inconsistent for a believing Christian to recognize that there are inaccuracies in the mundane portions of the Biblical record.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

creation c. 3500 B.C.⁵²

Thus, if one accepts the Biblical account Noah's birth occurred in the early part of the third millennium B.C., around 2444 B.C.⁵³ This places the flood about 1844 B.C., possibly as early as 2300 or 2400 B.C. Unfortunately, this is within the historical period of a number of civilizations, and it can be stated rather definitively that no flood embraced the Middle and Near East and Egypt during that period. In fact, beginning around 2350 B.C., the region experienced an intense drying and decrease in rainfall. Thus, if there is a historical basis to the Biblical flood, it lies in another region or in another time, long before that given in the Biblical Genesis. This means that that Biblical story of Noah is essentially mythical, and, as such, has mythical roots in the stories and cultures of the people of the Near and Middle East.⁵⁴

MYTHICAL ORIGINS

The first borrowing of the Bible is the story of creation.⁵⁵ The Egyptians believed that creation was an emergence from the waters of Chaos, and that it was Atem,⁵⁶ who emerged from the waters of the earth, who created the

⁵²This date does not allow the Jews to remain in Egypt 430 years. If that date is taken literally, the Bible suggests that Joseph entered Egypt about 1900 B.C., near the beginning of the Middle Kingdom, and that Moses led the Exodus from Egypt c. 1470 B.C., placing creation c. 4100 – 4000 B.C. Before the languages of the Near East, including the Egyptian language, the Hittite language, and the cuneiform languages, such as Akkadian, were understood, this was the accepted dating schema. However, expanding knowledge of historical events requires those dates be re-evaluated. Also note that there is substantial evidence of events having occurred before 3500 BC, and it is unlikely the world was actually created at or around that year.

⁵³Closer to 3000 B.C. if one accepts an early date for creation.

⁵⁴Recognizing the story as mythical does not mean it is not "true." As stated in Chapter One, myth is often more true than what is "real." The point is that the story is of much greater antiquity than the effort by the Biblical chronicler to historicize it allowed.

⁵⁵Joseph Campbell, for all the faults of his gyanecratic approach to myth, has an excellent discussion of the Biblical text and its borrowings in Volume III of his magnum opus, *The Masks of God*.

⁵⁶Re and Amun in later variants of the myth.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

first mound, and upon it emerged either a lotus flower or the egg of a goose, from which the sun emerged.⁵⁷ This first sunrise separated the waters of the earth from the “waters” of the sky,⁵⁸ the wet from the dry, the hot from the cold, the seen from the unseen, and the light from the dark. This belief is first attested to in the Pyramid texts, and was known no later than c. 2600 B.C.⁵⁹ In Mesopotamia, the Akkadian *Enuma Elish* tells a similar story of creation, where the waters of the earth and sky are contained within the serpent-demoness Tiamat, who is split by the wind blown into her by the storm god Bel-Marduk. This story was borrowed by the Akkadians and other Mesopotamian Semites from an earlier Sumerian tale, and is known no later than c. 1700 B.C.⁶⁰ These two watery tales are captured in the creation myth of Genesis 1:1 – 2:4, which is itself an almost direct borrowing from an earlier Sumerian poetic work, and forms one of the two distinct versions of the creation myth adopted by the Hebrews.⁶¹

Knowing of the extensive borrowings of the Hebrews from their Near Eastern neighbors helps establish a context for understanding the flood myth. The flood story is known from the *Epic of Gilgamesh*, also compiled about 1700 B.C. in Babylon, in which Gilgamesh, a historical ruler of Sumerian

⁵⁷There is also a variant where Horus as the falcon flies from the lotus.

⁵⁸The “waters of the sky” are what we would term outer space – it is a reference to the sky that is beyond the breathable air of the Earth.

⁵⁹It was likely brought to Egypt with the Sumerian religion, c. 2650 B.C., near the beginning of the Fourth Dynasty. Traces of Sumerian culture in Egypt begin during the Third Dynasty, and the period of acculturation likely occurred over several decades, before the Sumerian tendency gained the throne.

⁶⁰This is the first written record of the tale. However, for it to be of Sumerian origin, as the linguistic evidence indicates, it would have had to have been recorded no later than c. 2400 B.C., and it is probably of much greater antiquity.

⁶¹The first version, Genesis 1:1 – 2:4, refers to the Biblical God as the Elohim, in plural. It is believed that this story was added to the Biblical text in the 4th century B.C., with the “Priestly Text.” The second version, Genesis 2:5 onwards, refers to the creator God as Yahweh, singular, and likely dates from the “Yahwehist Text” of the 9th century B.C. and the southern kingdom of Judah. The Elohim are more generally associated with the “Elohim Text,” from the 8th century and the Northern Kingdom of Israel-Samaria.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

Uruk c. 2700 B.C.⁶², searches for Ut-Napishtim, a survivor of the flood, in order to find eternal life. We know from the *Atrahasis*, compiled in Babylon about 1500 B.C., that Enlil, a king of the younger gods of his pantheon, chose to destroy man after creating him because he found the noise of man's labors annoying, and the flood was his method of choice. The Semites of Mesopotamia borrowed, almost entirely, their mythical structure from the Sumerians that preceded them, and both stories are likely of Sumerian derivation.⁶³ Later flood stories, such as the Greek and Nordic, are cognate with the Hebrew and possibly derivative⁶⁴, thus it appears that, like their creation story, the Hebrews borrowed their flood story from a Near or Middle Eastern source – likely the Sumerians, possibly through the mediation of the Semites of Mesopotamia.

THE STORY OF NOAH

To summarize the story of Noah, the “sons of the Elohim,”⁶⁵ marry the “daughters of man” and produce a divine race of heroes. The “sons of the Elohim” are called the Nephilim, or fallen ones. Angered by the mating of the Nephilim and the daughters of men, Yahweh issues two curses: One, that men shall only live 120 years; and two, that Yahweh shall destroy “all flesh” except Noah and his sons. Noah is selected for this privilege because he is a “religious man” who “walks with the Lord”, and he is instructed to build an ark, upon

⁶²Insofar as anything in ancient history can be historical. As discussed, there is a constant interplay of myth and history.

⁶³The problem with this is that the flood story is unknown in Egypt, to which the Sumerian religion was exported c. 2650 B.C. If the story was known in Sumerian culture prior to that date, why was it not known in Egypt as well? An alternate explanation is that the Sumerians adopted it from some other culture. The linguistic evidence is that the story was originally Sumerian. This evidence involves the appearance of Sumerian words and characters in Semitic, and particularly Akkadian, cuneiform texts.

⁶⁴As discussed throughout this book, the interplay between Classical, Nordic, Near Eastern and Semitic civilizations is not as simple as those who have read the Edda and decided they are seeing late Christian borrowings assert.

⁶⁵Not “god.” See n 57, above.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

which he loads the animals of the earth two by two and floats on the waters when the rain brings the flood. He survives and eventually lands on Mount Ararat. Despite the destruction of “all flesh,” the Nephilim survive the flood as the Rephaim, Anakim, Emim and Zamsumim – men “tall and great” who makes the Israelites appear “like grasshoppers” before them.⁶⁶

After the flood, Yahweh makes a covenant with Noah, which forms the basis of what the Jews call the Noahide laws. Noah and his sons are commanded to “be fruitful and become many and fill the earth,” and in exchange for this, they are given all the plants and animals of the earth to eat, and the animals are made to fear man. Only the blood of animals may not be eaten, because it is “the soul” – an idea reminiscent of the Greek notion of the *θυμὸν*, or blood soul, and contrasts the worship of the Jews with the worship of the being known as the God of Nysa – the Greek Dionysius⁶⁷ – whose followers were told to consume both the flesh and the blood – preferably raw. Lastly, as part of the Noahide laws, Yahweh demands “the blood of [men’s] souls back” and states that any man who sheds blood is to have his blood shed. He then promises never to flood the earth again and gives Noah a sign – the rainbow – to remind him of the covenant.

The Talmud expands upon these laws considerably, and the later teachings of some influential Jewish Rabbis and Rebbes have turned the Noahide laws into a license for the enslavement of mankind, based upon the scriptural interpretation that non-Jews are not human in the context of Yahweh’s commands, and thus were given to the Jews with the animals. In this sense, these animals are then commanded to live pursuant to the Mosaic law as slaves of world Jewry.⁶⁸ The Talmud, though, is a much later work of Jewish

⁶⁶It should be noted that, despite the flood, these men are not exterminated until the Israelite entry into Canaan at the end of the Exodus and the beginning of Joshua.

⁶⁷I have elsewhere argued for an identity of Dionysius and the Syriac Baal. See Chapter 9, below, and elsewhere.

⁶⁸Elements of the Chasidim, particularly the Chabad movement, tend to gravitate toward this view, and this view is part of the extremist movement to ban Christmas displays and other Christian religious symbols in the United States.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

mythology, and that particular interpretation is also informed by dark age and medieval occultism. As we shall discuss here, the racial schema used in the Talmud to determine that only Hebrews⁶⁹ are human is incorrect.

THE RACIAL UNDERSTANDINGS OF EGYPT

With this background, we are ready to approach the question of who are the children of Noah. Following the flood story of Genesis 9 comes Genesis 10, which is essentially a genealogy of Noah's descendants. This genealogy has been the basis of several spurious interpretations of racial schemas, many designed with political or ideological interests at heart.⁷⁰ What is captured in Genesis 10 is essentially the ethnic and racial understanding of the Egyptians, with some Hebrew-centric modifications, in which the peoples of Europe, the Near and Middle East, and Northern and Eastern Africa are categorized. The black race of Africa is the one people known to the Egyptians who appears completely excluded from this list, and this is because of the Egyptian belief that the Negro was a "beast."⁷¹ Races unknown or barely known to the Egyptians, such as the yellow race of Eastern Asia and its cousins in the American Indian, are also absent from the schema.⁷²

⁶⁹The Talmud would limit this further and make only the Jews human. Presumably, the Israelites would have been excluded from this definition. However, the terms "Jew" and "Israelite," while technically separate branches of the Hebrews, have become identified in modern times – generally with the Khazars, neither Biblical Jews nor Israelites, who currently occupy Palestine.

⁷⁰Some have tried to include all of the peoples of the world in this schema, to prove that all men are descended from the children of Noah. Others have imposed "racist" or "anti-racist" interpretations. The intent here is to see what is in the Bible as it is, and not as one would like it to be.

⁷¹The Egyptians despised black Africans. Drawings of black Africans were made on the soles of the Pharaoh's shoes, for instance, and Senwoseret III, a noted conqueror of the Middle Kingdom period, once erected a stele in Nubia stating along the lines of "The Nubian is a faggot [an Egyptian word, literally "back-turner," meaning coward and homosexual is used]. Turn your back to him, and he is loud, but turn to face him, and he flees before you."

⁷²While there is an Indo-European branch, it is not clear that it includes any of the peoples of Europe, such as the Germans and Celts, though the schema was later interpreted in that way. Several of the names, as we discuss, cannot be clearly identified, likely because they refer to lands

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

Egypt was united circa 3000 B.C. as a nation consisting of three peoples. In the north, Lower Egypt, the Biblical Goshen, was the Nile delta, which had been inhabited by Semites, possibly related to the people of Canaan,⁷³ for at least a millennium and half beforehand. These people worshipped the god Seth – who was adopted by the Hebrews as a son of Adam and later integrated into their notion of Yahweh. Seth is a difficult character to define because his role changed substantially over the course of several thousand years. When the Hebrews encountered him in the midst of the New Kingdom, he was equated in one aspect with the wilderness and with the serpent-demon Apep, and was also, at times, equated with the storm god Baal. These three archetypes – the wilderness god, the anti-human fire-breathing serpent god, and the evil storm god – were the deities blended into their god Yahweh.⁷⁴

Contrasting with the Semites were the people of Upper Egypt, who were whites of Nordic or Mediterranean stock. These people entered Egypt from the Red Sea across the Eastern Desert, likely as colonists from Sumeria.⁷⁵ The Sumerians were colonizers who built cities and civilizations in the Indus Valley and along the coast of Eastern Africa, and they appear to have entered Egypt in two waves – one around 4100 B.C., and one around 2650 B.C. The earliest white influence in Upper Egypt is at the city of Hierakonpolis, where these settlers from Southern Mesopotamia established the worship of Horus, one of the many things that distinguished them from the Lower Egyptian Semites.

Also in the region are the people the Egyptians called Hamites, a term in which the modern world includes a variety of Northern and Eastern Africans, but which the Egyptians appear to have understood somewhat differently.⁷⁶

and people that are still unknown to the modern world. This has not stopped efforts to compel identification of them with known ancient peoples, though.

⁷³The Canaanites inhabited the areas whose people were called Eham, as we shall discuss. I am not certain that they are properly related to the northern Delta Semites.

⁷⁴I argue this extensively elsewhere in this book and in my book *The Centuries of Revolution*.

⁷⁵Discussed in Chapter 3.

⁷⁶The differentiation between the Hamitic people and the people we call Semites is not at all

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

The Egyptians knew these people, generally, as the Rebu (𓂏𓂏𓂏), the Aam or Eham (𓂏𓂏) and the Medjai (𓂏𓂏𓂏𓂏). Modern scholars use the terms "Libyans" or Bedouins, "Asiatics" and "Eastern Nomads," to translate those Egyptian words. None of those terms seems satisfactory, and the term "Hamite" may refer to the Mediterranean, non-Indo-European, branch of the white race. It also appears to, at times, have been a general geographic term for the peoples inhabiting what is modern Palestine.⁷⁷

Typically, in attempting to interpret Genesis 10, scholars have attempted derivation of the ethnic terms from the Hebrew or from Semitic roots. While Egyptian has some traits in common with the Semitic languages, it stands apart from them, and is considered cognate but independent. What one finds upon analysis is that a derivation of these ethnic terms from Middle Egyptian, rather than Hebrew, leads to a much more satisfactory explanation of the eponyms of the children of Noah.

A HISTORY OF THE TERM 'HEBREW,' AND EGYPTIAN DERIVATIONS IN GENERAL

The name "Hebrew" is derived from the word "Apiru." The term is first used in Akkadian texts to refer to a group of people that raided caravans in Aram⁷⁸ and sold goods in the middle part of Mesopotamia in the 18th century. In the Biblical context, the Apiru become known to us through Akkadian inscriptions on clay tablets found at the Egyptian city of Amarna during the reign of the Pharaoh Akhenaton. According to those tablets, the Apiru entered the southern part



clear. In the modern context, Hamitic refers to the brown-ish mixed populations of North and East Africa, but this does not appear to be the Egyptian understanding. Libyans were typically depicted with yellow skins, as were the people of Canaan, and with distinct racial features not at all like those of modern "Hamitic" peoples. Further, the Libyans were close enough to the white strata of Egypt in racial form that they were able to govern Egypt in the first millennium, at a time of racial tension, without problem.

⁷⁷And thus the term may have embraced Canaanites as well.

⁷⁸Modern Syria. The word may be related to the Egyptian Eham.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

of the land we now call Palestine as allies of the Hittites and of a fellow named Aziru, who was a northern Palestinian / Syrian prince. Aziru consolidated a small empire at the expense of the Egyptians, whose allies and vassals he conquered⁷⁹ and used the Apiru to attack the southern part of Palestine.

Apiru is the Egyptian word , 'pir or apir, with the Egyptian plural , or -w, appended. It means "the equipped people," with "equipped" connotating the possession of knowledge or learning. Modern scholars define the Apiru as a "social class of mafia-like brigands," and Apiru appears to be a reference to the secret rituals, possibly including circumcision, that were necessary to participate in the Hebrew secret society – much as one is initiated into the Mafia, the Freemasons, or the Ku Klux Klan.

There is some resistance to the identification of the Hebrew and the Apiru among modern Jewish scholars, because the Apiru were not savory characters, and deriving the origin of the Hebrews from a real people contradicts both Talmudic scholarship – which is, on the whole, very bad – and the religious claims of the Hebrews to being an eternal people. Further, linking the Hebrews and the Apiru helps demonstrate that the Hebrews not only came out of Egypt, but derived much of their religion and culture from Egyptian sources. Proof that there was something before the Jews, some Jews feel, reduces the uniqueness of the Jewish people and challenges the desire among some Jews not to be a people in historical time, but to be a timeless and ahistorical people – a phenomenon outside the normal course of human history. This is, of course, nonsense.⁸⁰

The major forms of Hebrew worship known in antiquity involved the Egyptian deities Seth, the deity Baal, Isis-Hathor the "golden calf," and the Sumerian goddess Ishtar.⁸¹ Yahweh – Jehovah himself is a composite of Baal,

⁷⁹Though he was, himself, an Egyptian ally and vassal until the last two years of Akhenaton's reign. See Chapter 10 for a detailed discussion of this invasion.

⁸⁰And is one of the themes of my book, *The Centuries of Revolution*.

⁸¹Known to the Jews as Asherah and generally syncretized with Isis. Isis and Ishtar separate as goddesses in about the 27th century B.C. and reunite and syncretize starting about a millennium

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

Seth and Apep, god of storms and mountains, god of the wilderness, and serpent demon of fire, respectively.⁸² Seth, a wilderness god associated with the northern Egyptian Semites, was so central to the Hebrew form of worship that he became their eponymous ancestor in Genesis. Later in that lineage we find the word "Apiru" in various forms, including as Eber, as Abram, and as Abraham. As late as the dynasty of Saul, we find Hebrew kings with names like "Meribbaal" – that being a common Egyptian way of naming kings, and means "beloved heart of Baal." This same character is called "Ishboeth" at one point, and the "Seth" of that name is equivalent to the "Baal" of the other, as the two deities were often considered the same.⁸³ The Bible tells us that the invasion of Judaea and Samaria by an Egyptian pharaoh brought with it the worship of the Golden Calf, and a reasonable conclusion that the Egyptian forms of worship, including the worship of Yahweh, the worship of Seth and Baal, and the worship of Isis, were all derived from forms the Hebrews brought with them out of Egypt.

THE ERRORS OF JOSEPHUS

Josephus was a learned Jew and favorite of the Roman emperors in the first century AD. Because of his alliance with the Romans, who occupied Judaea, many Jews considered Josephus a traitor; others thought his status as "court Jew" was a model that the Jewish people should follow. During Josephus' lifetime he authored, within another of his works, a commentary upon Genesis 10 that formed the basis of much Dark Age through Renaissance scholarship.

later. See the discussion in Chapter 9.

⁸²Argued elsewhere in this book, particularly Chapters 8 and 9, and in *The Centuries of Revolution*.

⁸³The argument has been made that Ishboeth is "Ish-bosheth," man of shame. But this is likely incorrect. The name Baal means "lord of the place." The name Seth has a number of meanings in Egypt, one of which is "the seat," in the sense of "the place or center of a thing" (i.e., "seat of power" in English). Thus the names Seth and Baal have some linguistic equivalency as well. Further, the latter derivation of Ishboeth requires one to ignore the good Egyptian derivation of Meribbaal, and that is clearly erroneous. See n. 236 and 252 as well.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

While Genesis 10 was recorded in Hebrew in the 9th or 8th centuries B.C., it is clearly derived from an earlier document – probably one that was contemporary with Moses' Exodus. Josephus attempted to interpret the chapter based upon the peoples known to him as a first century A.D. resident of the Roman Empire, and he made many mistakes, involving far-flung people unknown to the eastern Mediterranean at the time of Genesis 10's composition. To this day, there are continuing efforts to interpret Genesis 10 in the light of the culture of the Jews or Israelites at various points in the first millennium. These efforts ignore the fact that the names of several kingdoms and principalities which were destroyed by the 11th century A.D., likely unknown when the Hebrew text of Genesis was composed in the 9th and 8th centuries B.C., and certainly unknown by the time of the Ezraite compilation of the Bible in the 4th century A.D.⁸⁴ appear in the schema.

Similarly, there is a wealth of Rabbinical materials from the Renaissance interpreting and reinterpreting Genesis 10 in the light of Talmudic texts set down mostly in the first millennium of this era. This material, which involves efforts to derive the eponyms of Genesis 10 from Hebrew roots, has been mostly futile, but has produced a large amount of erroneous literature.⁸⁵ Many racial groups of the 19th and 20th centuries have attempted to derive racial schemas that build on these Talmudic works,⁸⁶ without having adequate knowledge of the period of authorship and its historical context. Lastly, modern "scholars", building on Talmudic efforts to derive these eponyms from Hebrew roots and place names, have built up a mass of scholarship using materials from the 6th,

⁸⁴I follow Joseph Campbell here, who dates Ezra to about 397 B.C.

⁸⁵The conceit of the Jews is that their cultures derives solely from themselves, and not from any other peoples. In this light, they look only to themselves for understanding of themselves.

⁸⁶Particularly "racist" forms of Christianity in the United States and Britain. Even worse than the Rabbinical writings are the works of authors such as LA Waddell, who is utilized often in support of British Israelism and Christian Identity. Waddell's scholarship is awful – he did not understand the languages he interpreted, and used the general ignorance of certain forms of hieroglyphs and cuneiform to impose an incorrect understanding on the characters, and to manufacture non-existent relationships between cultures.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

7th and 8th centuries B.C., on the assumption this section was authored or amended during the Ezraite redaction of the Bible – an assumption that has no apparent textual basis. Thus, there are many efforts to derive these eponyms from Assyrian and Greek ethnic terms which have been equally unsatisfactory.

One reason for these errors is the continuing development of knowledge of the peoples of the Near East. The Hittite language was not interpreted until the early part of the 20th century, and many of the Hittites works known to us have still not been translated for a lack of scholars. The Sumerian language was not interpreted until the mid-20th century, and, similarly, there is a wealth of unknowns in its interpretation. The Egyptian language, though deciphered in the early 19th century, was not applied to the existing texts and broadly disseminated until the late 19th and early 20th centuries, and it can still be said that Egyptian religion and culture, particularly prior to the New Kingdom, hold a lot of mysteries. Thus, it would have been impossible for even the most scholarly person, during the period when knowledge of Hittite was lost, to interpret Togarmah the son of Gomer as the Hittite vassal kingdom of Tegarama, which existed in southeastern Asia Minor just north of Syria – an excellent position from which to send horses to the city of Tyre. This problem continues today, as even the limited modern understanding of the many peoples, empires, tribal statelets and their movements about the Near and Middle East in antiquity is not well distributed among the general population, even among its more educated portions.⁸⁷

In general, in interpreting these terms, one is looking for ethnic names of the late second millennium B.C. The “brother” and “son” schema involves peoples who are related at least geographically – looking at the sons of Japheth,

⁸⁷The Hittite language, for example, has only been deciphered within the past century, and there is a wealth of Hittite documents sitting in archives uninterpreted. Minoan Linear B was interpreted perhaps fifty years ago, and its archives are in a similar sad state. The knowledge we have gained from exploring these civilization is still not widely dispersed among the population – and was largely buried in the latter part of the 20th century during the Soviet Union's effort to bury and confuse the study of Indo-European peoples among academics. Many languages of the ancient world, including Etruscan and Minoan Linear A, remain uninterpreted to this day.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

for instance, one finds a group representing western and southern Asia Minor, the sons of Javan, and another group representing eastern Asia Minor, the sons of Gomer. While the derivations below should not be considered definitive in all cases – there are some names which just do not fit well with what is known of the ancient world, and likely represent unknown peoples – they are better than much of the material extant.⁸⁸

THE RACIAL SCHEMA OF GENESIS 10

Noah has three sons, Japheth, Shem and Ham. Japheth is the Egyptian word , 'ipt or ehaipet, and means “most select,” a synonym for the Indo-European word we know as “Aryan.” Japheth and his descendents are traditionally associated with the Aryan or Indo-European peoples of Europe and the Near and Middle East and Japheth is the divine figure imported into Greek myth as the Titan $\iota\alpha\pi\epsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$. Ham is an eponym derived from the Egyptian racial term , “m or Eham, and refers, generally, to the people dwelling in modern Palestine⁸⁹. Shem is the eponym derived from the name of the Upper Egyptian kingdom , šm'w or shemehu⁹⁰, and refers generally to the Eastern branch of the Semites – those that dwelt in the Arabian deserts, from which they invaded Mesopotamia, Syria and Canaan.

THE SONS OF JAPHETH

The sons of Japheth are Javan, Madai, Gomer, Tubal, Meshach, Magog, and Tiras, and these names represent the Aryan peoples of Anatolia as they were known to the Egyptians.⁹¹


⁸⁸Not least of all because, as neither a Jew nor a Christian, I have no interest in conforming the text of the Bible to my religious views.

⁸⁹See my discussion and n 72, above.

⁹⁰It may also be derived from or related to the Egyptian word , šm3w or shemawu, meaning “strangers” or “wanderers.”

⁹¹The typical Hebrew association of some them with people such as the Germans – Ashkenaz

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

Javan is generally considered to be an eponym of Ionia, and he and his sons appear to be the peoples of Asia Minor and the island kingdoms off the Western and Southern coasts of Asia Minor, all of which were settled by Indo-European peoples starting no later than the 20th century B.C.⁹² Javan's son Elishah is the kingdom of Alishiya, which was based on the island of Cyprus, and is known through Akkadian inscriptions on tablets found in Amarna, among other sources.⁹³ Dodainim, or Rhodanim, is usually associated with the island of Rhodes, which was invaded by the Aryan Mycenaeans in the 15th century B.C.⁹⁴ Tarshish is often associated with Tarsus, a city on Asia Minor's southern coast that the Hittites founded as Tarsa, and which flourished under the Roman Empire. However, Tarshish is more likely the Hittite vassal kingdom of Tarhunassa, which maintained nominal independence from the Hittite Empire after its reunification under Tudhaliyas,⁹⁵ and was likely one of the kingdoms the Egyptians courted in their efforts to check Hittite expansion in the late 18th Dynasty.⁹⁶ This means Kittim is the Egyptian land of  Ht or Khat, a name for the Hatti, the pre-Hittite peoples of the Hittite Empire.⁹⁷

– from which the Ashkenazi Jews take their name, is probably incorrect. Here I argue the Ashkenazi are the people of Kanesh – the Neshites – which is what the people we call the Hittites called themselves.

⁹²The exact date of this entry is the subject of debate, but people such as the Luwians were in Western Anatolia prior to the Hittites – and were still there when the Hittite Empire collapsed.

⁹³In this context the myth of the conquest of Cyprus by Belus and Teucer – Teucer being the Western Hittite storm god Tarkhun, who is said to have sailed from Troy — is of interest. Historians generally link this Classical myth, given in Servius from an unknown and earlier source, to a 9th century invasion by a Phoenician king whose name incorporated Baal, but this is far from clear. See Chapter 9 for further discussion.

⁹⁴It may have been invaded earlier by pre-Mycenaean Aryans in the pre-Hittite period.

⁹⁵The identity of the king that founded the Hittite Empire is disputed.

⁹⁶This is one example of how limited knowledge of proper nouns has affected scholarship. The kingdom of Tarhunassa was unknown prior to the early 20th century B.C. Thus, “scholars” utilized what they did know, and associated the name with Tarsus, though it was not a great fit. Part of this is the fear of recognizing the limits of human knowledge.

⁹⁷We refer to the Hittites as Hittites, but they referred to themselves as the Neshites or Kaneshites. The Hittim or Hatti were the pre-Hittite peoples of Anatolia. Their origins are unknown, but

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

Madai is the eponym of the Medes, an Aryan people who invaded northern Persia near the end of the second millennium B.C.⁹⁸

Gomer is traditionally linked to the Aryan and Indo-European peoples of Europe and the Eurasian steppes, but the evidence of archaeology and second millennium historical documents does not support that.⁹⁹ Gomer and his sons are probably better linked to the Eastern portion of Asia Minor and the Northern portion of Mesopotamia, and his name is probably related to the people the Assyrians would later call Gimmiru, or Cimmerians. The Cimmerians are thought to have entered Eastern Asia Minor during the 9th century, but the name Gomer seems to indicate they were known in the region several centuries before.

Gomer is the father of three sons, Riphath, Ashkenaz, and Togarmah, two of which refer to component kingdoms of the Hittite Empire – suggesting that the third does as well.¹⁰⁰ Ashkenaz appears to be the Middle Egyptian word *ꜥꜣꜣ*, ‘š3 or ashau-, meaning “hordes” or “multitudes,”¹⁰¹ appended to the name of the city of Kanesh, which was the home of a Hittite dynasty in central-north-eastern Asian Minor.¹⁰² Togarmah is the Hittite vassal kingdom of Tegarama, which existed in southeast Asia Minor just north of Syria. As Ezekiel 27:14 tells us that Togarmah was one of the component nations which sent aid to the Tyrians, its position about 150 miles north of Tyre is consistent

this Biblical schema suggests a relationship with the Luwians and pre-Hittite Indo-Europeans.

⁹⁸In the next millennium, the Medes conquered Persia and established a ruling dynasty, into which native Persian nobility married, producing the ruling dynasty of the Persian Empire.

⁹⁹Gomer is equated by the Jewish historian Josephus with the Celtic peoples who settled in Galatia, though his “children” include non-Celtic Indo-Europeans.

¹⁰⁰The Hittite culture is divided into three periods – the Old Kingdom, the interregnum or Hurrian kingdom, and the Empire. In the interregnum, when the Hittites came under Hurrian domination, their kingdom fragmented into several sub-kingdoms, which were reunited to form the empire.

¹⁰¹Though David Icke fans may find it interesting the word can also mean “lizards” or “reptiles.”

¹⁰²See n 91, above.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

with the Bible's account. Riphath is unknown, but likely is the eponym of a Hittite principality.¹⁰³

As Gomer is representative of several small Indo-European states in Asia Minor derived from the Hittites, Tubal is generally derived from the name of a second Indo-European people, the Luwians, who settled in south eastern Asia Minor and were the dominant population in the Hittite city of Hattusas.¹⁰⁴ Tubal's son Meshech is the Luwian people known as the Mushki – Greek Μόσχοι¹⁰⁵ and also the Sea Peoples known as the Ekwesh.¹⁰⁶ Unfortunately, the Ekwesh are one of the Sea Peoples who are not linked to a definite region. However, as a sea peoples, Meshech would then be linked to Tiras, who it is suggested is the Sea People known as Teshesh.

Biblically, Magog¹⁰⁷ is the land of Gog from which hordes will invade from the north and destroy the land of the Jews. The “land of Magog” is described in Ezekiel 38:2 as the “Meshech and Tubal,” and, as such, appears to refer to the Indo-European peoples who remained in Eastern Asia Minor after the Hittite conquerors had come and gone. Such an interpretation further affirms the theory that Tubal and Meshech are Luwian Indo-Europeans and predecessors of a portion of the Sea Peoples.

¹⁰³One of many reasons why the remainder of the Hittite documents known to the world need to be translated. Frankly, it could be that this term is floating around a known document somewhere, but it is not included in any standard references.

¹⁰⁴The Luwians came from the west, and were followed by other Indo-Europeans who settled Western Anatolia.

¹⁰⁵Some associate them with the ancestors of the people of Georgia and the Caucasus Mountains.



¹⁰⁶The Sea Peoples are generally believed to be tribes of Mycenaean Greeks who, after conquering the city of Troy, raided the coast of Western Asia and Northern Africa. Four of the Sea Peoples – the Sharden, the Shekelesh, the Peleset and the Lukka – can be definitively linked to regions which they later settled – Sardinia, Sicily, Palestine and Lycia.

¹⁰⁷The derivation of “Magog” is obscure, and has been equated with the Greek figure Γύγης, and thus with the 8th century dynasty of Lydia. Unfortunately, like most of the preferred explanations of modern scholarship, this is way too late for the authorship of Genesis 10.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

THE SONS OF HAM




The next son of Noah is Ham, and while he has historically been associated with the peoples of Africa, he and his descendents are more the “Asiatics” or the peoples of early Palestine and the Arabian, Red Sea and Mediterranean coasts, including the non-black-governed kingdoms of eastern Africa. One good piece of evidence for this is that there is missing from this branch of the family tree the black African peoples that we know were known to the Egyptians and the Near East, particularly the Nubians and their confederate tribes, along with the various African tribal names. Further, it is reasonably certain that the Canaanites and the peoples of Babylon and Akkad were not black African, and this difference would have been known and appreciated, as the societies of the Near East were highly racial societies and generally disdained blacks. Rabbinical scholarship and its Christian derivatives have pointed to the Empire of Cush as being “the” black Africans of Genesis, but the Cush that would have been known to the author of Genesis was a Semitic-governed kingdom of the late First Intermediate Period (19th century B.C.) that seized Egypt’s Nubian colonies in a movement originating in Arabia. The black African Empire of Cush was a name the Nubians of the 8th century B.C. gave themselves, as they, with the assistance of the Temple of Amun, waged war on the white peoples of the Nile Delta and River Valley. Most likely, blacks are considered in Genesis among the “beasts of the field” that Noah places two by two upon his ark, insofar as they are considered at all.

Mizraim is a Hebrew word which means “the two lands,”¹⁰⁸ and is generally thought to be a translation of the Egyptian term , t3wy or tauwy, which also means “the two lands” - a term for Egypt. The only trouble with this is that, if so, it would be the only Hebrew name preserved in the genealogy. An alternative would be Egyptian , msr'w or mesrahu, “people born of the

¹⁰⁸I do not read or speak Hebrew, and have only a basic familiarity with the grammar, so I am taking the word of others for this.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

sun.” In either case, Mizraim could be a reference to the peoples of Egypt¹⁰⁹.

The trouble with this lies in the name Caphtor, who is one of the children of Mizraim. The identity of Caphtor is the subject of much debate. The Bible describes Caphtor as “the island origin of the Philistines”. Phillistines is a term often used in the Bible to refer to people residing in the region we know as Phoenicia.¹¹⁰ The origins of the Phoenicians are not clear. The term Phoenicia is derived from the Egyptian , fnḥw, or Fenkhu, and that term is known as early as the 20th century BC in a work known as the Tale of Sinuhe. There, it is definitely associated with a man named , mnws or Menus of , kftiu or Kefitu, the Egyptian term for “Crete.” This Menus of Keftiu is believed to be King Minos of Crete, and it is believed that the Egyptians believed the people of what is now Lebanon to have been of Cretan origin. Yet the Phoenicians were Semites, very distinct from the Peleset, and, unlike the Peleset, their migration to modern Lebanon occurred by land and not by sea.

So, despite the claims of Josephus, and whether a Phoenician migration from east Africa happened or not, this theoretical Phoenician homeland could not be the African Caphtor described in Genesis 10, as their migration is too late for the author of the chapter to have been aware of it. Further, the people referred to are clearly Phillistines, or members of the Peleset sea peoples who attacked and colonized the Levant just prior to or contemporary with the composition of Genesis 10, and eastern Africa is not an “island.”. As many of the Sea Peoples conducted their invasions from homelands in southern Anatolia, a location to which the culture of Minoan Crete had been exported,¹¹¹ it is very likely that this verse of the Bible should be taken literally – that the

¹⁰⁹If the term Hamitic refers to the Mediterranean branch of the white race, the Egyptians are not totally out of place here. They certainly represent a pre-Indo-European branch of the white race, though their branch is more closely related to the Indo-Europeans than, say, the Libyans.

¹¹⁰The Peleset Sea People – the Phillistines, modern Palestinians – are distinct from the Phoenicians, who were Semitic, or who, at least, adopted Semitic forms in their language and culture.


¹¹¹See Chapter 9.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

Peleset were remnants of the Minoan culture, which had been exported to their homeland in southern Anatolia.

If so, then these descendents of Mizraim appear to refer to the larger tradition linking Egypt, Minoan Crete, and the peoples of Lebanon, rather than merely people of Egyptian Africa and Libya. If the belief that Ludim, the son of Mizraim, is the eponymous founder of Lydia,¹¹² a kingdom on the Western coast of Asia Minor, it reinforces the idea that the Hamitic race is the pre-Indo-European Mediterranean branch of the white race.

Anamim, the son of Mizraim, is obscure, but may be related to the Anakes or Anaktes who appear in Greek myth as the Dioscuri, or Castor and Pollux. Their particular worship at Athens tends to link them to the cult of Erechtheus – one of the few cults in the Peloponnese – and one of the few cultures – that both pre-dated survived the Mycenaean invasion. If so, this raises interesting questions about the influence of the myths of the Mediterranean on the Nordic countries.¹¹³

The Lehabim are generally associated with the Rebu, Greek Lebu or Libyans, of Egyptian inscriptions, and they fit well into the schema of the Mizraim as part of the Mediterranean branch of the Indo-European race. Though I have not gone into detail here, the religion of this race appears tied to the worship of the Great Mother and of Baal – for instance, Libya is recorded in the Greek myths as a sister of Aegyptus and daughter of Belus.¹¹⁴ Naphutim has been associated with “Na-Ptah,” an alleged reference to an Egyptian name for the people of Memphis, but Memphis was known as , mnfr

¹¹²On the one hand, the name Lydia is not well attested prior to the 7th century B.C.; the origin of the name is obscure. The Greeks referred to the area as Maeonia. On the other hand, the Lydians have been linked historically to the Etruscans, who were culturally part of the Mediterranean sub-strata, see Chapter 6. Their worship also involved the double-axe, a prominent symbol of Minoan religion. The Lydians did not refer to themselves as Lydians – they called themselves Sfar or Sparda. Sardis was the name of the Lydian capital. Their language is Indo-European but not part of the Luwian subgroup, unlike their neighbors in Lycia and Caria. Josephus is wrong in arguing they are Semites, children of Lud son of Shem.

¹¹³See Chapter 6.

¹¹⁴This theme is explored in detail in Chapter 9.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

THE SONS OF SHEM

The sons of Shem are the Semites, the people who emerged from the Arabian Desert and settled the northern part of the fertile crescent – modern Syria – and well as the northern and central portions of Mesopotamia and the lower Nile Delta region. Into this culture the Hebrews eventually integrated themselves, though their origins appear to have been outside of it.

First, there is Ashur, the founder of the Assyrian Empire. The Assyrians may have dwelt in the upper portion of the Tigris and Euphrates river valleys prior to the larger Semitic invasion of Mesopotamia that led to the founding of Akkad. His brother Elam is a reference to the Semitic peoples that settled in the southwest mountains of Persia, near the Mesopotamian river valleys, though these people spoke a language related to Dravidian, an indication that the Semites there were conquerors of a larger racial sub-stratum.¹²⁵ An effort has been made to link their brother Lud to both the Lydians and the Luwians of Asia Minor, but this effort is somewhat irrational, as neither people was Semitic, nor do they have any known historical ties to the other people included as the children of Shem. The best guess as to who these people were is a Semitic people who settled near the source of the river Halys, west of Assyria and north of Edessa.

Aram is the ancient name of Syria. His brother Arpachsad is said to have founded the city of Ur of the Chaldees, which is linked to a small Semitic kingdom in southeastern Turkey, near to Assyria, modern Urfa and classic Edessa. An argument has been made this is the Sumerian kingdom of Ur, but this is unlikely, as the southern Mesopotamians appear to be grouped with the sons of Ham under Nimrod. As the founder of Edessa, this reinforces the Biblical creation story that the Hebrews emerged from Mesopotamia by way of Syria. From Arpachsad is said to descend Eber, who, as we have discussed, is the eponymous founder of the Hebrews.

¹²⁵This appearance of Dravidian languages so far north and east tends to support the hypothesis of a link between the Dravidian culture of southern India and the Minoan culture of Crete.

THE TRADITION OF THE MOTHER

CONCLUSION

In sum, the Bible divides the people of the Near and Middle East into three racial groups – the sons of Japheth, the sons of Ham, and the sons of Shem. These racial classifications are Egyptian in origin. The first is an Egyptian translation of the Indo-European epithet “Aryan,” and means the “most select” or “elite” people, and the children of Japheth represent the Indo-European racial groups of Asia Minor, the Caucasus, and possibly beyond. The children of Ham are classically and erroneously considered black Africans, the pre-Indo-European, primarily Mediterranean, whites of the Near and Middle East. Lastly, the Semites are represented in their nations of Assyria, Elam, Aram, and the branches they threw out into the surrounding area, including the Hebrews.

Efforts to impose other racial classifications and schema upon these peoples are the result of bad scholarship, originating with the largely fantastic work of the Jew Josephus, and continuing with Talmudic and Rabbinical interpretations and reinterpretations through the Dark and Middle Ages and into the modern world. Many of these Talmudic interpretations cross into Christian scholarship, and became the basis of racial theories which developed in the 19th and 20th centuries. Modern scholars often assign to these racial categories peoples of a much later date, often between the 6th and 9th centuries BC, partially out of ignorance of the world of the 12th and 13th centuries B.C., and partly because efforts to find Semitic, rather than late New Kingdom Egyptian, ethnic and place names have focused on Assyrian and late Semitic texts.