Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland

<http://journals.cambridge.org/JRA>

Additional services for *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

Art. II.—Notes on the Early History of Babylonia

Colonel Rawlinson

Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland / Volume 15 / January 1854, pp 215 - 259

DOI: 10.1017/S0035869X00013435, Published online: 14 March 2011

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0035869X00013435

How to cite this article:

Colonel Rawlinson (1854). Art. II.—Notes on the Early History of Babylonia. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain & Ireland*, 15, pp 215-259 doi:10.1017/S0035869X00013435

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

ART. II.—*Notes on the Early History of Babylonia.*

By COLONEL RAWLINSON, C.B.

IN the numerous letters and papers which I have addressed during the last two years to the Secretary of the Royal Asiatic Society, and which have been either read at the meetings of the Society, or in some instances published in the Journal,¹ I have explained, in more or less detail, the successive discoveries which I have made in the history of ancient Assyria. Those discoveries have pretty well established the fact that an independent empire was first instituted on the Upper Tigris in the thirteenth century, B.C. They have furnished what may be considered an almost complete list of Assyrian kings from the above-named period to the destruction of Nineveh in B.C. 625, and they have further made us acquainted with the general history of Western Asia, during this interval of above seven centuries.

I now propose to state the results of my researches into the ante-Assyrian period, and to show that an inquiry which aims at the illustration of history from the local monuments, may be legitimately extended in Babylonia to the patriarchal ages.²

As it is now generally admitted that there is no sacred chronology beyond the time of Solomon, I shall not attempt to prove the antiquity of the Chaldees on scriptural authority, by fixing the period of the Exodus of Abraham—still less shall I pretend to trace back the years of the patriarchal genealogies to the era of Nimrod, and thus obtain a date for the building of Babylon. The gloss in the Toldoth Beni Noah,³ which describes the empire of Nimrod, is unquestionably

¹ Outlines of Assyrian History, attached to the Anniversary Report for 1852.

² For a *resumé* of the argument relating to this subject, see the third and fourth sections of Prichard's Note on the Biblical Chronology, appended to the fifth volume of his Researches into the Physical History of Mankind.

³ It hardly requires to be stated that the first portion of Genesis consists of a number of independent documents, each qualified by a distinct title, and belonging to a different age. The fragment which forms the 10th chapter bears the Hebrew title of Toldoth Beni Noah, or the Genealogies of the Noachidae, and is probably of the very greatest antiquity, inasmuch as it relates exclusively to the affiliation of races, and is independent of that chronological computation which is attached to the Toldoth Beni Adam and Toldoth Beni Shem, and which is indicative of a comparatively advanced period of civilization. Portions, however, of this chapter, such as the 13th verse, must assuredly belong to a period subsequent to the

a notice of great geographical value, and the incidental mention of "Ur of the Chaldees," as the primitive seat of the Jewish race, supplies a not less important item of ethnic information; but to build a chronological structure on such foundations, would be to abuse scripture, rather than to use it. I prefer at any rate to follow profane history; and to rest content, as far as dates are concerned, with mere approximations.

Our best authority on early Babylonian history would be undoubtedly Berosus, if his works had descended to us entire; for he was a priest of Belus, well skilled in the learning of his class, and he wrote moreover in an age when the Cuneiform character was still in

Hebrew occupation of Palestine, since explanations are there given which could only be intelligible to parties well acquainted with the geography of the province. The reasons which lead me to regard the 9th, 10th, 11th, and 12th verses as a gloss of even later date, are as follows:—1stly. The general tenor of the document is simply that of the affiliation of races, while at the 9th verse the ethnic series is abruptly interrupted to introduce a popular saying about Nimrod, and to describe the geography of Babylon, neither one subject nor the other possessing any interest for the Jews, or being by possibility within their cognizance at the time of their passage from Egypt to Palestine, or indeed at any period of their history earlier than the Babylonian captivity. 2ndly. If we accept the text as it stands at present, Asshur is anticipated, and transferred from the line of Shem to that of Ham; while we must further suppose the city of Babylon to have been built three generations before the tower of Babel and the confusion of tongues, in which latter event, however, we are expressly told (chap. xi. v. 9) the name originated. 3rdly. Whatever may be said of the Babylonian names, those of the Assyrian capitals are all comparatively modern. Calah was not founded till about 1000 B.C., nor was Nineveh more than a few centuries more ancient. The primæval Assyrian capital was *Asshur* or *Ellasar*, and the name was not exchanged for *Resen* till towards the close of the empire. 4thly. The Samaritan version is well known to follow the Samaritan text in general with the most scrupulous fidelity; yet in the particular verses in question almost all the names are altered, and it is difficult to believe that the translator would have taken such a liberty with the passage, had it formed an integral portion of the inspired text. At any rate, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Samaritan translator found the verses still retaining their original form of a gloss, and that he thus interpreted them without hesitation, according to his own geographical knowledge; the example, moreover, which he gave of explaining, rather than transcribing, being followed by most of his successors.

I will only add that these remarks are not penned in any irreverent spirit for the authority of Scripture. Chevalier Bunsen has already familiarized us with the idea that the Toldoth Beni Noah is a mere "historical representation of the great and lengthened migration of the primitive Asiatic races of mankind;" and there can be nothing repugnant, therefore, to the religious feeling of the age in the explanation which I have ventured to give of a portion of this document. I would refer indeed to Dr. Prichard's temperate and enlightened note on the Biblical Chronology, already quoted, as a proof that the severest criticism may be applied to the book of Genesis without in any way impugning its canonical authority.

current use,¹ and when materials for precise information in regard to dynasties, names of kings, and chronological dates, were thus certainly at his disposal. He must have been in fact as well qualified to tabulate the Babylonian kings, as Manetho was to classify the thirty dynasties of Egypt. Unfortunately, however, we have only one solitary fragment of Berosus on primeval Babylonian history, and that fragment is imperfect.² The Germans, it is true, have recently suggested a most ingenious method of restoring the text.³ By supplying the number 258, for the duration of the second historical dynasty of Berosus, which is wanting in the MS., and by further designating this nameless dynasty as Chaldæan, they obtain two results, the coincidence of which is, to say the least of it, curious; 1stly, the date of the institution of a Chaldæan empire is assigned to the year B.C. 2234, in precise conformity with the numbers obtained by Callisthenes at Babylon; and 2ndly, the aggregate of the eight post-diluvian dynasties of Babylon, consisting of one mythical and five historical dynasties preserved by Berosus, and two others elaborated from history, is found exactly to fill up the great cycle of ten sari or 36,000 years,⁴ to which the Chaldæans are supposed to have attached so much importance.

Berosus flourished from the time of Alexander at Babylon (B.C. 331) to the reign of Antiochus Soter, his great historical work having been dedicated to the latter king in B.C. 279. For the authorities, see Müller's *Frag. Hist. Græc.*, vol. II. p. 492. As Cuneiform tablets, therefore, have been lately found, differing in no respect from the ancient writing, and which are dated in the reigns of Seleucus and Antiochus, I am quite justified in asserting that the original historical records of Babylon were accessible to the researches of Berosus.

² This fragment, which is a quotation by Alexander Polyhistor from the *Βαβυλωνιακά* of Berosus, was first published in the Armenian Eusebius (see Aucher's *Eusebii Chron.* vol. I. p. 40). Syncellus (p. 78) has the same extract (copied probably from Eusebius), but he has so altered the numbers, and distorted the entire sense, that the value of the passage is lost. It is, however, to this source alone that we are indebted for our knowledge of Berosus having mentioned the name of Zoroaster.

³ See the *Rerum Assyriorum Tempora Emendata* of Dr. Brandis (Bonn, 1853), and the reference to Gutschmid's Essay in the *Mus. Rhen.*, given in p. 16.

⁴ I do not, I confess, find it anywhere stated that this cycle was known to the Babylonians. The Germans seem to have merely inferred that, as the Nerus, or ordinary great year, according to Josephus consisted of 10 Sossi ($60 \times 10 = 600$), so the astronomical great year must have consisted of 10 Sari ($3600 \times 10 = 36,000$). That the Babylonians did really make use both of the centesimal and sexagesimal notation, as stated by Berosus, is abundantly proved by the monuments; and from the same sources we can illustrate the respective uses of the *Sarus*, the *Nerus*, and *Sossus* in the calculation of the higher numbers. The phonetic reading, moreover, for a *Soss*, constantly occurs, *Sussu* in the singular, and

sistency of the restored numbers with ordinary life-tables, in yielding an average of $23\frac{1}{2}$ years ($258 \div 11$), for each generation of the name-

In Roman numerals this is simply

Soss	units	
43	21	= 51^2 or 2601
45	4	= 52^2 „ 2704
46	49	= 53^2 „ 2809
48	36	= 54^2 „ 2916
50	25	= 55^2 „ 3025
52	16	= 56^2 „ 3136
54	9	= 57^2 „ 3249
56	4	= 58^2 „ 3364
58	1	= 59^2 „ 3481
60	00	= 60^2 „ 3600

Now as we here find the unit, the *Soss*, and the *Sar*, to be each represented by Υ , while the decades of each series are indicated by $\angle$, it is evident that the Babylonian notation consisted of a double recurring series, in which the elements $\angle$ and Υ were used respectively for the decades and units of the integers of 60. Applying this system of notation to the numbers of Berosus, 34,080 will be represented by $\begin{smallmatrix} \Upsilon \Upsilon \Upsilon \\ \Upsilon \Upsilon \Upsilon \end{smallmatrix} \angle \angle \begin{smallmatrix} \Upsilon \Upsilon \Upsilon \\ \Upsilon \Upsilon \Upsilon \end{smallmatrix}$, which I should read as 9 *Sari* and 29 *Soss*, but which may be equally well expressed by 9 *Sari*, 2 *Neri*, and 9 *Soss*, the very words quoted by Syncellus from Polyhistor. If there had been any fractional parts of a *Soss*, a third series of the signs $\angle$ and Υ would have been added. There was probably also a higher number in the next ascending series of 60 beyond the *Sar*, which gave as its product 216,000, and two of these periods constituted the antediluvian cycle of Berosus, computed by Syncellus at 432,000 years.

And while I am now discussing the notation of the Babylonians, I may as well give the phonetic reading of the numbers, as they are found in the Assyrian vocabularies.

$\Upsilon \angle$	=	$\angle \Upsilon$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	Υ	<i>aliter</i>	$\angle$
$\angle \angle$	=	$\Upsilon \angle$	$\angle \Upsilon$	$\Upsilon \Upsilon$		
$\angle \angle$	=	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	$\angle \angle \Upsilon$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	<i>aliter</i>	$\Upsilon \Upsilon$
$\angle \angle \angle$	=	$\angle$	$\angle \Upsilon$	$\Upsilon \Upsilon$		
$\angle \angle$	=	$\angle \angle \angle$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	$\Upsilon \Upsilon$		
$\angle \Upsilon$	=	$\Upsilon \angle$	$\angle \angle \angle$	$\angle$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	<i>aliter</i> $\angle$ or $\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$
$\angle$	=	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	$\angle$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$		
Υ	=	$\Upsilon \angle$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$	$\angle \Upsilon \Upsilon$		

less dynasty. On the latter ground indeed the restoration cannot be far wrong, and we may thus assume it as proved, that Berosus dated the commencement of his second historical dynasty of Babylon from the latter half of the twenty-third century B.C.

That is—

60 = <i>Sussu</i>	Compare שָׁשִׁים
50 = <i>Khansa</i>	חֲמִשִּׁים
40 = <i>Irbaya</i> (or <i>Irba</i>)	אַרְבָּעִים
30 = <i>Silasa</i>	שְׁלֹשִׁים
20 = <i>Sinra</i> (?) , . . .	עֶשְׂרִי
(perhaps 2 tens, as <i>eshra</i> is 1 ten)	
15 = <i>Khamis sirat</i> .	חֲמִשָּׁת עָשָׂר
10 = <i>Esra</i>	עֶשְׂרָה
5 = <i>Khamish</i>	חֲמִשָּׁה

On another fragment we have—

𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 = 𐎶𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 (probably 𐎶)	
𐎶𐎶 = 𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶	
𐎶 = 𐎶𐎶𐎶𐎶 𐎶𐎶	
𐎶 = 𐎶 𐎶𐎶𐎶 𐎶	

That is—

8 = <i>Tsumana</i> . . .	שְׁמֹנֶה
6 = <i>Tsudu</i> (Chal.) .	שֵׁשׁ
4 = <i>Rubu</i>	רְבַע
2 = <i>Sunnu</i>	שְׁנֵי

These readings are valuable, not merely for their Semitic forms, but also for their grammatical peculiarities.

Mons. Oppert communicated to me last year a theory, which he has probably published before this, that the use of the *Soss*, *Ner*, and *Sar* originated in the minor divisions of time. The *Soss* he supposed to be the hour of 60 minutes; the *Ner* (Arab. نهار) the day of 10 hours; and the *Sar* (شهر) the month, containing 60 of these 10-hour periods. But this explanation does not, I confess, appear to me at all satisfactory. I know of no authority for a decimal horary division. I doubt much if נהר or نهار, although used for the day-light, ever designated a period either of 10 hours or 12; and I question still more the existence in Babylonian of the Arabic word *Shahar* for a month. Having stated that the phonetic

On his first or Median dynasty, which reigned for 224 years previously, I shall have much to say presently, but in the mean time I confine myself to the examination of this approximate date of B.C. 2234, for the institution of a Semitic empire at Babylon.

That this empire was Semitic, and that it superseded a Scythic occupation of Babylonia, I infer from many circumstances. The astronomical observations which Callisthenes sent to Aristotle from Babylon,¹ and which ascended to 1903 years before the occupation of the city by Alexander ($331 + 1903 = 2234$), were certainly recorded upon cuneiform tablets, and these tablets seem in Babylonia to have been introduced by, and to have exclusively belonged to, a Semitic priesthood;² at least, from the earliest period to the latest, the inscriptions of Babylon and Chaldæa bear the same monograms for the gods, the same names of countries and cities, the same titles for the kings; and although, as might be expected when the inquiry extends over a period of two thousand years, there are sensible varieties of language, still the structure is throughout Semitic, and the relics may be thus determinately assigned to kindred branches of the same stock. Whether the name of Chaldæan or Aramæan, or

forms of *Ner* and *Sar* are still desiderata, I may add that in two passages of the Assyrian syllabary *Nîru* is given as the phonetic plural for a very complicated monogram which is explained in the left hand column as *Sudun*, a term perhaps allied to six, though the initial sibilant is of a different class; whether indeed does really represent the *Nnp* of Berossus I consider extremely doubtful.

¹ See Simplicius ad Aristot. de Cælo, lib. ii. p. 123. There is, I believe, also an allusion to this date in the Scholiast to Aristophanes; but I have not the authority to refer to at Baghdad.

² I have not made much progress as yet in reading the primitive Babylonian manuscripts; indeed, until within these few days, I have not had sufficient materials at my disposal; for the bricks and seal cylinders contain nothing but names and titles expressed by arbitrary monograms, and afford, therefore, very little insight into a language. Now, therefore, that I have received Mr. Loftus's collection of primitive Chaldæan tablets from Senkereh, I hope to make good progress. I already see, indeed, that the same pronouns and particles occur as in the later Babylonian, and that the verbs and participles are formed in the same manner; so that I have no hesitation in pronouncing the language to be Semitic; and this, be it observed, is in opposition to my former opinion, which, from the want of such evidence, questioned the Semitic affinity of the language. Although it was always clear that the same monograms expressed the same ideas, it by no means followed that the same phonetic terms were employed in the two languages; indeed, the analogous comparison of the Armenian with the Assyrian rather led to a contrary conclusion.

even Elymæan,¹ may be most appropriately applied to the colonists who first introduced the art of writing, we cannot at present decide—it is sufficient to know that they belonged to the Semitic family, and that they first rose into power in Babylonia, in the latter part of the twenty-third century B.C.²

¹ The ethnic character to be assigned to the Elymæans still continues to be one of the most obscure questions connected with cuneiform research. Elam is allied with Asshur and Aram in the Toldoth Beni Noah, and a Semitic origin would seem, therefore, to be proved; but the native inscriptions of Susa and Elymais are undoubtedly written in Scythic dialects, more nearly related to the language of the second column of the trilingual Achæmænian records, than to any other class of cuneiform documents. As these inscriptions, moreover, are certainly of very great antiquity, I can only suppose that the Semitic Elymæans gave way to Scyths before the historic period, and that these latter inherited the name as well as the country of the race which they had dispossessed. In fact, I conceive the same irregular nomenclature to have prevailed in Susiana, although reversed in its application, which has often been remarked upon in Syria. In that country, the Hamite or Scythic name of Sidon was retained after the city was peopled by the Semites, in Susiana; and the Semitic title of Elam was preserved after the country was peopled by the Scyths.

² I have recently met with a date which confirms, in a most remarkable manner, the testimony of Callisthenes, and the restoration of the numbers of Berosus. I had always been aware, of course, that Pliny, in his discourse on the invention of writing, quoted the authority of Berosus and Critodemus for assigning to the Babylonian stellar observations an antiquity of 480 years—"ex quo apparet æternus literarum usus;" but, as I presumed these numbers to refer to the age of Berosus, and thus to ascend no higher than the eighth century, I could only suppose some fatal corruption of the text. On re-examining, however, the passage of Pliny, I see quite clearly that the numbers of Berosus refer to the era of Phoroneus, and record, in fact, a genuine Babylonian date adapted to the Greek calendar. "Anticlidēs," says Pliny, "reports that letters were invented in Egypt by a certain man of the name of Menon, fifteen years before Phoroneus, who was the most ancient king of Greece, and endeavours to prove this from the monuments; but Epigenes, on the other hand, a first-rate authority, maintains that the Babylonians had recorded their sidereal observations inscribed on tablets of baked clay for 720 years [before that era]; and even Berosus and Critodemus, who are the most moderate calculators, say for 480 years, from which we may infer the extreme antiquity of the use of letters." (See Plin. Nat. Hist., lib. vii. c. 56.) Now, as Clinton, from a very large field of induction, and irrespectively altogether of the coincidence I am about to mention, has fixed the age of Phoroneus, as understood by the Greeks, to be B.C. 1753, we have an exact identity between the numbers of Berosus and Callisthenes; 1753 + 480, and 330 + 1903, giving the same result of B.C. 2233, for the primitive Semitic era of Babylon. In the text I have followed the Germans in placing Alexander's conquest of Babylon in B.C. 331, instead of in 330, which is the usual chronological date, and there is thus the difference of a year in the Babylonian epoch; but this is of no consequence. The numbers of Epigenes, which exceed those of Berosus by 240 years (or by 230, if we follow some of the MSS. of Pliny), include, no doubt, the Median dynasty, which preceded the Semites in Chaldæa, the duration of which was calculated by

There is still another Greek date for the building of Babylon, or, as I would rather understand the passage, for the institution of a Semitic empire on the Euphrates, which has hardly received the attention that it deserves. Philo Byblius, as he is quoted by Stephen,¹ contradicts the statement that Babylon was built by Semiramis, and observes that it was in reality 1002 years older than the Assyrian queen.² This remarkable number evidently implies an attempt at definite chronology, and what that chronology was we may infer from an independent statement of the same author, that Sanchoniathon lived under Semiramis, who was contemporary with the Trojan war.³ Now the Trojan epoch was variously calculated by the Greeks,⁴ a period of above two centuries intervening between the lower date of Callimachus, and the higher date of Duris. The best authorities, however, place it late in the thirteenth century B.C.; the Parian marble in 1219; Hellanicus in 1229; and 1002 added to this latter number, will give the date of B.C. 2231; which accordingly differs by only three years from the Babylonian era of Callisthenes. That Philo really also intended to assign this approximate date to the building of Babylon, may be gathered from his special notice of Semiramis being contemporary with the war of Troy; for the Assyrian empire actually commenced in B.C. 1273;⁵ and as Semiramis, according to the popular tradition, was the second monarch, succeeding Ninus after a long reign of fifty-two years, her supposed era of B.C. 1221 would fall within the period assigned by the Parian marble to the Trojan expedition.

It is an ungracious task to attempt to extract dates from barren

Berosus at 224 or 234 years; but it may fairly be questioned, in the absence of all local evidence, if the Scyths really recorded their observations upon tablets. Consult Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, vol. I. pp. 9, 139, and 282.

¹ Stephen de Urbibus, in voce *Βαβυλών*.

² The value of this quotation is of course impaired by the discrepant numbers of Eustathius, who, in his commentary on verse 1005 of the *Periegesis* of Dionysius, writes the date in full, *χιλίοις ὀκτακοσίοις*, so that, whether he followed Stephen or Philo, he must have read the numbers *αω'* instead of *αβ'*—1,800 years, however, before the Trojan war falls in with no era whatever; and Eustathius, therefore, in all probability, was misled by a textual error. See Müller's *Greek Fragments*, Vol. III. p. 575.

³ See Gaisford's *Eus. Pr. Ev.* 1, 9, 2; and Müller's *Fragments*, Vol. III. p. 563.

⁴ For the Trojan era I have merely consulted Clinton's *Fasti Hellenici*, Vol. I. p. 123; Larcher's *Herodotus*, tom. VII. p. 352-404; and Müller's *Fragments*, Vol. I. p. 571.

⁵ That is, 747 + 526, according to the computation of Berosus preserved by Polyhistor, as already quoted.

catalogues of kings, or to quote the results obtained from such catalogues by professed chronologers; for even where the numbers come out satisfactorily, we have the consciousness that much is due to manipulation and systematic arrangement. This remark applies especially to the Assyrian canon of Ctesias, and to the use that has been made of it by his followers; that is, by Diodorus and Æmilius Sura, by Castor and Cephalion, and especially by Eusebius and Syncellus. Historically this famous canon is almost worthless, the small ingredient which it contains of traditional truth being insufficient to leaven the general mass of fable. Chronologically too, since it depends for its closing point upon two events which are entirely fictitious—namely, the destruction of Nineveh under Sardanapalus, and the synchronous establishment of an independent Median dynasty—and since the duration of the several reigns which form this latter supposititious dynasty constitutes the only link of connection between the early Assyrian series and the era of Cyrus at Babylon, the approximate accuracy of the general result in assigning the institution of a Semitic empire to the close of the twenty-third century B.C., is liable to be looked on as a mere happy coincidence¹—at any rate this general accuracy cannot be held to authenticate the arrangement of the details, nor even to prove the integrity of the numbers employed. If we could be sure that Ctesias, independently of all adjustment of his numbers to the first Olympiad, really placed the era of Ninus at an interval of one thousand years above the Trojan expedition, then we might accept his authority as indicating an ancient tradition, and thus affording a valuable corroboration of the date already obtained from Philo for the building of Babylon; but it is equally doubtful whether this statement belong to Ctesias, and whether, if it be his, it do not proceed from computation rather than from an independent source.² As a general rule, indeed, we may

¹ The Assyrian reigns of Ctesias, with their respective duration, and the period at which the dynasty closed, were differently computed by all the chronologers, although they drew their information from the same source. The calculation of Syncellus was the nearest to the truth, though quite wrong in its details; for, by assigning the close of the empire to B.C. 826, under Arphron at Athens, and by computing its duration at 1460 years, he obtains the date B.C. 2285 for its commencement; and if from this number we deduct 55 years for the reign of Belus, we have B.C. 2230 for the era of Ninus, which only differs by four years from the Babylonian date of Callisthenes. See Clinton's *Fast. Hell.*, Vol. I, p. 266.

² Clinton believes the statement, which is only found in Diodorus, to proceed from Ctesias, and even speculates that Ctesias, like his contemporary Isocrates, placed the fall of Troy a few years below the epoch of Eratosthenes (*Fast. Hell.* I. 268); but I should rather ascribe the calculation to Diodorus himself,

assume, I think, that the many relative dates in the canon which connect Greek and Assyrian history, and which are thus so often cited as a proof of the authenticity of the lists, were obtained either by Ctesias or his copyists, from the simple calculation of the numbers assigned arbitrarily to the reigns of the different kings of Nineveh, as compared with the standard epochal dates of Greece; in the same way that the Hebrew synchronisms were certainly added by later christian compilers from a collation of the same numbers with the received scripture chronology.¹ Although, however, I thus summarily reject both the authorities and the facts of Ctesias, I have no doubt but that at particular points a glimmering of truth is to be found in his scheme of Oriental history—he was aware for instance that a Median kingdom independent of Babylon, followed on the destruction of Nineveh—he had also heard of the domestic revolution at Nineveh (in B.C. 747), which put an end to the original imperial family, and substituted the lower dynasty in its place—he was perhaps even acquainted with the general nature of the Semitic claim to antiquity, and thus adjusted his numbers so as to fall in approximately with the true dates; but he was guilty of gross errors both of omission and commission—he confounded in the first place Assyrian with Babylonian dominion, and he supplied all details both of nomenclature and chronology, with a single exception,² from his own unassisted imagination.

That Ctesias, at the head of his history, had substituted an Assyrian for a Babylonian empire, was always to be suspected from his placing the capital of Ninus, and his place of sepulture, upon the Euphrates, instead of on the Tigris;³ as well as from his subsequent

since it is not mentioned either by Eusebius or Syncellus, and is even at variance with their numbers.

¹ The Greek synchronisms are, the war of Perseus and Bacchus, the Argonautic expedition, the Trojan war, the era of Lycurgus, &c. The principal scriptural dates are, for the birth of Abraham and the Exodus from Egypt, calculated according to the numbers of the Septuagint; but the canon of Eusebius of course aims at a complete scheme of general comparative chronology from the most ancient times to his own days.

² This solitary instance of accuracy in regard to names is in the notice of Bolochus and Semiramis (or *Phulukh* and *Sammuramit*) and their being followed by *Balatar* (or *Tiglath Palatsar*), but in this case even it is doubtful if Ctesias recognized a change of dynasty; for Agathias and Syncellus, although using nearly the same names that are found in Ctesias, quote Bion and Polyhistor as their authorities for the revolution.

³ As Diodorus also places the capital of Sardanapalus on the Euphrates, it has been supposed that there was this radical geographical error in Ctesias' notice of Nineveh; but Nicolaus of Damascus, who also follows Ctesias in his account of

account of the magnificent works of Semiramis at Babylon, rather than at Nineveh. The error was rendered still more probable, by the near coincidence of his era of Ninus with the Babylonian date of Berosus. It is proved, I now venture to affirm, as far as such questions admit of demonstration, by the identification, through the name of Zoroaster, of the leading exploit of the so-called Assyrian king, with that ethnic revolution which in reality established Semitic supremacy in Babylonia; as well as by the evidence afforded by the inscriptions that the primæval seat of empire was in Chaldæa, and that Assyria was a tributary or subordinate government for at least one thousand years after the age of the pretended Ninus. Unless, indeed, the entire chronological structure of Ctesias is to be discarded as an absolute fiction, the only possible explanation of his system seems to be that he employed the names of Ninus and Semiramis as mere eponyms for the Semitic race; and that under the hyperbole of their wonderful achievements, he disguised the simple historical fact of the supersession of Scythic by Semitic power in Chaldæa and Babylonia.

This ethnic supersession, I conceive at the same time, to have been the most important political revolution of the ancient world, and I proceed accordingly to consider it in some detail.

ANTE-SEMITIC PERIOD.

If we examine the traditions of the Greeks, as distinguished from their heroic myths, we trace everywhere a belief in the existence of a Scythic dominion of Asia, at the dawn of history. Justin assigns to this dominion a specific duration of 1500 years before it was overthrown by Ninus, but a much higher antiquity may be inferred from other authorities.¹ The Scythic supremacy was further distinguished by a peculiar religion, probably the worship of the elements (and of fire in particular) and of the heavenly bodies, as

the taking of Nineveh, names the river correctly the Tigris, and it thus seems probable that Ctesias, in his first description, where the river Euphrates is twice mentioned, really alludes to a capital of Ninus, distinct from the Assyrian Nineveh. The German geographers, indeed, upon these grounds, often place a "vetus Ninus" on the Euphrates near Babylon. If the primæval capital of Ctesias, however, have any historic identity, it is to be looked for at Warka or Mugheir; at any rate, in the lower basin of the Euphrates, and not on the upper part of the river, where canals of irrigation, the invention of a later age, were requisite for the production of corn and the other necessities of life.

¹ Epiphanius and the chronologers define "Scythism" as the period extending from the flood to the age of Peleg or of Terah, the father of Abraham; and Plutarch and Pliny allude to the same period of extreme antiquity, when they place the age of the Scythic Zoroaster 5000 years before the Trojan war.

contrasted with idolatry, and the period therefore, during which it prevailed, was named *Σκυθισμός* by the Christians, who classified the religious epochs of the world, and who have certainly preserved many old fragments of great value.¹ With this religion, again, was especially connected the name of Zoroaster, which the Greeks translated "the star-worshipper :"² wherever, indeed, we meet with notices of a primitive Zoroaster, the allusion is, I think, to the elemental worship of the early Scyths, who preceded the Semitic idolators; and the extraordinary confusion which prevailed amongst the Greeks, with regard to the age of this personage, is to be explained probably, by the double period of the prevalence of the religious ideas which the name represented, that is by the existence of the elemental worship before the institution of a Semitic empire, and by the restoration of the same faith, or at any rate of a faith which went by the same name, by the Achæmenians, after the Semitic doctrines had been dominant for about seventeen hundred years. Now, although Justin appears to distinguish between the overthrow of the Scythians and the war of Ninus with Zoroaster, and although the latter name is replaced by Oxyartes, in the garbled extracts from Ctesias preserved by Diodorus, yet it can, I think, be clearly proved, that this so-called

¹ I refer especially to Epiphanius, John of Malala, the author of the Paschal Chronicle, John of Antioch, Cedrenus, &c.

² Diogenes Laertius (i. 8, de Magis), quoting Hermodorus and Dinon. Numerous explanations have been given of the etymology of this name by Bochart, Kircher, and others, more or less in accordance with the Greek translation, and all referring to Semitic sources (See Stanley's Philosophy, p. 758); but the critical judgment of the present age seems to prefer an Arian derivation, and to agree with Burnouf in referring all the Greek forms to the Zend word, *Zarath-ushtra*, "the possessor of yellow camels." I venture, however, to revive the Semitic theory, and to propose as the original form of the name *Ziru-ishtar*, "the seed of the goddess," a regular Babylonian compound, very much resembling the *בני אלהים* of Scripture. *ziru* (answering to the Heb. *זֵרָע* comp. *זְרַבְבֶּל* Zerubbabel) is everywhere put for the Persian *tumâ* (*tukhm*); and *Ishtar*, denoting specifically the planet Venus, is used generally for female deities, like the Ashtaroth of Scripture. I must add that although we have not *Ziru-ishtar* in the inscriptions, as far as I know, for Zoroaster or the Hamites, yet we have constantly the analogous compound *Ziru-banit* or as an epithet for Belus, the prototype of the Semites. I am in doubt about the meaning of *banit* or *panit*, but the epithet is of course the *Zerwan* of later times, who was understood to be the same as Shem, although the Berosian Sybil confounded this Zerwan with Zoroaster. See Moses of Chorene, Whiston's edition, p. 17.

Bactrian war was in reality nothing more than the supersession of the Scyths by the Semites in Babylonia. In the first place, Berosus himself designated the Median dynasty, which was driven out of Babylonia in B.C. 2234, by "the Hæresionym of Zoroaster."¹ That Ctesias also did actually name the Bactrian king Zoroaster, and not Oxyartes, is rendered almost certain, by the frequent occurrence of the former name in the fragments of his copyist Cephalion;² and that he even recognized the connection of this Bactrian Zoroaster with Babylon, may be inferred from a passage of Arnobius, where the first book of Ctesias is quoted, to the effect, that "Zoroaster contended with Ninus, not merely with steel and strength, but by magical force and the occult sciences of the Chaldæans."³

The next point upon which I shall insist, is, that these primitive Zoroastrian Scyths are identical with the Nimrod of scripture. The name of Nimrod, in the book of Genesis, certainly represents the original inhabitants of Babylonia, before the immigration of the Semites. The title is in all probability a disguised Semitic plural (*Nimrut* from *Nimr*), and as *Nimr* is the special name of the hunting leopard, it may have been given to the Scyths by their Semitic neighbours, to denote their passion for the chase.⁴ At any rate,

¹ The name does not occur in the extract from Polyhistor given in the Armenian Eusebius, but has been preserved by Syncellus.

² See the extracts of Cephalion, collected from Syncellus and Moses of Chorene, in Müller's Fragments, Vol. III. p. 623. In Syncellus, the name is Ζωροάστρου μάγου; in Mos. of Chorene, "Zaravaste, mago Bactrianorum rege." In another passage of Moses, also from Cephalion (lib. i. c. 16), Zoroaster is called "the Magian chief of the Medes," and is said to have been placed in the government of Assyria by Semiramis.

³ Arnobius, it must be observed, where he quotes the first book of Ctesias, which, as we learn from Photius, treated exclusively of the Assyrian "origines," expressly terms Zoroaster a Bactrian; and it is almost certain, therefore, that the passage quoted in the text, which commences "Ut, inter Assyrios et Bactrianos, Nino quondam Zoroastreque ductoribus," must also be drawn from the same source. I mention this, as Ctesias has often been cited as an authority for placing Zoroaster under Darius Hystaspes. I shall have occasion to refer to the famous Zoroastrian passage of Arnobius in another place. In the first book of Stanley's Chaldee Philosophy, the subject of Zoroaster is treated with all the learning that belonged to the age in which it was written.

⁴ The objection to this etymology is, that the word "leopards" often occurs in the Assyrian inscriptions under the form of or that is, *Nimri*, whereas the ethnic title is written *Namri*, so that, if the two words were identical in their origin, their connection had been at any rate forgotten in later times.

Namra raba,¹ was a title used even by the later Chaldean kings, and the nation of the *Namri* are distinctly marked in the inscriptions as a Scythic race, who were cognate with the Elamites, and who inhabited the ranges of Zagros, from the lesser Zab to Susiana, during the period of the Assyrian supremacy. The direct connexion moreover of Zoroaster and Nimrod may be inferred from a multitude of authorities. According to one tradition, Orion being invoked, Zoroaster was consumed by fire, and apotheosized. According to another, Nimrod was worshipped by the Semites as Orion;² in fact the constellation is only known in Arabic astronomy to the present day, as *El Jabbar*, or "the Giant," the special epithet of Nimrod.³ Again, one of the most universal of the traditions regarding the primitive Zoroaster, was, that after his apotheosis, his ashes were preserved by the Babylonians and carried about as a palladium; indeed, according to a very ancient writer, the sacred relics were preserved to his day.⁴ In Greek mythology, these were supposed to be the ashes of Jupiter Enyalios,⁵ but if any explanation is to be obtained from the popular traditions of the East, the story must necessarily refer to Nimrod, who has been throughout Babylonia in all times the object of a general superstitious reverence. We may further compare the constant attribution to the first Zoroaster, of the institution of the fire-worship, with the legend which ascribed the same institution to Nimrod,⁶ as well as with the multitudinous

¹ This title, written as is distinctly seen on an alabaster vase belonging to *Naram Sin*, one of the primitive Chaldean kings, which has been lately obtained by Mons. Fresnel at Babylon. In the ordinary Chaldean titles, however, seems to constitute of itself a distinctive epithet; and I cannot, therefore, depend on its phonetic power.

² These traditions are to be found in the Paschal Chronicle, Cedrenus, and the Anonymous Chronicle prefixed to John of Malala.

³ Equivalent to the Hebrew גִּבּוֹר, *Gibbur*, which is the particular title given to Nimrod in Scripture.

⁴ See Paschal Chron. ed. Dind., p. 67; and compare the following page, where the ancient Assyrian traditions are given on the authority of an ancient writer named Σεμηρώνιος ὁ Βαβυλώνιος Πέρσης. Suidas, Cedrenus, and the anonymous chronologers repeat the same tradition.

⁵ See passage of Histiaeus in Müller's Frag., Vol. IV. p. 434, where, moreover, there is the remarkable phrase εἰς Σεναὰρ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας.

⁶ Οὗτος (i.e. Nimrod) διδάσκει Ἀσσυρίους σέβειν τὸ πῦρ—Pasc. Chron., p. 50. The most determinate proof, however, of the identity of Nimrod and Zoroaster is to be found in the common attribution to them of the invention of Astronomy, Astrology, Magic, and Genethialogy. See particularly Anon. Chron. (John of Malala), p. 17, where the description given of Nimrod is precisely that which ordinarily belongs to the primitive Chaldean Zoroaster.

local traditions which, wherever a mound of ashes is to be seen in Babylonia or the adjoining countries, attach to it the name of Nimrud, in pretended allusion to the furnace of Abraham,¹ but really referring, as I think, to the primitive fire-worship of the Zoroastrian Scythians.

I will now endeavour to show who these *Namri* or Babylonian Scythians really were, in regard to their ethnic relations. The Toldoth Beni Noah, which is undoubtedly the most authentic record we possess for the affiliation of those branches of the human race which sprung from the triple stock of the Noachidæ, assigns Nimrod to the family of Ham, as distinguished from the Arian and Semitic groupings; and further, brings the nation thus designated into immediate relation with the Egyptians, the Æthiopians, the Lybians, and the Canaanites.² Such authority, is I think, then, determinate for deriving all

¹ So at *Birs-i-Nimrud*, *Kuiha*, *Akkerkuf*, *Warka*, &c. The Arabs generally derived, no doubt, their knowledge of Nimrod and Abraham from the Koran; but the commentaries and geographical explanations of the very early traditionists, who drew their inspiration both from the Talmud and from local sources, prove that the legend must have existed in the country long before the Mohammedan conquest. I suspect, indeed, that the Jewish rabbis adopted their forced reading of "fire" for אֵשׁ אֱלֹהִים, in order to fall in with the current popular tradition which connected Nimrod with the fire-worship; and this reading is at least as old as the third or fourth century, as it was known to, and partially approved by, St. Jerome.

² In the mere sketch which I am now writing, I cannot of course enter upon any general discussion of primitive Noachide ethnography. Referring, however, to the four sons of Ham, Cush, Mizraim, Phut, and Canaan, I may note as follows: The sons of Cush in the Bible, excluding Nimrod, designate the original Scythic colonization of Arabia from Susiana, the traditions of these colonists having been well traced by Caussin de Perceval, in the first book of his *Hist. des Arabes*. Of Mizraim, or Egypt, I will only remark that the כְּשִׁלִּים (or *Χασμυρίαι* of the LXX), from whom sprung the Philistines, are certainly the race called in the inscriptions, who held all Southern Syria as a dependency of Egypt in the time of Tiglath Pileser I. (B.C. 1125). The reading of the name is doubtful, for, curiously enough according to the vocabularies, has the power of *khassu* as well as *khazma*: the concluding syllable is *nim*. *Phut*, although peopling Lybia, also left a large remnant in the mountains of Elymais; hence, *Cush* and *Phut* are joined with *Pars* in Ezek. xxxviii. 5; and the *Kushiyá* and *Putiyá* are associated in the inscriptions of Darius. The latter, whose Babylonian name was *Budu*, are the Median *Βούδιοι* of Herodotus. All the Canaanites were, I am satisfied, Scythians; and the inhabitants of Syria retained their distinctive ethnic character until quite a late period of history. According to the inscriptions, the *Khettá* or Hittites were the dominant Scythic race from the earliest times, and they gave way very slowly before the Aramæans, Jews, and Phœnicians, who were the earliest and probably the only extensive Semitic immigrants.

the above races from a common Scythic origin, however their linguistic affinities may have been subsequently weakened by a diversity of development, or by the infusion of foreign elements. How long the aboriginal Scyths may have held the dominion of Western Asia before they were dispossessed by the Semites, it is of course impossible to say. Berosus had apparently the same ancient fragments at his command, for writing the early history of his race, which were embodied by Moses in the book of Genesis; and thus he describes the cosmogony, the antediluvian generations, the flood, the building of the tower, and the confusion of tongues, not merely under the same general treatment, but often in the very words of the Hebrew text;¹ yet he did not venture, even with these materials, to define the period of the primæval Scythic supremacy. The præ-historic

The Hittite capital was at *Carchemish*; but this city had nothing to do with Circæssium at the mouth of the Khabor, as is generally presumed; it was on the Euphrates, immediately contiguous to Hierapolis. Hence, the Syrians translated Carchemish by *Mabog* (2 Chron. xxxv. 20), which latter title, moreover, was a regular Achæmenian compound for "Mother of the Gods," the famous *Dea Syria* of Lucian.

¹ Compare especially the ten antediluvian generations, the building of the ark, the sending out of the birds, the very connexion between Babel and the confusion of tongues, which, although no doubt a popular belief, is disproved by the cuneiform orthography *Bab-il*, "the gate of the God Il." This *Il* is no doubt the Ἥλος of Sanchoniathon, and as the name is expressed by the letter *ra*, I suspect an Egyptian origin, the same sign being used which would have been phonetically rendered *Ra* "the sun;" while the Semitic pronunciation was given of *el* or *il*, which may have been used by the primitive Semites for the same deity, though of this there is no proof. The god is almost unknown in the later Babylonian and Assyrian mythology.

I must also notice, in regard to the traditions of Berosus, that his *Xisuthrus* is, I think, to be recognized in the god which name, on the Tiglath Pileser Cylinder, replaces the ordinary or

interval between the flood and the establishment of a kingdom at Babylon, he was content to compute by the astronomical notation of Sari and Neri ; from the latter epoch alone, about the middle of the twenty-fifth century, B.C., did he attempt a definite chronology. Leaving it, therefore, still a matter of speculation whether the præ-historic period may be more correctly estimated at two thousand or four thousand years ;¹ I will only remark, that it must have been during this interval that nationalities were first established ; and that the aboriginal Scyths or Hamites appear to have been the principal movers in the great work of social organization. They would seem, indeed, simultaneously or progressively, to have passed in one direction by Southern Persia into India ; in another, through Southern Arabia to Æthiopia, Egypt, and Numidia. They must have spread themselves at the same time over Syria and Asia Minor, sending out colonies from one country to Mauritania, Sicily, and Iberia ; from the other, to the southern coasts of Greece and Italy. They further, probably, occupied the whole area of modern Persia, and thence proceeding to the north by Chalcis and the Caucasus, they penetrated to the extreme northern point of the European and Asiatic continents. It is well known to ethnographers, that the passage of the Scyths is to be traced along all these lines, either by direct historical tradition, or by the cognate dialects spoken by their descendants at the present day ; and it is further pleasing to remark that, if we were to be thus guided by the mere intersection of linguistic paths, and independently of all reference to the scriptural record, we should still be led to fix on the plains of Shinar, as the focus from which the various lines had radiated.

When I propose to class the multitude of nations here indicated in a common Scythic category, I do not pretend that a connexion can be established between them, either by direct historical evidence or by any positive test of philology. All that I maintain is, that certain special ethnic names have everywhere prevailed amongst them, and that, either from ancient monuments, or from tradition, or from the dialects now spoken by their descendants, we are authorised to infer that, at some very remote period, before the rise of the Semitic or Arian nations, a great Scythic population must have overspread Europe, Asia, and Africa, speaking languages all more or less dissi-

¹ Lepsius raises the historic period of Egypt at least as high as 4000 B.C. ; and Mons. Gobineau, in his excellent work "*Sur l'Inégalité des Races Humaines*" (tom. i. p. 367), assumes, as an established fact, that history is to be traced beyond the year 5000 B.C. When I speak of historic and præ-historic periods in this memoir, I refer especially to Semitic records.

milar in their vocabulary, but possessing in common, certain organic characteristics of grammar and construction. I will now briefly follow the various supposed lines of colonization. In Susiana, the chief seat of the Cush, we have the Scythic inscriptions of Susa and Elymais, and the Scythic names of *Kissia*, *Cossæa*, *Shus*, *Afar*, &c., not forgetting the traditions of the Æthiopian Memnon, and the Æthiopian Cepheus. Along the line to India, the Æthiopians of Southern Persia were known to Homer, Herodotus, and Strabo; the country east of Kerman, was named *Kusan*, throughout the Sassanian period; the *Brahui* division of the *Belús* rejoined their Cushite brethren in Mekran, by crossing from Arabia, and still speak a Scythic dialect; while the names of *Kooch* and *Belooch*, for *Kús* and *Belús*, remain to the present day. Then we have Indo-Scythia, at the mouth of the Indus, and the crowning fact, that all the aboriginal (?) and præ-Arian languages of India are of the Scythic stock. In the Arabian peninsula, traces of the old Cushite tongues are now almost extinct, but there is no tradition better supported than their existence at a not very remote period of history. I suspect, indeed, that there is a strong Scythic element in the Himyaric itself, and that the character is very ancient, since there is a Babylonian cylinder in the British Museum, with a Himyaric legend, which, from the style of art, cannot be later than the Achæmenian period. The passage of the Cush into Æthiopia probably took place at many different epochs; the name indeed occurs, I believe, on the Egyptian monuments, as early as the twelfth dynasty; and it is now well known, that some of the Abyssinian and neighbouring languages are of the Scythic or Hamite stock. In the ancient Egyptian itself, moreover, there is probably an original Scythic element overlaid by Semitic forms, and the same may be said of the Berber. I would further class what is called the *Tugga* character, in the bilingual inscriptions of Numidia, with those remarkable legends which have been found in Sicily and Cyprus, and which, to a certain extent, resemble the Celto-Iberian writings; all these alphabets, at any rate, are especially distinguished from the Phœnician, which was the only other universal type in the Mediterranean, and they must therefore belong to the primitive Scythic colonists. With regard to the Scythic line which spread into Europe by way of Syria and Asia Minor, I have to state, that almost all the early cuneiform names, both of men and countries, throughout Western Asia, seem to be Scythic: a few are Arian, but in the early times, Semitic influence, as far as I can ascertain, must have been very limited. With the exception of the Kenites, Kenizzites, and Kadmonites (and the Phœnicians from about

B.C. 1200), I take all the races of Syria mentioned in Scripture, as well as in the Egyptian and Assyrian inscriptions, to have been Scyths; and in Asia Minor, the only Arian nations which I recognise with any certainty, are Tubal and Meshech. From Syria the Scyths probably crossed to Cyprus and Sicily, Southern France and Iberia, this line of emigration being well marked in classic authors, and the modern Basque language attesting the Scythic origin of the Iberians. From Asia Minor, the great Scythic stream which passed into Europe, I suppose to have been Tyrrheno-Pelasgic, and I refer to the ancient Etruscans, and more doubtfully to the modern *Skipetars*, as a proof of the ethnic affinity of the early settlers. The whole Illyrian nation, indeed, including Macedonians, Epirotes, and Albanians, may have been of the true Scythic family, as distinguished from the Arian Hellenes. The Pelasgians were probably Scytho-Arians, as the Etruscans were Scytho-Semites; and in this distinction between the compound character of the barbaric element which prevailed respectively in Greek and Latin, we see perhaps the reason of the predominance of Semitisms in the latter language, as compared with the former.

For the Scythic population of Persia anterior to the Arian immigration, the inquiry which I am now pursuing into the true character of the Zoroastrian Medes affords the best argument. The Scythic version of the Achæmenian tablets, is alone an evidence of the utmost weight; and notwithstanding all Dr. Hincks has written to the contrary, I am persuaded that the groundwork of the language of the said inscriptions is also Scythic and not Arian. The modern Armenian has been subjected to a much greater degree of Arian influence, but even there the Scythic element is perceptible, while the modern Georgian is probably the direct representative of the ancient Scythic, spoken in the time of Herodotus by the *Cush* or *Æthiopians* of Chalcis. Remark also, that the Scyths introduced the same names of Albania and Iberia in this quarter, which their kindred colonists applied to Greece and Spain; Iberia being in all probability the very same name as *Abar* or *Avar*, which followed them in all their migrations. I put no faith whatever in the Chinese derivation of the Persian *Kushan*, nor in the arrival from the far east of the Scythians who subverted the Greek kingdom of Bactria. These tribes were in reality the descendants of the aboriginal Persian *Cush*, who preceded the Arians; and the Parthian empire, established with such extraordinary facility, was but the recovery of Scythic supremacy, which had been interrupted for a time by the Arian Achæmenides. Thus, Armenian historians always name the eastern Parthians *Kushan*, and acknowledge their own connexion with them. Moses of Chorene.

gives to each of the four great divisions of Persia, that is, to Media, Elymais, Persis, and even Aria, the generic name of *Kush*; and the *Kushan* are constantly mentioned by Firdousi as the aboriginal race. Even in modern Persian, the Scythic element is very clearly to be traced. I shall not pretend to pursue the steps of the Scyths beyond the Caucasus, but we have ample evidence of their progress in the languages still spoken in Europe by the Lapps, the Fins, the Esthonians, and the Magyars, as well as by the several divisions of the Ugrians in Asia, comprising the Woguls, Ostiaks, and at least one tribe of Samoyedes, and by the scanty and diminishing sections of the same nation on the west of the Volga, known to the Russians under the names of Mordwins, Cheremisses, Wotiaks, and Zyrianians. There is little in this sketch, I believe, which is new to ethnography, but it will serve to explain my general view of the ethnic affinities of the Persian Scyths.

To return, however, to the more particular illustration of the Babylonian Scyths; I would remark in the first place on the name of Medes, which Berosus gives to the particular branch or sect that established a kingdom at Babylon, in the twenty-fifth century B.C.; a name, moreover, which in other authors, in allusion to a common Zoroastrian faith, is constantly replaced by Bactrians. Now the Medes and Bactrians of a later age were undoubtedly Arians; but I fully believe that, at the period of which Berosus is writing, the countries known to the Greeks as Media and Bactria, were really inhabited by Scyths.

The *Namri*, at any rate, whom I take to be the descendants of the præ-Semitic Babylonians, held, during the period of Assyrian supremacy, the entire range of Zagros, together with the conterminous territory of Media; and to prove their ethnic relationship, I state the following facts: the *Namri*, in the inscriptions, are always joined with the Elymæans;¹ *Humba-negas*, indeed, the contemporary of Sargon, was king of the two nations,² and the Elymæan inscriptions, both from Susa and from Elymais Proper, are most positively in a Scythic dialect. Again, Mr. Norris has shown good reason for assigning the

¹ Thus, the King of Babylon assembles against *Shamas-phul*, on one side the Aramæans and Chaldeans, on the other the Elymæans and *Namri*. It must be confessed that, on the Nimrud obelisk, the kings of the *Namri* have Semitic names, that is, names compounded of the Assyrian gods; and the same remark applies in some cases to the kings of Elymais; but I suspect that these are instances of a foreign nomenclature, or that the Assyrians translated the Scythic vernacular names. At any rate, in the inscriptions of Susa and Elymais, the name of a Semitic god has never yet been found.

² This association is not clearly given in the published inscriptions of Khur-sabad; but on Mons. Place's new cylinders of Sargon it is distinctly stated.

Scythic version of the famous trilingual Achæmenian records to a people who were either identical, or immediately cognate, with the inhabitants of Susiana or Elymais; since, in the catalogue of the Satrapies, the country named 'Uwaj (or *Khuz* خوز) in the Persian, and *Elam* in the Babylonian,¹ is the only name which is replaced in the Scythic column by an independent geographical title, that title being *Afarti*; a still more important fact, however, is, that in the same catalogue, the Babylonian name which replaces the Persian *Saká* or Σάκα, and which, misled by the doubtful form of the initial letter, I formerly read as *Gimiri*, and proposed to identify with the Κιμῆριοι, turns out, on a nearer inspection of the cuneiform text, to be the identical ethnic title of *Nammiri*, with which the independent inscriptions of Assyria have already rendered us so familiar. One division of these *Sacæ* or *Nammiri* are also placed in the Nakhsh-i-Rustam catalogue, as the immediate neighbours of the Babylonians and Assyrians, and they are further designated by the specific title of *Tigra Khuda* in the Persian, *Rappa* in the Babylonian, that is "the archers," in apparent allusion to the old national characteristic of a passion for the chase.²

¹ I may here mention that in one of my vocabularies the phonetic power of *Elam* is assigned to the character , and that there is accordingly no longer any doubt as to the Babylonian name of Susiana.

This correction was first brought to my notice by Mr. Norris, who discovered the error in copying, by pantograph, the Babylonian paper casts of the Bisitun Inscription deposited with the Royal Asiatic Society; and, on referring to my own note book, I found that I had in both passages copied the initial letter for the Babylonian name of the *Sacæ* as , which is equivalent to the Assyrian , but had afterwards altered the form to , on the authority of Westergaard and Tasker's copies of the Babylonian tablet at Nakhsh-i-Rustam. I have no doubt now but that or is the true form of the initial sign.

² The Babylonian is probably to be compared with רַב־יָ, "archers," in Job, xvi. 13, and perhaps רַב־יָ נִלְוָה has the same meaning in Gen. xxi. 20. Compare also the names of *Sarançæ* and *Comani*, both signifying "archers," and the general name of "the nation of archers" applied by the Armenians to the Tartars. See St. Martin's *Armenia*, tom. II. p. 439.

Before quitting the subject of the *Namri*, I must give some further illustrations of their habitat and their connexion with the *Sacæ*. In the Assyrian Inscriptions they are usually the first nation met with after crossing the lesser Zab and approaching the mountain barrier of Zagros (compare the expeditions of the 16th, 25th, and 31st year of the Assyrian king on the Nimrud Obelisk). Their principal settlement, therefore, was in the modern plain of *Sheherizor*; and here, at the time of the Arab conquest, the capital, now marked by the extensive ruins of *Yassin Teppéh*, was still named *Nimrah*. It is true that the early Arab

To trace in any detail the ethnic relations of the Babylonian Scyths would occupy more time than I can conveniently spare; but I must at any rate note a few of the leading points which refer to them. Their connection with Egypt on the one hand, and with

geographers, Ibn Khordadbeh, &c., who were always seeking for Persian etymologies, read this name as *nīm az rāī*, and pretended it was so called from being half-way between the fire-temple of *Shiz* (or Ganzaca) and Ctesiphon; but I consider this explanation to be certainly spurious, and prefer regarding *Nimrah* as a genuine relic of the old Scythic inhabitants.

Again, there is no doubt but that the title *Nim-rux* (*meridies*) was applied to countries by the Persians of the Sassanian age, to denote a southern position (see Bún-dehesh, Moses Chorenensis, and Maasudi); but this geographical indication will by no means explain the application of the name of *Nimrox* to the province of Seistan, which was in fact to the east or north-east of all the great Persian settlements. Bearing in mind, then, that Seistan, Segestan, or *Σακαστήνη*, was inhabited by the Sacæ division of the Persian Scyths, at least as early as the time of Isidore of Charax, does it not seem probable that the title of *Nimrus* is a mere corruption of the Scythic name of *Namri*, nearly, in fact, reproducing the biblical form of *Nimrod*? The ethnic affinity of these Sacæ is at any rate proved by their association with the Scythic *Kushan* to the north and the Scythic *Turan* and *Kusan* immediately to the south; and it is certainly, therefore, not a little curious to find them designated by the same name which is applied to the Persian *Saká* in the Babylonian version of the Achæmenian tablets. My own idea of the connexion between the *Namri* and *Sacæ* is simply this, that the names were given to the Scythian "hunters" by the Semites and Arians respectively, to denote their passion for the chase, the one race using as a type the *hunting leopard*, and the other the *hunting dog*. I will mention, at any rate, another instance of the association of the leopard and dog, which may be accidental, but which certainly seems to me worthy of being noticed. St. James of Seruj, describing the idols which were anciently worshipped at Edessa, Harran, and in the neighbouring countries, assigns Bel and Nebo to the former place, and *Sin* and *Beel Shemin*, or "the moon and sun" to the latter; he then goes on, "*ba bar Nimra va Mari di Kalbuti, Tarata va Gadlat*." Assemani supposes all these to be names of Chaldean idols at Harran, and accordingly translates "the leopard son (Bacchus), the dog lords Tarata and Gadlat;" but I take *Bar Nimra* and *Mari di Kalbuti* to be geographical names, to denote, that is, the tribes who worshipped Atargatis and Gadlat, or Venus and Diana, two particular deities being throughout assigned to each locality. If it be so, then *Bar Nimra*, or the "leopard sons," will be the Scythian *Nimri*, and *Mari di Kalbuti* will be the "Sacan Medes," who may, at the time in question, have inhabited the skirts of Taurus. At any rate, the Chaldeans of Harran, whose books we still have, certainly never worshipped "leopards" or "dogs;" and if the names, therefore, in St. James do really designate idols, they were the personifications of the ancient Scythic tribes. The Syriac passage is further of interest in giving us the true orthography (𐤀𐤍𐤓𐤕) of the Greek Atargatis, which also occurs in the Talmud (De Idol. c. 1, f. 11, b) as תרעתא. The Syriac *Tar'atá* and *Gadlat* are no doubt the two supreme goddesses of the Inscriptions, >>𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤀 and >>𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤀𐤌𐤁𐤁𐤀, to adopt the most common types of expression; but there is no reason to suppose that the Syriac names were used at Nineveh and Babylon. On the contrary, Venus was almost

tion to Africa did in reality take place about the same period, for the Arab traditions of the movements of the Cush (immediately cognate be it remembered both with Nimrod and Mizraim) before the settlement of the Semitic Joctanides in Arabia, and the Egyptian traditions of the Shepherd invasion, are singularly in accordance with such a theory, both chronologically and in the employment of certain characteristic ethnic names. To the connexion of the Elamites and *Namri*, or of Cush and Nimrod, I have more than once referred. These Elamites I have further stated to bear in the Achæmenian age the vernacular title of *Afar* or *Avar*,¹ and I have now to add that at an earlier period they had also the vernacular title of *Shus*, which indeed they imposed upon their capital.² If then we find that at the exact period of history when we can shew the *Namri* and Elamites to have been displaced from Babylonia by Semitic races, Scythic tribes bearing the names of *Shos* and *Avar* swarmed into Egypt and supplanted the native rulers, it is surely only reasonable to connect the two events together. I leave, however, to the appreciation of professed Egyptologists, this identification of the barbarian *Shos* or *Hyc-sos*, and their famous capital of *Avaris*, with the Scythic *Shus* and *Avars* of Elymais and Babylonia, merely drawing attention, firstly to the fact that the city of *Avaris* (a sacred name)³ is stated to have been built as a protection against the growing power of the Semites, and secondly, to the identical juxtaposition of the same two names in a later age, at another principal point of Scythic settlement. I allude to the *Kushan* of Khorassan, and to their capital city, which in the time of Alex-

¹ For Mr. Norris's opinion on the *Afar* of Susiana, see Journ. R. A. S., vol. XV. p. 3 and 164. The Amardi of the Greeks may have been a branch of the same Scythic family; but I doubt myself that there was any close or immediate connexion between them and the *Afar* of Susiana. I see traces of the latter name in the אֶפְרַסְכִּיָּא and the אֶפְרַסְתִּכִּיָּא of Ezra v. 6, and iv. 9, these compounds being probably "the Sacan Afar" and "the Afar of Sittace." *Afrunijeh*, the ancient name of Wasit, may be derived from the same source; and there is also an *Abara* in the Peutingerian Table near the site of, if not identical with, Niffer.

² In the Scythic inscription of Susa, the name of , *Susinaga*, occurs in almost every line—compare Heb. שִׁשְׁנִיָּא of Ezra iv. 9. The Assyrians wrote simply *Sushan*, like the Heb. שֹׁשַׁן.

³ Mons. Caussin de Perceval (Hist. des Arabes, tom. i. p. 13) has already remarked on the evident connexion between the Arab traditions of the conquest of Egypt by *Sheddád*, and his residence at *Awar*, the after site of Alexandria, with Manetho's account of the Hycsos invasion, and the building of the city of *Avaris*, so named ἀπὸ τινὸς ἀρχαίας θεολογίας.

ander bore the name of Σούσα; but which was afterwards known as *Abar shahar* or the city of the *Avars*; the title of *Nishapoor*, by which it is designated at present, dating only from the time of the Sassanians.¹

It would extend too much this preliminary inquiry into the predecessors of the Semites in Babylon, if I were to pursue the ramified migrations of the Cush, or to trace in any detail the connection of the various tribes and races who gave the Greek name of Ethiopia to the country of their settlement; this name being found, as it is well known, in ancient times, in Southern Persia and in India, in Susiana, Arabia, and Abyssinia, at Colchis upon the Euxine, in Southern Syria, along the northern coasts of Africa, and even in Spain. Nor is the subject, however interesting, immediately related to the present inquiry, for the Cush or Elamites, although of a kindred stock, were not identical with the Babylonian Scyths. Of more importance is it to show the real nature of the connexion between these Scyths and the Medes, to which I have more than once alluded. From the Toldoth Beni Noah it is only fair to infer that the Japhetic races were spread very extensively over Northern Persia and Asia Minor, and that they had even penetrated into Europe, at least as early as the diffusion of the Scyths;—Slavonians, Medes, Armenians, and Greeks, are recognised in Genesis among the offshoots of this race, and two other great divisions, Tubal and Meshech, which are named in the same list,² retained their primitive seats along the range

¹ I have noticed the ancient ethnic relationship of the *Kushan* of Khorassan in a preceding note, and now add a few words regarding their later history. Under the disguised Chinese form of *Kwei-shwang* they are well known to Indian numismatists, being the particular race who, under the name of the Kadphises dynasty, occupied Afghanistan about the period of the Christian era. In the title of *Kajoulo* we have probably a trace of the ethnic name, and *Korsoko* is the very epithet which, according to Solinus, these Scyths applied to their Persian neighbours. The point, however, on which I particularly insist is, that the successive tribes of Scythians who overran Bactria and Upper India, between the Greek conquest and the era of Islam, were the aborigines of Persia, and did not come from the frontiers of China. The *Ssus* of the Chinese are the *Shus* or *Shos*, who had their capital at Σούσα in the time of Alexander. The Ἀσίοι (perhaps the *Azes* of the coins and *Asvas* of the Puranas) may be the Ἀσσία τῶν μεγάλων Ἰνδῶν, the name given to Eastern Persia by the Zoroastrian Scyths, according to the legend in the Paschal Chronicle. At any rate, the *Toxaroi*, joined with the *Asii* and *Sacrauli* by Strabo, and also mentioned by Trogus Pompeius, were settled in the Armenian mountains in the time of Sennacherib. It is only, indeed, through Persia that a Semitic alphabet, and the Semitic worship of *Nanaia* or *Venus*, could have been introduced into Bactria by the Scythic invaders.

² See the names of Gomer, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, Ashkenaz, and Togarmah, Gen. x. 2, 3.

of Taurus, until a late period of the Assyrian empire.¹ The Medes, however, though sprung from a Japhetic source, must have been, I think, at a very early period merged in the overpowering masses of their Scythic neighbours; at any rate, when they first appear in history they are not to be distinguished from true Scythians, and they seem moreover to have retained all the characteristics of the family of their adoption, both as to manners, language, and religion, until at a late epoch of history they were to a certain extent re-Arianized by contact with the Persians, and perhaps by the junction of fresh colonies from the east.

The identity of the Zoroastrian Medes with the Nimrod of Scripture, has been already suggested upon strong authority; but there are even stronger arguments remaining to prove the general Scythic character of the race. In the first place, when Herodotus states that the ancient name of Media was Aria, I cannot at all admit the connexion which is generally assumed between this title and the *Aryavarta* of India, for there is nothing whatever to show that the term Arian was used by the Greeks, either ethnically or geographically, in the sense in which we now employ it, before the time of Alexander. It seems to me far more probable that at the remote epoch to which Herodotus alludes, Aria must have been used as synonymous, or at any rate as a kindred term, with *Nimr*, and in this conjecture I am supported by a very remarkable passage of the Arab historian Massoudi, who is a most excellent authority on the subject of ancient oriental traditions. In explaining the application to the city of Babylon of the name of *Iran-Sheher*, he observes that, according to some, the true orthography should be *Arian-sheher*, which signifies in Nabathæan, "the city of Lions," and that this name of Lion designated the kings of Assyria, who bore the general title of Nimrud.² Another

¹ There is no geographical indication better established in the inscriptions of Assyria, than the location of the and that is, the *Tuplai* and *Muskai*, in the countries which intervened between Syria and Cappadocia.

Kummukha, or *Κωμυγήνη*, was a part of *Muska*; and the king of this country, who paid tribute to Tiglath Pileser II., was named *Kustaspa*, which is evidently an Arian compound. The kings of the Moschi and Commagene, who contended with Tiglath Pileser I. (about B.C. 1130), have names of a very uncertain etymology, but which cannot possibly be Semitic; they are—1st, *Kililleru*, son of *Kalilleru*, son of *Isarupin-Sihusun*; and 2ndly, *Shadilleru*, son of *Khatukhin*.

² For this important extract from Massoudi's *Tenbih*, see Notice des Manu-

proof of Median and Scythic amalgamation is to be drawn from the application of the title which the Medes held among their Arian neighbours. This title was usually written *Mar*,¹ and it gave rise, no doubt, not only to the Persian traditions of Zohák and his snakes, but to the Armenian traditions also of the dragon dynasty of Media, the word *Már* مار having in Persian the signification of "a snake." Hence then are we to explain the assimilation by Sallust of the names of *Mauri* and *Medi*, in the tradition of the Median colonization of Mauritania,² which he substitutes for the Æthiopian colonization of Ephorus; and hence too it may be inferred that the Mauri whom the Argonauts found at Colchis,³ and the Mares whom Herodotus places in the same vicinity, were Scythian Medes associated with Scythic Æthiopians.

There is nothing positive to be ascertained from the Assyrian inscriptions with regard to the ethnic relations of the early Medes. Neither in the annals of Tiglath Pileser I. (about B.C. 1130), nor in those of *Asshur-akh-pal*, nearly three centuries later, does the name of the Medes occur, although the eastern expeditions of those monarchs are described beyond the mountain barrier of Assyria.⁴ The name of *Mád* is first met with in the eastern wars of Shalman, at the close of the eighth century B.C., and it is there applied to a race dwelling

scrips, tom. VIII. p. 148. It is, indeed, all the more interesting to find this assimilation of *Arian* with *Nimrud*, that Massoudi himself was evidently not aware of the connexion between מַר and מָר.

¹ See Moses of Chorene, lib. ii. c. 43, and, in fact, all the Armenian historians and geographers. The dragon race of Media is also constantly mentioned in Moses of Chorene, from the old traditions.

² "Barbará linguá Mauros pro Medis appellantes."—Sall. de Bell. Jugurth.

³ Argonaut. verse 742. For the Æthiopians or Scyths of Colchis, see all the authorities collected by Bochart, Phaleg., lib. iv. c. 31; and in Larcher's Herodotus, tom. II. p. 373.

⁴ The names of the countries subdued by Tiglath Pileser beyond the mountains to the east are difficult to be read, and absolutely unknown in later history. They are—

𐎶. 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵- 𐎶𐎵
 𐎶. 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵
 𐎶. 𐎶 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵= and
 𐎶. 𐎶 𐎶𐎵 𐎶𐎵

Asshur-akh-pal crossed the mountains more to the south, after ravaging Upper Babylonia, and perhaps, therefore, never entered Media Proper.

beyond the *Namri* and adjoining the *Bartsa*.¹ The same habitat is assigned to the Medes, both in the annals of *Shamas Phul*, who was the son of Shalman, and in the disjointed fragments which we alone possess of the conquests of Tiglath Pileser II., who established the lower dynasty of Assyria in B.C. 747.² Under the later kings the notices of the Medes are more full and satisfactory. Sargon conducted two expeditions against them, and founded cities in their country. Media is first characterized at this period as *rukuta* or "the remote," the title being the same which is borne by Judæa, and an indication being thus afforded of the eastern and western limits of the Assyrian empire. Media is further stated in all the inscriptions of Sargon, to be a dependency of *Bikni*,³ which latter country was also famous for a valuable mineral product. When Sennacherib records his reception of tribute from Media, he especially notes that it was a country which had never been brought in subjection to Assyria by the kings his fathers; and this same testimony to Median

¹ The *Bartsa* seem to have dwelt between the *Namri* and the Medes (See Nimrud Obelisk, ls. 120 and 185). I now question whether this name can represent the Persians. The first authentic notice of the Persians is, I think, in a late inscription of Sennacherib, where the *Partsu* are associated with the Elymæans, as allies of the Chaldeans and Aramæans, in an attempt made by the son of Merodach Baladan to drive out the governor who had been placed by the Assyrian king in charge of Babylonia.

² What I particularly remark in the geographical nomenclature of Media is the constant use of *kin* or *kind*, evidently as a prefix or affix of locality; and as this same term was further extensively used among the nations of Asia Minor, I compare it with the Turkish *kend*, rather than with the Semitic .

³ If the name of this country is really to be read *Bikni*, I can offer no possible explanation of it. In some passages, however, the last letter is , and if this form be correct, the entire name will be *Bikrat*, which nearly answers to the *Vaekeret* of the Vendidad, denoting, as I think, Khorassan. I may also observe that the stone . for which *Bikni* or *Bikrat* was celebrated (see B. M. Series, p. 24, l. 9), is almost certainly the lapis lazuli, as it applies to the enamelled bricks of Babylon and Nineveh; and this product no doubt came to Assyria from Khorassan or Bactria.

I should wish to read the word as *Khasmat*, and thus to compare the Babylonian name for the lapis lazuli with the Egyptian *Chesbet*; but I am not sure that has in any case the power of *Khas*. According to the ordinary power of the letters we might read either *Khamat* or *Khasat*, but I still lean to *Khasmat*. The lapis lazuli was taken to Egypt from Babylon.

independence is twice repeated by Esarhaddon.¹ Again, during the reign of the son of Esarhaddon, of whose annals we have numerous fragments, Media appears to have remained at peace with Assyria, and I put no faith therefore either in the Median history of Ctesias, nor even in the narrative of Herodotus, so far as regards the Median revolt and the first two kings Dejoces and Phraortes.²

It was Cyaxares, probably, who, at the head of a new immigration from the eastward, re-established an Arian supremacy over the Scythic Medes, and afterwards invaded Assyria with the united forces

¹ See B. M. Series, p. 24, 10, and 25, 22. The Sennacherib passage is in the 34th line of Grottefend's Cylinder.

² There is a *Daiukka* carried off from Armenia by Sargon, and placed in Hamath; but no other name occurs at all resembling *Δηϊόκης* in the annals of Sargon, although, according to the dates of Herodotus, they must have been contemporaries. It seems to me, indeed, that Herodotus has fallen into the same error in distinguishing *Δηϊόκης* and *Ἀσπράγης*, which we find in the Zend Avesta itself, where the name of "the biting snake," personifying Media,—which is given in the Vendidad in full as *Ajīs dahāka* (in the nom.), is abbreviated to *Dahāka* alone, in the hymn to the god *Homa*: the same tradition, however, of the destruction of the snake by *Thritaon* or *Feridun*, which typifies the transfer of power from the Medes to the Persians, applying to both the names (see *Journal As.* 1844, p. 498). By the Dejoces of Herodotus, I understand the genuine Median nation, the *Mar* or snakes; and I further suspect that he took his *Phraortes* from the *Frawartish* of Bisitun, who was the antagonist of Darius Hystaspes, and did really gain great advantages over the Persians. I am supported, indeed, in this explanation, not only by the negative evidence of the Assyrian inscriptions, during the supposed reigns of Dejoces and Phraortes, but by the fact that Diodorus substitutes the name of Cyaxares for the Dejoces of Herodotus, and by the remarkable boast of both the rebel leaders, *Frawartish* of Media, and *Chitralakhma* of Sagartia, that they were of the race of *Huwakhshatra*, or Cyaxares, in allusion, as it would seem, to the well-known chief of some great and recent Arian immigration. The Sagartii were a race who, according to Herodotus, spoke the same language as the Achæmenian Persians; but they inhabited far to the east of the Caspian Gates, and at first sight, therefore, it seems difficult to understand how a native Sagartian could have claimed to be of the blood royal of Media. If we assume, however, that the great Arian immigration took place in the first half of the seventh century B.C., everything comes out satisfactorily. Achæmenes, the leader of the Persian division, was the fifth ancestor of Darius Hystaspes. Cyaxares, or *Huwakhshatra*, leader of a cognate division of Sagartians, was the third ancestor of Cyrus. The former turned to the south and took possession of Persis; the latter proceeded due west from Khorassan, leaving colonies along the mountains south of the Caspian, and gradually established an Arian supremacy over the Scythic Medes, an event for which we have the direct authority of Herodotus himself. All this is singularly in accordance both with the line of immigration indicated in the Vendidad, and with the traditions of Feridun at Damawend and along the Elburz. It further, too, explains a host of difficulties, not only in regard to dates, but with respect to the linguistic and religious relationship of the Medes and Persians of history.

of the two races. If, indeed, we compare the statement of Herodotus, regarding the relative position of the Scyths and Medes, with the identification already established between the Namri and the Sacæ, and the undoubted evidence of the location of the former race along the mountain barrier of Assyria and Babylonia during all the later period of the Assyrian empire, we cannot help seeing that the Scythic must have been the old and predominating element in Media, and the Arian the new infusion¹; and if we further observe that in the Greek writers from the time of Alexander downwards, the Sacæ and Cadusii are so mixed up with the Northern Medes as to be absolutely undistinguishable from them, while there is the not less important fact that the second column of the tri-lingual inscriptions of the Achæmenidæ, which has hitherto for many good and sufficient reasons borne the title of Median, is now found to be written in a bonâ-fide Scythic dialect, and to be evidently addressed as their vernacular language to the general mass of the subjects of the Great King, as distinguished from the native Persians and the conquered Babylonians; the scheme which I have proposed for defining the ethnic affinities of the Medes really seems to afford the only explanation possible.

But there is still another corroboration of this scheme to be drawn from the Zoroastrian religion and from the native traditions of Persia. Magism, or the faith of Zoroaster, which prevailed at Babylon before the establishment of Chaldæan power,² and which was maintained in

¹ It is probable, indeed, that this connexion of the Scyths with the earlier Medes is indicated by the name of their king, *Madyas*, who was the antagonist of *Cyaxares*; and it may be further observed that the building of *Aghatana* by *Dejoces* is a mere type of astronomical Magism, the seven walls being the seven concentric spheres of the heavens, each ruled by its dominant planet, and characterized by its particular colour. That a nation, moreover, which held all Asia in subjection, and was strong enough to march from Assyria to Palestine in order to attempt the conquest of Egypt, should have been suddenly annihilated at a small dinner party, is a fiction so gross that it could hardly have imposed even on the credulity of Herodotus.

² In order to explain more fully the view which I take of the primitive Zoroastrian faith, of its relationship on the one hand to Theism, before the latter merged into idolatry, and on the other to Dualism, and of the respective attribution of these three faiths in Western Asia to the Scyths, Semites, and Arians, I venture to append some further illustrations in a note. Moses of Chorene (p. 17), after quoting the Berosian Sybil and some old Greek traditions of Olympiodorus, states, as a well-known fact, that the people of the east termed *Zeruan*, *Sim* or *Shem*; and that the memory of the conflict between the three Noachide brothers, and the rise of their respective names, were preserved in the popular songs of Armenia to his day. Now *Zeruan* is, as I have said before, in all probability, the *Ziru-banit* of the inscriptions, which is the ordinary epithet of *Bel*, or *Belus*, evidently the prototype of the Semitic race. At the same time, a host of ancient traditions, both

Persia and Media up to the period of the Achæmenian supremacy, was certainly the special religion of the Scyths, and was antagonistic both

Christian and Talmudic (collected by Bochart, Phaleg. col. 204; and Stanley, Chald. Philosoph., p. 760), identified the Greek Zoroaster with Ham. I therefore think it almost certain that *Zerwan* and *Zoroaster* are antithetical names applied to the Semites and Scyths. To explain the name of Zoroaster, or *Ziru-ishtar*, I further observe that, during the conflict of the brothers, their sister *Asteria* conveyed away the children of one of them to the far east, or the borders of Bactria. (The sybil says this of *Shem*; but I understand it of Ham.) Here, then, we have the exact word *Ziru-ishtar*, or "the seed of Asteria," for the primitive Noachide race which emigrated from Babylonia to Bactria; and we have further an admirable illustration of the Greek traditions, which connected Zoroaster, the founder of the Magian religion, on one side with Bactria, and on the other with the Hamite Nimrod in Babylonia.

Pursuing this subject, I conjecture that there was to a certain extent an interchange of knowledge and religious tenets between the Scyths and Semites before their final separation. The Zoroastrians must have imparted the elements of Magism and astronomy to the Chaldeans, while they received from them the worship of *Bel Ziru-bani*, typifying time. Hence, there is to be explained the Greek identification of Belus, the father of Ninus, with *Κρόνος*; and hence we may see the origin of the confusion of *Zerwan* with Zoroaster, as well as the reason why *Zerwan* signified "time" in Zend (no satisfactory Sanscrit etymology having been found); and how it happened that *Zerwan*, as the type of a pure theism, came to be irregularly amalgamated with dualism in the religion of the Parsees. A radical and irreconcilable distinction between theism and dualism, or the religion of *Zerwan* and the religion of Zoroaster, is perceptible in all the Greek and Armenian accounts of the Magian faith, as well as throughout the pages of the *Zendavesta*. Among later inquirers, Sheheristani alone seems to have understood this distinction in classifying the three divisions of *Magi* as *Zerwainiyyeh*, or worshippers of infinite time; *Zoroastrians*, or true magi; and *Thanawiyyeh*, or dualists; these divisions being referable to three primitive sources—Semitic theism, before the introduction of idolatry; the Scythic worship of the elements; and the Oromasdian faith of the Arian Achæmenides. See, on this really interesting subject, the second chapter of Wilson's *Parsi Religion*; note on *Zerwan*, in Brockhaus's *Vendidad*; Burnouf, in *Jour. As.*, 1845, Avril, p. 275; St. Martin's *Armenia*, vol. II. p. 477, &c.

Whilst on the subject of the famous *Zarwan akarana*, or "time without bounds," regarding whom so much has been written with really so little success, I must add an illustration from the inscriptions which, for the present, can be received only as a conjecture, but to which, nevertheless, I attach some importance. The winged and horned bulls of Assyria are, perhaps, sometimes indicated by the words which are read phonetically by Dr. Hincks as *illip illil*, or the bull idols; but admitting even the correctness of the application of the names, I see very little for, and very much against, this reading. In one of my vocabularies, is explained by in the singular, and in the plural; that is, *lamsu* and *lamassu*, to which I cannot assign any Semitic equivalent. In another passage, however, the

to the idolatry of the Semites and the Dualism of the Arians. The religion described by Herodotus (Clio. C, 131), is not that of the Oromazdian Persians, but of the Zoroastrian Scyths.¹ The early Achæmenians evidently abhorred Magism; Cambyzes on his death-bed invoked his native gods to prevent the restoration of power to

explanation of $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{III}$ is given as $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{III}$ that is *khallu*, which may be derived from חָלַץ (Hiph. "to make strong"), or from עָלָץ "to exult." The second term $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{I}$ is explained by $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{I}$ or $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{I}$ that is, *karan* in the singular, and *karanu* in the plural; and it seems to refer both to "time" and to a class of animals, otherwise represented by $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{I}$. I conjecture, therefore, that *karan* is the Hebrew קָרָן, and signifies, as in Arabic, both "a horn" and "time" or "eternity," typified by horns. Is not then, this *karan* the Greek κρόνος (so written when referring to Belus)? and is not *Zerwan akarana* "Zerwan the horned," rather than merely "time without bounds"? I do not certainly suppose the Nineveh bulls to represent the image of $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{II}$ or *Bel-Ziru-banit*; but they may have been emblems of strength and eternity, and have been thus named *lamassu karanu*. As a further evidence that $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{I}$ refers to [horned] animals, I would also draw Dr. Hincks's attention to the fact that, on the Sennacherib bulls, the title is constantly replaced by $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{I}$ that is, I think, "beasts of the field," $\gg\text{I}$ being a determinative generally used for [horned] goats, and $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{I}$ or $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{I}$ *saddi* or *siddi*, being a well-known word answering to the Hebrew שָׂדִים or שְׂדֵה.

It need not at all surprise us to find *karan*, "time," answering to the Greek κρόνος, when we observe the near identity between the Babylonian $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{III}$ *khuratsu*, "gold," and χρυσός, and a host of other examples. The connexion which I have sought to establish between the winged and horned bulls of Nineveh and Persepolis, and the *Zerwan akarana* of later times is a more important and interesting matter. I would suggest even that Darius Hystaspes gladly admitted the horned type of eternity into his palace at Persepolis, notwithstanding his hostility to the magi, because *Zerwan*, or *Ziru-banit*, was of Semitic origin, and did not form an essential part of Magism as it then stood. This intricate question, however, will not be properly understood until we ascertain the meaning of the Assyrian word which is written $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{II}$ or $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{II}$ or $\gg\text{I}$ $\gg\text{II}$ $\gg\text{II}$ *banit* or *panit*, and thus obtain an insight into the mythic genealogy of Belus.

¹ I cannot too much insist on the importance of this remarkable notice of Herodotus, and on the striking contrast which his description exhibits both to the religion indicated in the Achæmenian records and to the dualistic faith afterwards known to the Greeks as Magism.

the Magian Medes.¹ The usurpation of the Magian impostor involved a religious as much as a political revolution; and the first care of Darius, on regaining the crown, was to restore the temples which his predecessor had destroyed, and to re-organize the Oromazdian priesthood with their chaunts and ceremonial service.² The slaughter of the Magi, indeed, which followed on this occasion, was celebrated by the Dualistic Persians for long afterwards as a national festival, during which the proscribed race were unable to show themselves in the streets.³ It is further to be observed that Herodotus expressly includes the Magi among the tribes of Media; that Zoroaster is also generally designated by the Greeks as a Mede, or a Medo-Assyrian, or a Medo-Persian;⁴ and lastly, that the popular legends, which have almost always a foundation in truth, are unanimous in ascribing to Azerbaijan or Northern Media, the origin of the fire worship, and in regarding it as the chief seat of the Zoroastrian religion; notwithstanding that the historical records preserved in the commencing chapter of the Vendidad, distinctly show that the immigrants to whom the records belonged came from the far east,⁵ (probably from India itself,) bringing of course their peculiar doctrines with them; and notwithstanding that in this depository of the ancient national traditions, not only is Media under its own name altogether unnoticed, but there is proof perhaps afforded that at the time of their compilation, the Arians had not come geographically in contact with the Western Medes, nor had Dualism been tainted with Magism. I will

¹ Thalia, c. 65.

² See Bisitun Inscriptions, col. I. par. 14.

³ Herodotus, Thalia, c. 79. The festival is also mentioned by Ctesias and Agathias.

⁴ Observe, too, that Dino, the father of Clitarchus, and the oldest certain writer among the Greeks on the subject of Magism, describes in the same terms the incantations with the divining rod practised by the Scythian Magians and the Medes. (Schol. Nicand. Ther. 613.) From all the fragments, indeed, of Dino that have survived (see Müller's Fragments, vol. II. p. 88), I should suppose that he treated exclusively of pure Magism, and did not take any note of the dualistic heresy. I quote Dino as the earliest Greek author on the subject, because it is doubtful whether the first Alcibiades, where the notice occurs of the Magic of *Ζωροάστρου τοῦ Ὀρομάζου*, be really Plato's.

⁵ For the native traditions regarding the fire-worship in Azerbaijan, and the birth of Zoroaster in that country, see my Memoir on the Atropatenian Ecbatana, in the Royal Geographical Society's Journal, vol. VIII.

The most westerly position that can be certainly identified in the first Fargard of the Vendidad, is *Raga* or Rhages. It is possible that *Varene*, "the squared," where *Thrithaon* destroyed *Aj-dahak*, may be the capital of Media Atropatene, the *Vera* or *Bárig* of the Greeks; but the tradition of the transfer of power from the Medes to the Persians, or the defeat of Astyages by Cyrus at Ecbatana, was more

only add the following remark, that the Median engravers who executed the Scythic version of the great inscription of Bisitun, so well understood the difference between Arian Dualism and Scythic Magism, that when they had to speak of Ormazd in connexion with other gods, they interpolated after the name the distinctive epithet of "God of the Arians."

It remains, before closing this digression on the religion of the Medes, to explain briefly the view which I take of the respective and independent development of Magism and Dualism, and of the process by which they were ultimately amalgamated in one faith. Magism, including the worship of the heavenly bodies, of the elements, and especially of fire, I conceive to have prevailed extensively among the Scyths from the earliest times to the Achæmenian period.¹ It was probably this religion that was introduced by the Hyc-sos into Egypt, when the Scyths were driven westward by the Semites; and if a fresh

determinately preserved in the story of the capture of *Afrasiab*, the true Scythic eponym, by *Kai Khuzru* at *Shiz*. Although, indeed, the *Ajis dahaka* of the Vendidad must almost certainly indicate the "snake" race, who afterwards inhabited Media, I think it most unlikely that the legend of Feridun and Zohak can refer to such a late period of history as the age of Cyrus.

In the hymn to the god Homa, *Thritaon* represents the second historical phase of the Arian immigrants, and refers, therefore, I should suppose, to their first collision with the Scythic Medes in their progress westward, about the meridian of the Caspian Gates, where we may infer from the Assyrian inscriptions the *Madai* were located as late as the eighth century B.C. This is further corroborated by the traditions which describe *Rei* and *Damawend* as the capitals of Feridun (the epithet of *threxanta*, or "three-germed," which is applied to *Raga*, in the Vendidad, referring probably to the name of *Thritaon* and the triple division of his empire), and which further suppose Zohak to have been imprisoned under the mountain of Damawend, where magicians went to consult him. All things considered, therefore, I am inclined to identify *Varene* with the city of Damawend itself.

¹ The Scythic god of fire I suppose to be since I have found this term substituted for the ordinary or . also constantly occurs in the names of cities, both in Media and Asia Minor. The Venus Urania of the Scyths, which Herodotus says they borrowed from the Assyrians, and which he confounds with the Arian *Muthra*, seems also, from the inscription of Artaxerxes at Susa, to have had a special title, which Mr. Norris reads as *Tanata*, and compares with the Greek *Tavatç*. As the Arian term in the same inscription is written *Anahata*, its connexion with the Zend *anáhita* and Sanscrit *anasita* (Yaçna, p. 432, note 289) is rendered doubtful, though the Babylonian orthography of *anakhita*, and the Greek *Avairuç*, are in its favour. In the inscriptions of Nabonit, the goddess in question is always named *Anunit*, the second element being almost certainly the Egyptian *Néith*.

immigration of the Cush from Susiana or Arabia to Æthiopia and the valley of the Nile really took place under Amenophis III. (Memnon), the Magian doctrines of these intruders will further account for the alterations which have often been remarked on the religious monuments of that king,¹ and for the introduction of the sun-worship into Egypt.² It is to Scythic Magism that the Greeks no doubt allude in their traditions of an early Zoroaster, who is sometimes placed as high as five thousand years before the Trojan war;³ and it is I conceive the precepts of this ancient faith, which were expounded and indexed by Hermippus, which were quoted by Plato as primæval relics, and which were in the hands of the disciples of Prodicus in the fifth century B.C.; the concurrent testimony of all writers as to the remote antiquity of the documents rendering it impossible that they can refer to a modern compilation of the contemporary Achæmenian period. Whilst Magism, as distinguished from Semitic idolatry, was thus being cultivated by all the Scythian races of high Asia, Dualism

¹ I allude of course to the introduction of the name of the god *Ammon*. See Bunsen's *Egypt*, p. 372.

² See Poole's *Horæ Ægyptiacæ*, p. 201; and Kenrick's *Egypt*, vol. II. p. 245.

³ Pliny, quoting Eudoxus and Aristotle, gives the date of Zoroaster at 6000 years before the death of Plato. Hermippus, following Hermodorus Platonicus, as he is quoted by Pliny and Diogenes Laertius, fixes the date at 5000 years before the Trojan war, and Plutarch (in *Isid. et Osir.*) has the same statement. See Pliny, lib. xxx. c. 1; and *Diog. Laer.*, i. 2. Aristotle also, in his treatise on Philosophy, maintained that the Magians were older than the Egyptians; and the 500 years before the Trojan war of Suidas is no doubt an error for 5000. The most complete collection of Magian and Zoroastrian authorities to which I have access, is in Brisson's second book, *De reg. Pers. Princip.*; but there is nothing like critique in any of the old dissertations. The main difficulty, however, in analysing Magism, lies with the Greeks themselves, who, misled by the anomalous faith which sprung up under the Achæmenians, constantly confounded Dualism with the religion of the primitive Zoroaster. If the first Alcibiades be genuine, Plato himself fell into this error. Aristotle (quoted by Diogenes Laertius, i. 8; Müller's *Frag.* vol. III. p. 53) certainly endorsed it, and his disciple Eudemus explained Magism, the faith of the Arian race, as the worship of the two principles. If Aristotle, however, really wrote the work on magic quoted by Diogenes, he maintained that the ancient Persians or Dualists were ignorant of the magic art; and the same distinction was advocated by Dino. I see, indeed, from a passage quoted from *Clem. Alex.* by Brisson, p. 232, that Dino positively asserted the Magian Medes to have no objects of worship but fire and water. As the astrologer Hermippus, at the same time, is one of the authorities quoted by Diogenes for the Dualism of the Magi, and is probably also the source from whence Plutarch drew his description of Zoroastrian Dualism, it must be presumed that the two millions of verses which he indexed and explained had been put together after the priesthood of the later Achæmenians had tampered with the original documents, and had engrafted on them their own Dualistic tenets.

seems to have originated among the pure Arians of *Kurukhshetra*. It was perhaps, in fact, the Dualistic heresy which separated the Zend or Persian branch of the Arians from their Vedic brethren within the Sutlej, and compelled them to migrate to the westward, carrying with them, however, their native language, their Indian names of places and persons, and a very large portion of the mythic traditions of the race.¹ The course of the Arian Exodus is admirably illustrated by the successive creations of Oromazdes, described in the first chapter of the Vendidad, which furnish a complete and connected series of geographical names extending from the frontiers of India to the Caspian gates,² and it is probable that along this line the immigrants came everywhere in collision with Magian Scyths, whose names are also obscurely indicated by the different calamities and evils which

¹ Among the Vedic names in the Vendidad have been recognized *Yimo*, the son of *Vivenghan*, or *Yama* the son of *Vivaswan*, *Mithra*, and *Homa*, for मित्र and सोम or the "sun" and "moon," &c. The name of *Haraqaiti* again (*Hara'-u-watish*, and Greek *Ἀραχώσια*), exactly answering to सरस्वति and applied by the primitive Arians to Candahar, seems to show that the colonists came from the true *Kurukhshetra*, and the banks of the *Sarasvati* river. The proper names of men, too, both in the Vendidad, in the cuneiform inscriptions, and even in the Greek notices of Persia, are in many cases Vedic or Puranic, and can almost always be referred to a Sanscrit etymology, thus authenticating the connexion of the races. Cyrus has the same name as the progenitor of the *Kuruvas*. Cambyses was named after the province of कम्बीज. The great point of interest at present would be to discover the Vedic correspondents of *Athvi* and *Thritaon*, and, if possible, of *Sama* and his two sons, *Urvákhshaya* and *Keresáspa*, as we should thereby obtain a clue to the approximate date of the Arian Exodus, and the progress of the colonists to the westward.

² Compare the names of *Sughdu*, or Sogdiana; *Mouru*, or Merv; *Bákhdi*, or Bactria; *Nisáya*, or Nisa; *Haróyu*, or Herat; *Vehrkan*, or Hyrcania; *Haraqaiti*, or Arachosia; *Haetumat*, or Hindmand; *Ragha*, or Rhages; and *Hapta Hindu*, or the seven Indies. Among the names which are still obscure, I observe that *Vackeret* is named *Daháko sayanem*, thereby showing that the country was inhabited by the "snake" race, or Medes: I believe it to be Western Khorassan. *Urvan*, with its epithet of *Pouru vastrám*, is very difficult; it was probably in the Elburz range. I suspect a connexion between *Chakh-ra* and *Kasv*, in Casvin, *Caspia*, &c., *kh* in Zend representing *sv*, although the epithet *surem asavanem* would indicate Semitic inhabitants. *Verene*, the birth-place of Feridun, must be *Damavend*; and *Raŋghaya* for Rasya, as *Danghu* for *dasyu*, must be the cuneiform — east of Susiana (or about Isfahan), which again is probably the *Rosh* of Ezekiel.

were created by Ahriman to obstruct the Arian progress to the west.¹ It would be hazardous, without further inquiry, to attempt to define the duration of this progress, or to assign fixed dates either for its commencement or its close. The period is figured in Persian tradition as the wars of *Feridun* and *Zohák*; and the relationship of the Arians, after their establishment in Central Persia, to the great nations on their western frontier is represented by the division of the empire of *Feridun* between his three sons, *Selm*,² *Toor*, and *Erij*. A conflict of races no doubt prevailed for many centuries after the Arian establishment, and it is this conflict which forms the groundwork of all later Persian romance; *Afrasiáb*,³ king of *Túran*, being the eponym of the Scythic race, which was gradually pressed by the Arians to the westward. The true historic period does not commence till five generations before Darius Hystaspes (or about B.C. 680), when Achæmenes founded a kingdom in Persia Proper. Not long afterwards, tribes immediately cognate with the Arians of Persia, both in language and religion, must have invaded Media; and it was in consequence probably of this invasion, that the Scythians were projected on Assyria.⁴

¹ For instance, I take the *Sakiti* (translated "flies"), who annoyed the Arians in *Sughd*, to be Σάκαι or Σκίθαι; and the *Dariwika* (translated "wasps"), who contended with them at Herat, to be Δερβικκοί or Δρεβικκοί of the Greeks. It would be a very curious subject to analyse all the Zend names, and search for their geographical application.

² I will here give the explanation of the word *Selm*, which has hitherto baffled etymologists. It is a simple transcription of the word or or or *shalamu* or *shalam*, which everywhere expresses "the west," or "the setting sun" (from שָׁלַם, because the day is "completed"?), in Assyrian and Babylonian. It thus exactly denotes the geographical position of the Semites in regard to the Arians. In all probability, the *Salem* of Melchizedek, who was the prototype of the Semite race in Syria, comes from the same source, as also do the mountains of the Solymi, which were known even to Homer. I believe even that the name of Jerusalem signifies nothing more than "the city of the west," the sea-board of Syria having the general name of *Shalam*, from its geographical relation to Babylonia.

³ I have sometimes thought that in the first element of the name of *Afrasiáb*, we might perceive a trace of the Scythic *Afar*, and that the termination was the 'Asoá of the Paschal Chronicle, the name applied by the Scythians to Inner Persia; but this is a mere conjecture.

⁴ There is some probability that the great Arian movement to the west from the Caspian Gates began at an earlier period than is here indicated; that, in fact, it was an Arian invasion which produced the Assyrian revolution of B.C. 747; for Perseus, the Arian eponym, is continually mixed up by the Greeks, as the antagonist of Sardanapalus, with this revolution, and the joint government of *Phulukh* or Belochus, who was the victim of the crisis, with Semiramis (or Atossa, the latter being certainly an Arian name), is now an established fact. See my note on Semiramis, published in the *Athenæum*, No. 1388, of 3rd June, 1854, p. 690.

It would seem, however, that *Huwakhshatra*, or Cyaxares, who led the invasion, must have adopted to a great extent the characteristic religion of the country he conquered; otherwise, we can hardly account for Median kings, whose names exhibit a pure Arian etymology, being identified with an anti-Arian Magism,¹ nor can we understand how these kings should continue to be figured in Persian romance under the Scythic eponym of *Afrasiab*.² However this may be, I conceived that the first blow which Magism received, was from the victorious career of Cyrus.³ The religion of Oromazdes and Arimanes then became the dominant faith, and the Magian priesthood were threatened with the loss of their prestige. They made a brilliant effort to recover it, by supporting the imposture of Smerdis; but the accession of Darius, and the persecution which fol-

If, however, the Arians did really thus early descend upon Assyria, they could not have maintained their position; for the Scyths held the Kurdish mountains during the four or five following reigns, to the end, in fact, of the reign of Esar Haddon; and I thus think I am justified in naming Cyaxares as the first Arian king who obtained a permanent footing in the country.

In my notes on Semiramis, published in the *Athenæum*, whilst assuming an Arian origin for *Sammuramit*, the wife of *Phulukh*, on the strength of her other name, *Atossa*, I omitted to notice the direct authority of Hellanicus to this effect. In his two fragments, 163 *a* and 163 *b*, quoted by Müller, vol. I. p. 68, *Atossa*, who, from the description, can only be the wife of *Phulukh* or Belochus, is called the queen of the Persians and the daughter of *Ariaspa*, the latter being a pure Arian name.

¹ *Huwa-khshatra*, or "self ruling," is a genuine Achæmenian compound, and there can be little doubt but that Astyages is the same name as the *Ajis-dahâka* of the Zendavesta, although that name was applied by the Arians to the Scyths of Media.

² The best proof that *Afrasiab* continues in Persian romance to represent the Median race, even after Arian kings had succeeded to power, is to be found in the tradition of the capture of *Afrasiab* by Kai Khusru, at *Shiz* or *Canzaka*, which exactly corresponds with the capture of Astyages by Cyrus at Ecbatana, as described by Herodotus and Ctesias.—See my Ecbatana Mem. p. 82, and compare *Mujmel el Tawarikh*,—*Journal Asiatique*, 3 sér. tom. xi., p. 290 and 329. There can be no doubt but that the concealment of *Afrasiab* in the reservoir of the lake at *Shiz*, described by Massoudi, and in the *Mujmel el Tawarikh* is the exact event related by Ctesias of Astyages, the hidden caverns of the lake answering to his obscure word *κρυπτάνοι*.

³ If Pythagoras really studied philosophy at Babylon under Cambyzes, as is reputed by Apuleius, Jamblichus, Porphyry, &c., it was Chaldean science and not Scythic magic that he imbibed, and the name of Zoroaster is therefore used improperly. From the numerous cuneiform tablets which I have consulted, referring to sacrificial worship and to the economy of the temples, it can now be positively asserted that the Babylonian religion underwent little or no modification from the Achæmenian conquest and occupation, or even from the infusion of Greek civilization which the Macedonians afterwards introduced into the country. The knowledge which Democritus acquired at Babylon, was essentially the same that existed in the country one thousand years previously.

lowed, extinguished all their hopes. From this period then, I date the gradual absorption of Magism in Dualism; the latter creed was sufficiently impressible and expansive; it borrowed, according to Herodotus, the worship of Venus Urania from the Assyrians; that of *Tanat* or *Anaitis*, who was *Diana* rather than *Venus*, it adopted, as I have already suggested, from the Scythians. The Magi, with their literary pre-eminence, their sacred character, their hereditary science, and possessing documents of the most venerable antiquity, could thus have had little difficulty in moulding the plastic and unlettered Persians to a partial adoption of their tenets. To discriminate the respective elements of the new faith is difficult, but not impossible. The worship of *Mithra* and *Homa*, or the sun and moon, had been cherished by the Arian colonists since their departure from *Kurukhshetra*; their religious chaunts corresponded with the Vedic hymns of their brethren beyond the *Sutlej*. The antagonism of *Oromazdes* and *Arimanes*, or of light and darkness, was their own peculiar and independent institution. On the other hand, the origin of all things from *Zerwan* was essentially a Magian doctrine; the veneration paid to fire and water came from the same source; and the *barsam* of the *Zend Avesta* is the Magian divining-rod. The most important Magian modification, however, was the personification of the old heresonym of the Scythic race, and its immediate association with *Oromazdes*. Under the disguise of *Zarathushtra*, which was the nearest practical Arian form, *Ziru-ishtar* (or the seed of *Venus*) became a prophet and lawgiver, receiving inspiration from *Ahuramazda*, and reforming the national religion.¹ The pretended synchronism of this *Zarathushtra* with *Vishtaspa* clearly marks the epoch from which it was designed that reformed Magism

¹ The remarkable notices of *Agathias* and *Ammianus* with regard to *Zoroaster* exemplify the difficulty that well-instructed men experienced in reconciling the hybrid traditions of the Persians of the Sassanian age with authentic Greek history. *Agathias* in the first place mentions the double name of *Zoroaster* and *Zarades* (the latter name being probably the same as *Ziru-ishtar*, inasmuch as *Hesychius* explains *'Aḏa* to be the Babylonian *Hera*), and he then goes on to express his doubts if the *Hystaspes* whom the Persians maintained to have been contemporary with the *Oromazdian Zoroaster*, could possibly be identical with the father of *Darius*. *Ammianus*, as I understand him, does not attempt to identify the two periods, though he gives the exact Persian description of the divine inspiration of the *Zendavesta* (a description, too, which is given in greater detail by *Dion Chrysostom*). *Ammianus* places the *Bactrian Zoroaster*, who introduced the occult Chaldaean sciences, "seculis prisceis;" while he takes it for granted that the *Hystaspes* contemporary with the *Zoroaster* of the *Zendavesta*, was the father of *Darius*. See *Agath.* (*Dind.*) p. 117, *Ammian. Marcellin.*, lib. xxiii., and *Dio Chrysostom, Orat. Boristh.*

should date, an epoch selected doubtless out of deference to the later Achæmenian kings, who derived their royalty from Darius. It cannot be positively asserted that we have any Zend writings at present of the Achæmenian age, but I think it is highly probable that portions of the Vendidad are really of that antiquity; and I further suspect that Osthanes the Magian, who accompanied Xerxes on his western expedition, and first communicated the Persian doctrines to the Greeks,¹ was a principal agent in compiling the reformed code, which respected the ancient tenets and traditions of the Arians, while it secured the Magi in their hereditary rights and privileges.

It is of no consequence to pursue the latter phases of the Zoroastrian faith under the dominion of the Parthians, who were of the old aboriginal stock, and who revived a Scythic supremacy over the Arians; it might have been expected that Scythic Magism would again predominate, to the exclusion almost of the Dualistic element, and this I really believe to have been the case; for all the Greek and Latin contemporary writers, who acquired their knowledge of the religion of Persia from personal observation, ignore the distinction of Oromazdes and Arimanes, and describe the mere primitive elemental worship, such as it existed in Media before the Achæmenian conquest.² Under the Sassanians, when the Arian element was again and finally triumphant, and when the Scyths were confined to Georgia upon one side, and to Afghanistan and Belúchistan upon the other, the Zoroastrian faith took its present definite form; the entire

¹ See Pliny, lib. xxx., c. 2. Diog. Laert., in proœmio, p. 1, and Tatian, *Orat. contra Græcos*, p. 172. It is of course this Osthanes whom Arnobius (if I have explained the passage rightly in page 24) connects with the Armenian Zoroaster of Ctesias, using, moreover, the same epithets of Erus and Pamphylus which were employed by Plato, in describing the Proto-patriarch of Magism. It is quite certain, however, that Ctesias (whom Arnobius seems to quote) never could have confounded a priest, whose doctrines were only acquiring form and consistency in his own day, with the Scythic antagonist of Ninus.

² I would draw particular attention on this head, to the notices of Strabo with regard to the religion of the Persians, the Medes, the Armenians, and the Cappadocians, the rites and ceremonies of the latter people being described from the Greek geographer's own personal experience. In the pages of Strabo occur the names of Omanus, Anandates, and Anaitis, but nowhere is there any mention of Oromazdes and Arimanes. The Persian religion is described almost in the words of Herodotus, while among the Arians of Cappadocia the worship of fire seems to have been the predominant observance. Compare, too, the accounts of the visits of the Parthian princes to Rome, where their adoration of the elements is alone noticed. Plutarch, and writers of that age, who described Dualism, followed Eudoxus, Theopompus, and Hermippus, who certainly drew for their information on materials of the Achæmenian age.

machinery,¹ however, of the watchers of the four quarters of heaven, of the twelve bands of the fixed stars, of the seven *Amshaspands*, and the seven *Divs*, presided over by the two great spirits of light and darkness, being adopted in many instances, even to the names,² from the Semitic inhabitants of Chaldæa, who still retained all the essential parts of the ancient Babylonian mythology.

There is only one other point connected with the Scyths, to which I wish to draw attention, and that refers especially to the wars of Feridun and Zohák. In the Zend hymn to the *Homa*,³ there are four distinct national phases clearly indicated:—the first is the reign of *Jem*, the son of *Vivenghan*, which represents the Perso-Arian race, up to the period of their exodus from *Aryavartta*; the second is the age of *Athvi*, the father of Feridun, who slew Zohák or the dragon, and divided the empire among his own sons;⁴ this represents the conflict of the Arians and Scyths, during the progress of the former to the westward, and up to the period of their establishment in Central Persia; the third age is that of *Sama*, the father of *Urvakhsh* and *Gershasp*,⁵ whose conflict with “the green and venomous snake” is described with the most curious mythic detail, this period being that

¹ See Prichard's *Researches into the Physical History of Mankind*, where the myths of the Zend Avesta is epitomised from Rhode, vol. IV. p. 39. Compare also Heeren's criticism in his *Researches*, &c., *Asiatic Nations*, vol. II. p. 367. Rhode's I have never had an opportunity of consulting.

² Thus *Tashter*, or Jupiter, who governed the eastern quarter, I take to be *Mushteri* مشتری, the *m* and *t* being nearly the same in Pahlevi. *Venant*, or Mercury, must be the *Μόνιμος* of Julian, which Jamblichus identified with that planet. *Satevis* is a mere Pahlevi form of Saturn. *Sura* is Sirius, &c.

³ This hymn, which is probably one of the most ancient portions of the Zend Avesta, was translated and analyzed by Mons. Burnouf in the *Journal Asiatique* for 1844-45; and the Roman text and translation, extracted from this work, are given as an appendix to the *Vendidad* of Brockhaus.

⁴ Burnouf leaves the identification of *Athvi* for future explorers of the Vedas. *Thritaon* he compares with *Trīta*, but there is no apparent connexion between the names beyond their etymology. An identity not merely of name but of character would be a subject well worthy of Dr. Max Müller's research in his present labours on the Vedas.

⁵ *Gershasp* the son of *Sam*, or *Keresaspa* the son of *Sama*, Mons. Burnouf compares with *Kṛiṣṇa*, the son of *Saṁyama* (*Jour. Asiat.* Avril—Mai, 1845, p. 255), mentioned in the *Bhāgavat Purana*; but a king of *Vāicāli*, or Bengal, could hardly have been referred to Central Persia. *Sam* was probably a native chieftain or dynasty of Seistan or Eastern Khorassan, where local traditions regarding him abound; and he must have risen into power long after the Persian Arians had been severed from their brethren on the Sutlej. The age, indeed, of Feridun and his sons is the latest point at which we can expect to trace any link of connexion between the traditions of the Vedas and Puranas and those of the Zend Avesta.

during which the Arians were engaged in constant war with the Scythic Medes, up to the time of the Achæmenian dynasty; the fourth age is that of Zoroaster, or of Dualism coalescing with Magism, from the time of Darius downwards. I have now only to refer to the second period, and I particularly notice it, because I think it possible to draw from Babylonian synchronisms an approximate date for the establishment of Arian power in Central Persia; at any rate, it will bring the remote and independent traditions of Persia and Greece into direct relationship, and thus to a certain extent lead to their mutual authentication. One of the most universal of the Greek heroic traditions is that which relates to the delivery and marriage of Andromeda, daughter of Cepheus, by Perseus, and to the inheritance by the latter of his father-in-law's empire. Now the real Greek Perseus was an Argive of the heroic age, and the scene of his exploit at the court of Cepheus was usually laid in the African or the Syrian Æthiopia;¹ yet Hellanicus and Herodotus had no doubt but that the names in question were of Oriental origin, and that they represented the transfer of power from one eastern race to another.² I take it for granted then, that Perseus, the ancestor of Achæmenes, must be the eponym of the Arian Persians, and that Cepheus represents the Scyths. It is stated, indeed, by all the most authentic of the Greek traditionists, that the ancient name of Chaldæa was Cephēnia;³ and Hellanicus, moreover, furnishes a most important notice of the actual exodus of the Cephēnes from Babylon, and their supersession by the Chaldæans,⁴ the line of emigration being marked by the name of Χώγη, which was the intervening district between Babylonia and the

¹ I presume that the general features of the Greek myth are too well known to require any references. The double location of the Court of Cepheus in Africa and Babylon, compared with the local tradition at Joppa of its being the scene of Andromeda's rescue, furnishes a good argument for the ethnic relationship of the Cushites at these three widely distant points.

² See the fragments of Hellanicus, 159 and 160 in Müller's *Fragments*, vol. I, p. 67; and Herodotus, II. 91, VI. 53 and 54; VII. 61. Herodotus, indeed, was so strongly impressed with the idea that the Argive hero and the Persian eponym were one and the same, that he actually described Xerxes as claiming kindred with the Argives through Perses, the son of Perseus and Andromeda, the latter being the daughter of Cepheus, the son of Belus. Nicol. Dam. and the Schol. to Plato both connect Achæmenes with Perses and Perseus; and Xenophon gives the same genealogy for the Persidæ, kings to whom Cyrus and Cambyses belonged. Perses and Perseus are of course the same as the *Pars* and *Pehlev* of Persian romance, but the names do not occur in the Zend Avesta.

³ See Steph. de Urbibus, *in voce* Χαλδαία; and compare Eustath. in *Iliad*. v. 1005, where Arrian is quoted as applying the name of Cephēnia to Babylon.

⁴ The passage of Hellanicus is given at length in Müller's *Fragments*, vol. I. p. 67.

mountains;¹ the identity of the Cephenees with the Scythic Medes who gave way before the Semites, according to Berosus, in the twenty-third century B.C., being thus all but demonstratively established.

Now Feridun, who was the native eponym of the Arian colonists, and who thus represents the Perseus of the Greeks, was indebted, according to the universal popular tradition (which came, however, from some other source than the Zend-Avesta), for the establishment of his power in Central Persia, to the aid which he received from a certain native champion usually called *Káva* or *Gáu*, the blacksmith of Isfahan. By some the *Kávas* were described as a line of princes to whose power Feridun succeeded; according to others it was a friendly army, led by *Kábi* of Isfahan, that placed Feridun on the throne.² That there is something more than mere fable in all this is further proved by the fact that Isfahan, the chief seat of the Kavis, is distinguished by the name of Gabæ and Gabiene, through the whole course of Greek history and geography,³ and by the still more tangible evidence that the national banner of Persia, which was lost at the time of the Arab conquest, still retained at that period its pristine designation of *Derefsh-i-Kavani*, in memory of the race from whom the Persians had inherited their glory.

It is surely then a legitimate inference to identify the Cushite Scythians or Cephenees, who were driven out of Babylon by the Semites, with the *Kávas* or *Kábis* of Persian romance, and to recognize in the succession of Feridun to the power of the *Kávas*, or (which is the same thing) the transfer of sovereignty from Cepheus to Perseus, that remarkable epoch in the history of the East, which established

¹ *Choge* is the *Jukhá* of the Arabs, or the country intervening between the lower Tigris and the mountains; it is mentioned repeatedly by the best Arabic historians and geographers, as well as by the Syrians generally, and also in two passages of the Sabæan Sidr, tom. III. pp. 83, 89. In Pliny, again, the lower Tigris cuts the Cauchian plains, and it is the same district of which the name is written ܚܓܐ, or *Kugha*, in Ezekiel xxiii. 23.

² For these statements I rely on *Ibn Mokaffa*, *Massoudi*, *Tabari*, *Abu Rihan*, and *Ibn Athir*, who all quote traditions long anterior to Islam. The celebrity of *Gáu*, the blacksmith, is no doubt owing to Firdousi, who, as usual, personified a dynasty or race, and thus converted history into fable. I am not able, however, to explain whence the Persians of the Sassanian age drew their traditions of the *Kábis*, for the name does not occur in our present fragments of the Zend Avesta.

³ The name is found, under various disguises, in Strabo, Cornelius Nepos, Diodorus, Polybius, Dionysius, and in the historians of Alexander, and very possibly it survives in the title of جيه *Jye*, which still attaches to the quarter of Isfahan on which is built the modern town of Julfa. The Achæmenian palace of Gabæ, noticed by Strabo, would be well worth the search of antiquarians in their rambles about Isfahan.

Arian dominion in Central Asia on the ruins of the Scythic power. Whether the Scythians of Isfahan really aided the Arians against the northern tribes, or whether, as I think more probable, the marriage of Perseus and Andromeda indicates a gradual amalgamation of the races, and the peaceful passage of supremacy from the one to the other, may well be left for discussion at a future period.¹ It is sufficient at present to have rescued, or to have sought to rescue, from the domain of fable, an epoch of such paramount importance as the establishment of the empire of Feridun, and to have shown that it merely depends on the determination of the interval which elapsed between the exodus of the Scyths from Babylon and their contact with the Arians at Isfahan, an interval which is figured by the eight or ten generations of *Kávas*² who preceded Feridun, to connect this epoch with the chronological date of the twenty-third century B.C., obtained from the astronomical and historical numbers of Callisthenes and Berosus.

¹ I take this opportunity of stating that the present section on "the Ante-Semitic period of Eastern history," consists of a mere series of notes taken from a far more elaborate paper on "the early Scythic population of Asia," which I commenced last year, in illustration of Mr. Norris's philological Memoir on the Scythic Inscriptions of Bisitun, and which I hope to be able to submit before long to the Royal Asiatic Society for publication, *in extenso*, in their Journal.

² Ibn Mokaffa, quoted by *Abu Rihán*, enumerates eight princes of the line of *Kávah* among the predecessors of Feridun; while Ibn Athir, confounding this family with the paternal ancestors of Feridun, raises the number to ten, and says that they were generally named *Athvian*, but had each a particular title. In reality, the *Athvian* were Arians, the *Kavas*, Scyths, and it was the fusion of the two races or families which led to the first establishment of an independent dynasty in Central Persia.