

## **The Archaian white races / by J.S. Stuart Glennie.**

### **Contributors**

Stuart-Glennie, John S.  
Royal College of Surgeons of England

### **Publication/Creation**

[Place of publication not identified] : [publisher not identified], [1887]

### **Persistent URL**

<https://wellcomecollection.org/works/chrtyget>

### **Provider**

Royal College of Surgeons

### **License and attribution**

This material has been provided by This material has been provided by The Royal College of Surgeons of England. The original may be consulted at The Royal College of Surgeons of England. where the originals may be consulted. This work has been identified as being free of known restrictions under copyright law, including all related and neighbouring rights and is being made available under the Creative Commons, Public Domain Mark.

You can copy, modify, distribute and perform the work, even for commercial purposes, without asking permission.



Wellcome Collection  
183 Euston Road  
London NW1 2BE UK  
T +44 (0)20 7611 8722  
E [library@wellcomecollection.org](mailto:library@wellcomecollection.org)  
<https://wellcomecollection.org>

~~p 19 n 2~~

## THE ARCHAIAIAN WHITE RACES.

By J. S. STUART GLENNIE, M.A.

(Read April 1887.)

'The dreams and falsehoods of the Rabbis of Jerusalem, of Alexandria, and of Babylon found a fertile soil in the decaying world of the Greeks and Romans . . . In the reign of Constantine, Christian writers, from Eusebius the Bishop of Cæsarea downwards, began to enter into the domain of falsehood . . . And the nineteenth century has witnessed, together with immortal discoveries, the most senseless and shameless attempts to re-establish ancient and modern fraud, falsehood, and nonsense, and pass it off as Orthodoxy.'—VON BUNSEN, *Egypt's Place in Universal History*, vol. iv. pp. 396-7.

### PART I.—THE ARCHAIAIAN TRADITIONS OF THE ORIGIN OF CIVILISATION.

I. BY Archaian White Races I mean White Races non-Semitic and non-Aryan; and by White Races I mean Races with either long or short heads, (dolichocephalic, or brachycephalic<sup>1</sup>), high noses, unprojecting jaws, (orthognathic, not prognathic<sup>2</sup>), long hair and beards,<sup>3</sup> and light-coloured skins.<sup>4</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Where the transverse diameter is less than eight tenths the longitudinal, a skull is reckoned long; when more than eight tenths the longitudinal diameter, it is reckoned short. Skull-measurements are now made by Virchow's method. Negroes, it may be added, are generally, and the Esquimaux and Australians are always, long-headed; while the Mongolians, or 'Turanians,' are characteristically round-headed.

<sup>2</sup> Projecting jaws and their correlates, flattened noses, it need hardly be said, are distinctive characteristics of the Black Races.

<sup>3</sup> It was Bory de St. Vincent (*Essai Zoologique sur le Genre humain*) who first scientifically classified mankind, according as they had straight and wavy, or woolly and tufted hair, into two primary groups of *Leiotrichi* and *Ulotrichi*; and this principle of classification has been adopted by Huxley, Fr. Müller, and Haeckel. See also Hovelacque, *Races humaines*, and more particularly Pruner Bey, *De la Chevelure*, *Mém. de la Soc. d'Anthrop.* t. ii.; and *Human Hair as a Race Character* (translation of above) *Anthrop. Rev.* Feb. 1864. I venture, however, to think that a true Classification of Races must take account of historical intermixtures no less than of anatomical features.

<sup>4</sup> Shades of skin-coloration are now distinguished by a scale introduced by Broca.



The existence of such Races is proved, as I trust to be able to show, by Traditional evidence, by Monumental evidence, and by Contemporary evidence. The very existence, however, of such a Stock of White Races has been, as yet, very partially, and their place in the history of Civilisation has been hitherto not at all, recognised by ethnologists.<sup>1</sup> And so far as the existence at least of such a Stock has been recognised, it has been designated by names such as Hamitic,<sup>2</sup> Kūshite,<sup>3</sup> Semito-Kūshite,<sup>4</sup> Caucasian,<sup>5</sup> Indo-European,<sup>6</sup> Allophyllian,<sup>7</sup> &c. to every one of which, as I venture to think, very strong objections may be urged. But the term *Archaian*, which I would propose, is, in the first place, regularly formed from the Greek *Ἀρχαῖος*, and may be thus compared, though, from its more general character, it is not likely to be confounded, with Achaian, from *Ἀχαιὸς*. Secondly, the term has thus far, at least, the authority of Aristotle that he calls

<sup>1</sup> The most complete account of these races, so far as I am aware, is to be found in the following works of De Quatrefages : *Les Polynésiens et leurs Migrations*, 1866 ; *Rapport sur les Progrès de l'Anthropologie en France*, 1867 ; and *Hommes fossiles et Hommes sauvages*, 1884. But even to M. de Quatrefages' treatment of the subject the statement in the text is, I venture to think, applicable.

<sup>2</sup> To the use of this term as the designation of a White Race, one sufficient objection is that it is now commonly used to designate the Black Race, though this was not so originally. See below, p. 13, n. 1.

<sup>3</sup> As Kūsh was but one of the many sons of Ham, the objections to the term Kūshite are even stronger than to Hamitic.

<sup>4</sup> This term, though applicable, like the term 'Anglo-Saxon,' to a certain limited time and locality, is just as false and misleading as is that term when used in a more general sense.

<sup>5</sup> The Georgians and Circassians of the Caucasus certainly belong to the non-Semitic and non-Aryan stock of White Races ; but far too many other races who have never had any connection with the Caucasus belong to this race to justify our giving it such a local name ; and, as will appear in the sequel, there are likewise other weighty objections to such a use of the term 'Caucasian.'

<sup>6</sup> With all respect to M. \_\_\_\_\_, I would submit that perversity in nomenclature could hardly much further go than in giving to a non-Aryan stock of White Races the name commonly used as a synonym for the Aryan stock.

<sup>7</sup> This term, which was employed by Pritchard, has been revived by De Quatrefages to designate the non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Races. But *Ἄλλοφυλοι* was used by Berossos and by the Septuagint with the meaning of 'other tribes' or 'foreigners.' And the objections to distinguishing the non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Races as simply 'other tribes' or 'foreigners' seem to be no less obvious than unanswerable.



the earlier philosophers 'Αρχαῖοι, the 'Ancients,' or *Archaïans*; and I now propose but to extend the use of the term to those 'Ancients' generally of the history of Civilisation, the White Races whose civilising action on the Coloured and Black Races preceded that of the Semites and Aryans. Thirdly, 'Archaian' no more associates the Stock it designates with any particular locality than the terms 'Semitic' and 'Aryan' associate the Races they respectively denote with any particular locality; and, considering the wide and, indeed, as we shall see, almost universal distribution of these non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Races, this is certainly an advantage. Fourthly, this term clearly connotes the most general facts that can as yet be affirmed with respect to these Races, namely, that the initiators of the First Civilisations belonged to this Stock of Races, and that to this day they exist in a more archaic state either of civilisation or of barbarism than any other White Races; nor is it, perhaps, improbable that the term may be further justified by our finding that these Archaian White Races are the Stock from which originated, through special ethnic intermixtures and other conditions, the Races speaking Semitic and Aryan languages, and which, by the intellectual reaction of these languages, were still further differentiated from the original Stock. And, finally, it is not certainly an unimportant advantage that such a term as Archaian goes well with the terms which may be considered as, notwithstanding all objections, the now established designations of the other two Stocks of White Races, the Semitic, and the Aryan.<sup>2</sup>

## 2. A discussion of the facts relating to the Archaian White

<sup>1</sup> See for 'Αρχαῖοι φιλόσοφοι, *De Cælo*, A, 5; for 'Αρχαῖοι σοφοί, *Phys.* B, 4; and for 'Αρχαῖοι, *Phys.* A, 6, and 8; B, 2; *De Gen.* A, 1; *De Cælo*, Δ, 3; *Meteorol.* Γ, 2; and *Metaph.* Δ, 1.

<sup>2</sup> Called also Indo-European, and Indo-Germanic. The latter term might have been excusable, while it was still uncertain whether the Kelts and Slavs belonged to the Aryan Stock of White Races. But to speak of Slavs and Kelts as Indo-Germans is now, considering not only its offensiveness but its falsity, unworthy of men of science; and is indeed only paralleled in falsity, if not in offensiveness, by the term 'Anglo-Saxon' as a designation of the Anglo-Keltic, or Teuto-Keltic Race of the British Islands, America, and Australasia.



Races falls naturally under three heads: (1) The facts as to the primitive traditions of these Races, and particularly of the Ruling Classes of the Egyptians and Chaldeans, whom we shall find to have been the chief representatives of these Races in the past; (2) the facts as to the world-wide distribution of these Races both in the past and in the present; and (3) the bearing of these facts of primitive tradition and of racial distribution on current theories of the origin and history of Civilisation.<sup>1</sup> But as it seems desirable to give full references to authorities, and as my space is here limited, I propose to confine myself to the first division of my subject; though I may, in concluding the Paper, very briefly indicate the relations of the facts set-forth to current theories. Confining myself, then, for the sake of space for verification, to a discussion of the facts as to the Primitive Traditions of the Archaian White Races, the divisions of this Paper will be determined by those of our Classification of these Primitive Traditions, considered as, of course, the Comparative Method requires that they should be considered, in relation to those of the other White Races—the Semites and the Aryans. Now, we shall find that the earliest traditions of each Stock of the White Races relate to subjects which are common to them all; that these traditions, therefore, may be generalised under common heads; and that they may be conveniently distinguished and considered as (1) Paradise-traditions; (2) Foretime-traditions; (3) Deluge-traditions; (4) Impiety-traditions; and (5) Kinship-traditions.\* In this Paper, therefore, I shall consider these Primitive Traditions in the order of this Classification. It will be evident, from the very names of the different classes of these traditions, that they are all traditions of the origin of Civilisation. We shall find that the Semitic and Aryan are, for the most part, but variants of the Archaian Primitive Traditions; and as these are traditions

<sup>1</sup> In the paper read before the Royal Historical Society on April 21, 1887, as in that read at the meeting of the British Association at Manchester on September 1 of that year, the subject was discussed under all these three heads, but necessarily in a very summary manner.

\* Compare Ewald & Lassen (cited by Pictet, *Origins* iii 361 ff.) Aryan Tradition of (1) Paradise (2) Foretime of the world (3) Ten Patriarchs (4) Deluge of a Race thereafter



of the Initiators of Civilisation, it may reasonably, perhaps, be conjectured that they will be found to have the most important bearing on those *theories* of the origin of Civilisation which have hitherto dispensed with anything like a scientific examination of these *traditions* of its origin.

3. But a scientific examination of the Primitive Traditions of the Archaian White Races implies, not only that they shall be compared with the Primitive Traditions of the other White Races, but that, in such a comparison, the results shall be accepted of the criticism both of the Hebrew Traditions, and of the conventional interpretations of these Traditions. In the sentences I have taken as motto for this Paper, these conventional interpretations have been truly characterised by my first Master in historical research, the most sincerely Christian author of *Bible-Records* and *God in History*, as well as of *Egypt's Place*. And as to the Hebrew Traditions themselves, I need here only remind the reader of those general results of research which are admitted by every competent critic, whether layman or cleric, and which may be thus briefly summarised.<sup>1</sup> The earliest and most general legends of *Genesis* are but variously redacted variants of traditions of which the sources, or at least the chief sources, are *not* Hebrew,<sup>2</sup> whilst it is questionable whether those of Chaldean origin did not come to the Hebrews only through the Phœnicians.<sup>3</sup> As to the so-called 'Books of Moses,' so far from even approaching, either in unity of authorship, or in antiquity of composition, to many Egyptian and Chaldean hieroglyphic and cuneiform documents, they are made up of four or five

<sup>1</sup> I have endeavoured to state these results in the most general and moderate way; but I would specially commend to students Wellhausen's *Prolegomena to the History of Israel*, translated by Messrs. Black and Menzies, and prefaced by the Rev. Prof. Robertson Smith.

<sup>2</sup> See G. Smith, *The Chaldean Account of Genesis*; and compare the corrected English edition by the Rev. Prof. Sayce, and German edition by Prof. Delitzsch. See also the latter's *Wo lag das Paradies*.

<sup>3</sup> 'There is no evidence,' says the Rev. Dr. Robertson Smith, 'that the Babylonian element in the traditions of *Genesis* reached the Hebrews through the Arameans of Harran rather than through the Phœnicians.' See *Historical Review*, January 1888, p. 127.



different elements, distinguished as Yahvist, Elohist, Deuteronomist, and Priestly, as to the variety of the dates of which there is no question, and a question only as to their relative dates, and whether the last may not be even post-exilic—that is to say, so late as the end of the sixth century B.C.<sup>1</sup> And not only were there great literatures in Egypt and Chaldea while the Hebrews were still in their nomad age, and during—nay, centuries, and even millenniums, before—their servitude in Egypt;<sup>2</sup> but a recent discovery,<sup>3</sup> which, as the Rev. Professor Sayce remarks, ‘must have the most important bearing on Biblical criticism,’<sup>4</sup> has shown, in an almost startling way, the immense development of civilisation, and particularly of its accompaniment, literary correspondence, not only in Chaldea and in Egypt, but in Canaan, more than a century before the commonly accepted dates of the

<sup>1</sup> Hence, though M. Renan (*Histoire du Peuple d'Israël*) maintains that there was really some such Patriarchal Age as is pictured in Genesis before the servitude in Egypt, so respectable an authority as the Rev. Professor Robertson Smith criticising M. Renan's work in the just-cited *Historical Review*, edited by the Rev. Professor Creighton, points out (p. 129) that to imagine that Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob roamed at large through Palestine, as represented in *Genesis* (Chaps. xii. to xxxv.), ‘though they were aliens from their own kin, and had not become the protected dependents of another kin,’ is to suppose a ‘standing miracle’; hence, that, if the supernatural explanation is given up, the whole notion of a Patriarchal Age falls to the ground; and, finally, that the true nomad age of the Hebrews was of the wildest and rudest type, while the picture of it in *Genesis* was idealised quite unhistorically from the life of a great flockmaster in the time of David and his successors, the tenth and ninth centuries B.C.

<sup>2</sup> There was already in the age of the builders of the pyramids (4500 B.C.—3500 B.C.) a developed literature; and one of the tombs at Gizeh is that of a royal librarian of the Sixth Dynasty. See Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne*, t. II. pp. 33, 87.

<sup>3</sup> At Tell-el-Amarna, the site of the capital of Amenophis IV. of the Eighteenth Dynasty (sixteenth century B.C.), a great number of clay tablets were picked up by fellahin last year, and these have been found to be despatches to the third and fourth Pharaohs of that name, in the cuneiform script, and Assyrian language, from the Egyptian provinces and protectorates in Syria and Mesopotamia. See *Der Thontafelfund von Tell-Amarna* in the *Sitzungsberichte der K. P. Akad. d. Wissenschaften*, bd. xxiii. ss. 583–9 (May 1888); Sayce, *Babylonian Tablets from Tel-el-Amarna*, *Proc. Soc. Bibl. Arch.*, v. x. pp. 488–525 (June 1888); and Budge, *On Cuneiform Despatches from Tushratta &c. to Amenophis III.*, *Ibid.* pp. 540–569.

<sup>4</sup> *Contemporary Review*, August 1888, ‘Recent Oriental Discovery,’ p. 300.



exodus from Egypt, and the invasion of Canaan by the rude Hebrew tribes. Finally, I would point out what is too often forgotten, that the 'Books of Moses' can, as to form, literary, moral, and theological, be justly compared, not with Sacred Books composed millenniums before the Hebrew Scriptures, but only with the literatures contemporary with the Pentateuch, or rather Hexateuch, *when it first assumed its present shape*—that is to say, with the other literatures bearing the impress of that great Moral Revolution under the influence of which the Hexateuch was finally redacted, that great Moral Revolution of the Sixth Century B.C. which extended throughout all the countries of civilisation from the Hoang-ho and the Ganges to the Nile and the Tiber.<sup>1</sup> And now let us

<sup>1</sup> As I was the first to point out, and as I have again and again shown during the last fifteen years, the sixth century B.C.—more accurately the fifth-sixth century B.C. (450–550 B.C.)—is the true epoch of division between the Ancient and Modern Civilisations. The fifth-sixth century before Christ was the century of Confucius in China; of Buddha in India; of Gomates and Zoroastrism as a political power in Persia; of the Babylonian Captivity (588–536); the so-called second Isaiah and the triumph of Yahvehism, in Judæa; of Psammetichus, its last Pharaoh, and of the worship of Isis and Horus, the divine Mother and Child, rather than of 'Our Father,' Osiris, in Egypt; of Thales, the Father of Philosophy; of Pythagoras and Xenophanes, the fathers also of Religious and Ethical Reform; and of Sappho and Alkaios, the first of the new subjective and lyric school of Poetry in Greece; and finally, in this rapid indication of its greater synchronisms, it was the century of that Persian world-empire of Kyros which, followed as it was by the Greek world-empire of Alexander, and the Roman world-empire of Cæsar, established henceforth Aryan domination; it was the century in which Europe and Asia first appear as clearly differentiated; and it was the century of those political changes from Monarchies to Republics which were but the outward sign and seal of far profounder economic changes both in Greece and at Rome. The dates of the birth of Confucius vary only between 550 and 551 B.C. As to the date of Buddha see the *Academy* of March 1, 1884, in which Professor Max Müller gives new proofs of the date of his death being 477–8 B.C.; and compare Mr. Müller's discussion of the date of Chandragupta, the basis of Indian chronology, in his *History of Sanscrit Literature*, pp. 242–300, and Rhys Davids, *Discussion of the Ceylon Date of the Buddha's Death*, in *The International Numismata Orientalia*, p. 56. As to Zoroaster, or at least Zoroastrism, see, for a refutation of the theories which place its origin as far back as 1500 B.C., or even 1800 B.C., De Harlez, *Origines du Zoroastrisme*, 1882, and *Avesta, Introduction*, 1884. And as to the other synchronisms see, for instance, Ewald, *Die Propheten des alten Bundes*, b. ii.; Goldzieher, *Mythology among the Hebrews*; Sharpe, *Egyptian Mythology*; Zeller, *Pre-Socratic Philosophy, First Period*; Grote, *History of Greece*, vol. ii. p. 505, note; and F. de Coulanges, *La Cité Antique*.



proceed, without further preliminary remark, to a comparative examination of the Archaian Traditions of the origin of Civilisation.

*Finish up with these  
begin with the Paradise  
traditions.*

## THE KINSHIP-TRADITIONS.

I. THE Archaian (Egyptian and Chaldean), Semitic, and Aryan Races possess Kinship-traditions that singularly correspond in their trifold forms, and may be summarily represented in the following parallel columns:—

### I. ARCHAIAN.

#### EGYPTIAN.<sup>1</sup>

(HIEROGLYPHICS).

1. Rotou.
2. Amou.
3. Tamáhou.

#### CHALDEAN.<sup>2</sup>

(BEROSSOS).

(MOSES OF KHOR'NI (?)).

- |                |                |
|----------------|----------------|
| 1. Kronos.     | 1. Zerovan.    |
| 2. Titan.      | 2. Titan.      |
| 3. Promethévs. | 3. Yapedosthé. |

<sup>1</sup> See Lieblein, *Les quatre Races dans le ciel inférieur des Egyptiens*, Musée Guimet, t. x. (1888), pp. 545-52; Lefebure, *Les Races connues des Egyptiens*, Do. t. i. (1880), pp. 60-76; and *Les quatre Races au Jugement dernier*, Trans. Soc. Bibl. Archæol., vol. iv. pp. 44-48; Brugsch, *Die altägyptische Völkertafel*, Verhandl. des fünften internat. Orientalisten Congresses (1881) 2 ss. 25-79; and *Geograph. Inschrift.*, b. ii. ss. 89, 91; and compare Chabas, *Etudes sur l'Antiquité hist.*, chap. iv. pp. 92 &c.; and Lenormant, *Origines de l'Histoire*, t. ii. p. 204.

<sup>2</sup> The cuneiform original of the Chaldean tradition of the three semi-divine Brothers who reigned after the Flood has not yet been discovered. That tradition we know as yet only in very late forms. The first of these is the version given in one of the Fragments of the *Χαλδαϊκά* of the priest Berossós, writing in Greek in the century of Alexander the Great (fourth century B.C.), and hence using what he believed to be the best Greek equivalents for the Chaldean names of the Brothers. See M. C. Müller, *Frag. Histor. Græc.*, t. ii.; Richter, *Berosi quæ supersunt*; Lenormant, *Commentaire des Fragments cosmogoniques de Bérose*. The second form of the tradition in point of date is that given by an Alexandrian Jew of the second century B.C., in the most ancient part of Book iii. of the so-called 'Sibylline Oracles.' But his list of the three Brothers differs from that of Berossós only in substituting Iapetos for Promethévs. See Alexandre, *Oracula Sibyllina*, t. ii. The third form of the tradition is that given by the Armenian historian of the seventh century A.C. who, according to Professor von Gutschmid, (*Glaubwürdigkeit d. Armen. Gesch. in Berichte d. K. Sächs. Gesell. d. Wissenschaft.* 1876), was the author of the *History* and the *Geography* attributed to Moses of Khor'ni of the fifth century A.C. But the Iranian form of the names he gives to the three Brothers shows that his source was not a Greek text directly extracted from Berossós, but a version of the tradition to which currency had been given by the learned school of Edessa, to which belonged, in the second century A.C., Mar-



## II. SEMITIC.

## III. ARYAN.

HEBREW. <sup>1</sup>	MENDAITE. <sup>2</sup>	IRANIAN. <sup>3</sup>	PERSIAN. <sup>4</sup>
2. Ham.	2. Yamen.	2. Toura.	2. Tour.
1. Shem.	1. Schoum.	3. Sairima	3. Selm.
3. Yapheth.	3. Yapheth.	1. Airya.	1. Eradj.

The figures attached to the Races indicate the rank of each according to the notions of the people making the classification ; each people, of course, putting its own Race in the first rank ; but Semites and Aryans agreeing, it will be observed, in severally ranking the non-Semitic and non-Aryan Race next to themselves. The linear succession of the Races, as I have above arranged them, indicates at once what I take to be equivalent names, and the order of the historical predominance of the Races thus designated—an order, it will be remarked, which accords with that dictated by national vanity only in the Egyptian and Chaldean columns. But several questions arise, first of all, with reference to the ethnological relations of the Egyptians and Chaldeans ; and then, with respect to that equivalency of names which is implied by the order in which I have above indicated the respective Kinship-traditions of the Archaian, Semitic, and Aryan Races.

2. First as to the *Rotou*, the name by which the Egyptians designated themselves—does this name connote a non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Race ? One may take it for granted that this question has been now conclusively answered in the affirmative by an ethnological examination of the ancient Egyptians themselves in their mummies, and of contemporary portraits of them in sculpture and fresco ;<sup>5</sup>

Abbas Katina, whom the author of the *History of Moses of Khor'ni* made his guide for the earlier ages of Armenia. See *Hist. Armen.* lib. i. c. 5, p. 16 (Ed. Whiston) ; p. 31 (Ed. Le Vaillant de Florival).

<sup>1</sup> See *Genesis*, v. 32 ; vii. 13 ; ix. 18 ; and x. 1.

<sup>2</sup> See Norberg, *Cod. Nasar.*, t. i. p. 96

<sup>3</sup> See De Harlez, *Avesta*, *Yescht* xiii. 143. And for proof that the myth of the three Brothers belongs to the cycle of traditions antecedent to the first putting-together of the books of the *Zend-Avesta* (or rather *Avesta-Zend*) see t. iii. p. 4.

<sup>4</sup> See Spiegel, *Eranische Alterthumskunde*, t. i. p. 554.

<sup>5</sup> 'The form of the skull, as well as the proportions of the several parts of the body, as these have been determined from examination of a great number of



as well as also by a philological examination of the language of the Egyptian inscriptions.<sup>1</sup> As to the Chaldeans,<sup>2</sup> if by that name I may distinguish the Kūshite<sup>3</sup> founders of that first Babylonian Empire which preceded the later Baby-

mummies, are held to indicate connection with the Caucasian Family of Mankind,' Brugsch, *History of Egypt*, v. i. p. 8. So Maspero: 'La race égyptienne se rattache aux peuples blancs de l'Asie antérieure par ses caractères ethnographiques,' *Hist. Ancienne*, p. 16. And see particularly Lepsius, *Nubische Grammatik, Einleitung*, in which he refutes the theory of the African origin of the Egyptians as advanced by Hartmann, *Die Völker Africa's*, ss. 3 flg. For reproductions of portraits see Lepsius, *Denkmäler*, bd. vi.; Brugsch, *Geographische Inschriften*, bd. ii.; and above all, the photographs by Mr. Flinders Petrie, *Racial Types from Egypt*, 1887.

<sup>1</sup> According to Lepsius, the Egyptian language indicates that the Egyptian Race belongs to a Stock unquestionably allied to both the Semitic and Aryan Stocks; and that to the same Family as the Egyptian belong the Languages of the Libyan tribes of North Africa. See his *Zwei sprachvergleichende Abhandlungen*; and also Schwartz, *Das alte Aegypten*; and Bunsen, *Egypt's Place in Univ. Hist.* With respect to the more special relationship of Egyptian to Semitic, see *pro*, Benfey, *Ueber das Verhältn. der ägypt. Sprache zum semitischen Sprachstammen*; E. Meier, *Hebräisches Wurzelwörterbuch, Anhang*; Bottischer, *Wurzelforschungen*; De Rougé, *Sur l'Inscription du Tombeau d'Ahmes*; and *contra*, Pott, Ewald, and Wearich, as cited by Renan in support of his own views, *Hist. de Langues Sémitiques*, l. i. ch. ii. § 4, p. 74.

<sup>2</sup> According to Lenormant, in Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités*, the name, Chaldaei or Χαλδαῖοι, has had three significations. First, it signified the people called Kaldi in the cuneiform texts; the Kasdim of one of the oldest passages of *Genesis* (xi. 28), and the people whom Hellanicus counted among the primitive elements of the population of Chaldea. Then it meant the Sacerdotal Tribe or Caste, using still the otherwise dead language which is now variously called Accadian, Sumerian, and Accado-Sumerian; the Tribe or Caste which, on the downfall of the Assyrian Empire, gave again to Babylonia a Chaldean Dynasty, of which the most illustrious representatives were Nebopolassar and Nebuchodossor, of whose Court we get interesting information in the *Book of Daniel*, late as is its date. Last of all, from the time of Alexander the Great, and particularly after the visit of the Chaldean priest and magus, as well as historian, Berossós, to Athens—where a statue was officially erected to him in consequence of the impression he made there by his predictions and inventions; (Plin. *Hist. Nat.* vii. 37; and Quaranta, *L'orologio a sole di Berosse scoperto in Pompeii* 1854)—the name Chaldean came to mean Prophet, Diviner, and Magician. But see E. Schrader, *Die Abstammung der Chaldäer und die Ursitze der Semiten in Zeitsch. d. d. Morgenl. Gesellsch.* bd. xxvii. (1873) pp. 397 flg. I venture, however, to dissent from his conclusion that there was no connection between the Chaldeans of the south and those later-mentioned Chaldeans of the north referred to by Xenophon and other classic writers. But the question will be better discussed in the Second Part of this Essay.

<sup>3</sup> *Genesis* x. 8-10; and compare Lenormant *Hist. Anc.* t. iv p. 57. Il paraît hors de doute que ce sont les Kouschites, représentés par le personnage de Nemrod, qui vivaient dans le Nord le nom de Kasdim, en Chaldéens. Tout porte à croire que ce sont les Kouschites d'Assyrie et les Céphéens, auxquels la tradition grecque attribuait la fondation de la civilisation chaldéenne. (Schrader)

Mafan and



lonian Empire of the Assyrians, and was contemporary with the first Egyptian Empire—as to the Chaldeans, the ethnological question is hardly as yet answered with such certainty as in the case of their great contemporaries of the Nile Valley. The Egyptians, however, in their most ancient frescoes, represent the Kūshites of the Euphrates Valley as a branch of their own ruddy-complexioned race.<sup>1</sup> And these Egyptian representations I venture to think that I shall be able, when treating of the Distribution of the Archaian White Races, conclusively to verify from the oldest Chaldean statues and reliefs of their Gods, Kings, and Heroes, and particularly of the first founder of their Empire, Nimrod, the son of Kūsh. For the clear indications, not only of primitive traditions, but of ancient portraiture, seem to have been hitherto obscured partly by the influence of old misconceptions<sup>2</sup>; partly by the implicit, if not explicit, but entirely unsound assumption that ethnological character is to be determined by philological research;<sup>3</sup> and partly by such misunderstandings as there appears to me to be in taking the epithet 'blackheaded,' to mean the *black-skinned*, 'Race of Accad.'<sup>4</sup> Surely this phrase rather means apparently, as in China,<sup>5</sup> the

<sup>1</sup> See Brugsch, *Die altägypt. Völkertafel*, in *Verhandl. Internat. Orientalisten Congresses*, v. 1881-2 bd. ii. I. s. 76: 'Die Denkmäler zeigen uns in dunkelrother Hautfärbung (1) die Aegypter, (2) die Kuschiten, (3) die Puntier, (4) die *ḫap* oder Phönizier;' and compare the same author's *Geograph. Inschriften* bd. ii. s. 89: 'Dieselbe rothbraune Farbe findet sich, den Denkmäler zufolge, auch bei . . . den Bewohnern *Naharuna's* oder Mesopotamiens.'

<sup>2</sup> And particularly as to the original meaning of the terms *Ham* and *Toura*, which, as I shall presently endeavour to show, were really the Semitic and Aryan designations respectively of the Archaian Races, the chief of which, themselves, the Egyptians designated *Rotou*.

<sup>3</sup> For even if it were admitted that the Accadian, the language of the inscriptions of the pre-Semitic Old Chaldean Empire, belongs to the family of languages spoken by those races of Central and Northern Asia now called 'Turanian,' it would by no means follow that the initiators of the Chaldean Civilisation spoke a language of 'Turanian' character because they were 'Turaniens' in the modern sense, and not simply because their own language, possibly allied, like their race, to the Egyptian, was influenced in the 'Turanian' direction by their Coloured and Black subjects.

<sup>4</sup> As by Professor Sayce in Smith's *Chaldean Account of Genesis*, pp. 81-3.

<sup>5</sup> See De Lacouperie, *The Shifted Cardinal Points from Elam to Early China* in *Bab. and Or. Record*, v. ii. pp. 25 and 31.



race with heads of dark hair, and hence, according to popular belief,<sup>1</sup> the strong and vigorous race—and this especially as beards are a distinctive characteristic of the White Races, and the monuments show a luxuriant development of the hair, not only of the head, but of the face, in the portraiture referred to.

3. But assuming, in the meantime, what I hope, in the Second Part of this Essay, to prove—assuming that the founders of the Chaldean, were, like those of the Egyptian Civilisation, a non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Race, there arises the question as to whether the first names in the Chaldean Tradition, as given respectively by Berossós, the Jew of the Sibylline Oracles, and Moses of Khor'ni (?), indicate the Archaian Race of the Chaldeans, or the Semitic Races. The question has been discussed at great length by M. F. Lenormant.<sup>2</sup> But as the names of the original Chaldean tradition can be, as yet, only conjectured,<sup>3</sup> it appears sufficient here to say that if, as M. Lenormant maintains, the Kronos of Berossos, and the Alexandrian Jew, and the Zerovan of Moses of Khorené are to be considered as representing, not the Chaldeans, but the Semites, then certainly Berossos did not even attempt to give us the genuine Chaldean Kinship-tradition, but only the Assyrian,—that is to say, a Semitic version of the myth. For it is in the highest degree improbable that the Chaldeans, unlike every other people, would, in their ethnological myths, have given precedence to a rival people. And if we assume that Kronos (*Kρόνος*) to which the notion of antiquity was early attached from its resemblance to Chronos (*Χρόνος*)—and Zerovan—to which a similar notion was attached from its identity with *Zarvan* (Time)—if we assume that Kronos and Zerovan indicate the unquestionably elder race, in point of historical predominance, the myth of the war between Kronos-Zerovan and Titan would accurately represent the

<sup>1</sup> As expressed, for instance, in the proverb, 'A hairy man's a happy man, a hairy wife's a witch.'

<sup>2</sup> *Origines de l'Histoire*, t. ii. 1<sup>re</sup> p. pp. 206-239.

<sup>3</sup> See below, § 8, pp. 20, 21.



long-continued historical rivalry which ended at length with the overthrow, by the Semites, of Chaldean supremacy.

4. So much for the Chaldean equivalents of *Rotou*. Let us now consider what I have, in the above parallel columns, indicated as the Semitic and Aryan equivalents of the name given by the Egyptians to the Archaian White Races as represented by themselves. First, then, as to Ham. According to the natural interpretation of the Biblical statement of these ethnological traditions, Ham, who is represented as the *brother* of Shem and Yapheth, the patriarch of two different stocks of the White Variety of mankind, was certainly the Patriarch of a third stock of the same Variety.<sup>1</sup> And this natural interpretation of the text is corroborated by the proved correspondence of 'the sons of Ham—Kūsh, and Mizraim, and Phūt and Canaan'—with the races which, in the Egyptian ethnographical traditions, are represented as branches, though of course inferior branches, of the supreme race of the Rotou. Kūsh is identical with the Egyptian Kesh who, as we have already seen, were, in the most ancient frescoes, represented by the Egyptians as a branch of their own ruddy-complexioned race.<sup>2</sup> Mizraim, a plural noun from the Assyrian

<sup>1</sup> With respect to the origin of the notion that the Hamitic Races were Negroes, the following remarks may here suffice. The curse, not on the irreverent Ham but on one of his sons (*Genesis ix. 22*)—the curse which Burns (*The Ordination*, s. iv.) so wittily ridicules :

How graceless Ham leugh at his dad,  
Which made Canaan a nigger—

(not the culprit Ham)—this curse was recorded with the evident purpose, on the redaction of these old traditions, of giving a sort of justification to the atrocities of the Israelitish conquest of the Kanaanites. This moral blackening of Ham prepared the Church for a theory that physically blackened the Hamitic Races. And owing to the results of millenniums of intermixture, the name of Kūsh, the eldest son of Ham, was already, in the Egyptian ethnography of the Ptolemaic Period, applied to Negroes, though this was contrary to the system of the nineteenth and eighteenth Dynasties. Compare Chabas, *Etudes sur l'Antiquité historique*, p. 97, and Lenormant, *Origines de l'Histoire*, t. ii. 1<sup>re</sup> p. pp. 202-3 n.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 11, n. 1, and compare Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne*, t. i. p. 266 and n. 2. 'L'identité de la race de *Kousch* et des Ethiopiens est certaine; les inscriptions hiéroglyphiques de l'Égypte désignant toujours les peuples du haut-Nil, au sud de la Nubie, sous le nom de *Kousch*. Ces habitants *non-nègre* du pays de Kousch, ou de l'Éthiopie nilotique, sont représentés sur les monuments exactement avec les mêmes traits que les Égyptiens.'



Musri, denotes Upper and Lower Egypt, while Mazor, its singular form, denotes Lower Egypt, as distinct from Pathros, or Upper Egypt;<sup>1</sup> and the sons of Mizraim, beginning with Loudim, the Hebrew equivalent of the Egyptian *Lot* or *Rot*<sup>2</sup> (*Rotou*) may be identified with higher and lower tribes of the Egyptians.<sup>3</sup> As to Phūt or Pūt, it seems to be identical both with the Egyptian Pūnt, to the south-east of Egypt, and with Phaiat, the name given by the Copts, and Pūtiya, the name given by the Persians to Libya on the north-west of Egypt;<sup>4</sup> Phūt is also called Libya by the Septuagint,<sup>5</sup> and Pliny<sup>6</sup> mentions a river Phūt in Libya. And, finally, Kenaan, the 'Lowlands,' though applied by Isaiah<sup>7</sup> to Phœnicia, and by Zephaniah<sup>8</sup> to Philistia, is said in Genesis<sup>9</sup> to extend from the torrent of Mizraim to the river Phrath (Euphrates); is thus identical with the Akkadian *Kur-Martu* and *Mat Aharri*, the 'West Country,' and was certainly inhabited by White Races, non-Semitic, and non-Aryan.<sup>10</sup>

5. Then as to Toura. The result of closer investigation appears to be that Toura is no less improperly held to be synonymous in the *Avesta* with Turanians, in the modern sense of the term, than Ham is held to be synonymous with Negroes. For not only does Toura appear to be derived from a word signifying 'of noble race,' but in the Iranian traditions, bitter as the wars between Airya and Toura are represented to have been, they are still represented as wars between brothers, and these so-called Turanians, or barbarians of Central Asia, in our modern sense of the term, are repre-

<sup>1</sup> *Isaiah* xi. 11.

<sup>2</sup> In Egyptian, *l* took the place of *r*, and *r* of *l* very easily.

<sup>3</sup> See Lenormant, *Hist. Anc.* t. i. pp. 269-71.

<sup>4</sup> Compare Lenormant as above cited, pp. 271-2, and Brugsch, *History of Egypt*, v. ii. p. 404.

<sup>5</sup> *Ezekiel* xxvii. 10.

<sup>6</sup> *Hist. Nat.* v. 1.

<sup>7</sup> xxiii. 1.

<sup>8</sup> ii. 5. Compare *Joshua* xi. 2 &c.

<sup>9</sup> xv. 18.

<sup>10</sup> See particularly Sayce, *The White Race of Ancient Palestine*, in *The Expositor*, July 1888, p. 48-57, and also in *Nature* of the same month.



sented as possessed of walled towns and castles, no less, if not more, splendid than those of the Aryans.<sup>1</sup> And this is entirely in accordance with the topographically as well as traditionally indicated distribution of Kūsh, a branch, as we have seen, of the Rotou, in the Egyptian traditions, and, in the Hebrew traditions, a son of Ham. In the old Sanscrit Geography, Kusa includes the Persian Gulf and the Caspian Sea.<sup>2</sup> And the Armenian Geography of the seventh century A.C. attributed to Moses of Khor'ni, of the fifth,<sup>3</sup> gives Media the name Chusti-Cupcochia; Elymais that of Chusti-Chorasania; Persia that of Chusti-Nemrozia; and Aria that again of Chusti-Chorasania; thus giving the name of Kūsh or Ethiopia to the whole territory between the Indus and the Tigris.<sup>4</sup> The name of Kephenes, in the Greek tradition, is certainly a synonym of that of Kūsh, and is always applied to the same populations from the shores of the Mediterranean to the banks of the Indus.<sup>5</sup> The cuneiform texts mention the Kussi or Kassu in the north-west of Elam, and with these Kussi correspond the Kisseans of Classical Geography, which also places in the north of Susiana the Kosseans.<sup>6</sup> The name also of Kusan for Beloochistan throughout the Sassanian period, and the Kush of Hindu-Kush, with the Kash of Kashmere, and Cutch of N.E. India, in their probable earlier forms, may all, to use the words of Professor Terrien de Lacouperie, 'be considered as so many landmarks left by the Kūshite Race.'<sup>7</sup> But the region thus proved to have been occupied by Kūshites, who, as we have just seen, were a non-Semitic and non-Aryan Race, allied both to the Egyptians and the Chaldeans—this

<sup>1</sup> See Geiger, *Civilisation of the Ancient Iranians*, p. 31.

<sup>2</sup> See Wilford, *Geographical Systems of the Hindus. Asiatic Researches*, v. viii. p. 296. See, however, as to Wilford's authority generally, Kennedy, *Ancient and Hindu Mythology*, Ap. A., pp. 405-422.

<sup>3</sup> See above, § 1 n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> *Geographia*, pp. 363-5 (Ed. Whiston).

<sup>5</sup> See Lenormant, *Histoire Ancienne*, t. i. p. 268.

<sup>6</sup> See D'Eckskin, *Les Ethiopiens de l'Asie* in *Athenæum Français*, 22 Août 1854; and compare *Les Regions de Cough et de Chavilah*, ib. 27 Mai; and *Les Origines de la Metallurgie*, ib. 18 Août.

<sup>7</sup> *The Kushites: Who were they?* in the *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, Dec. 1886, p. 26.



region occupied by Kūshites is identical with that occupied by the Toura of the Iranian traditions. And the proof would thus appear to be complete that the ancient Turanians were a White and civilising Race, very different, indeed, from the Coloured Races of Central Asian barbarians, to whom the name is now popularly applied.

6. But, indeed, generally with respect to Ham and Toura, as representatives of non-Semitic and non-Aryan White Races, it should be enough to remark that Ham is a son of Noah, the father of Shem ; and Toura a son of Thraetaona, the father of Airya. For, to imagine that either a Semitic or an Aryan ethnologist would have represented the Patriarch of the Coloured and Black Races as a brother of the Patriarch of his own White Race, is to attribute to men by whom they would have been utterly repudiated our own modern notions of equality and brotherhood—though, indeed, I should rather say *phrases*, these notions being still, for the most part, as utterly repudiated in practice, as they have ever been by the ruling White Races. To give a couple of illustrations of the genuine racial sentiments in ancient times both of Hebrews and of Aryans. Hebrew notions of other Races besides their own were thus expressed with characteristic coarseness:—‘As for the other people, which also come of Adam, Thou hast said that they are nothing, but be like unto spittle : and hast likened the abundance of them unto a drop which falleth from a vessel.’<sup>1</sup> And, in a more dignified form, Aryan pride of birth was no less characteristically expressed in the famous inscription on the sepulchre of Dareios at Nakshi-Rustam, between Persepolis and Pasargadæ. *Adam Dáryavush, Khsháyathiya, Vasarka . . . Vishtáspatiyá putra, Hakháman-ishiya, Pársa, Pársahyá putra, Ariya, Ariya chitra.* ‘I (am) Dareios, the Great King . . . the son of Hystaspes, an Achemenian, a Persian, the son of a Persian, an Aryan, of Aryan descent.’<sup>2</sup> And if at the late date of these passages,

<sup>1</sup> 1-2 *Esdras* vi. 56. They may be come of Adam, but not of Noah.

<sup>2</sup> See Rawlinson. *Herod*, vol. iv. p. 255, and Rawlinson (Sir H.) *Memoir on the Cuneiform Inscriptions*, v. i. p. 312.



when notions of equality were already beginning to gain utterance, racial pride was thus strongly expressed, it seems altogether unreasonable to suppose that, at the very early period of the origin of the ethnological myths in question the White Races acknowledged brotherhood with the Black.

7. Next, as to the Chaldean, Semitic, and Aryan equivalents of the Races named by the Egyptians Amū and Tamahū. What the Egyptians meant by these names we are clearly informed by the monuments. The Amū were, for the Egyptians, the White Races of Western Asia, not more directly connected with themselves, like the Pūnites, Kūshites, and Phœnicians<sup>1</sup>; and the Tamahū, or, as they were also called, Hanebū, were the White Races of the northern islands and coasts of the Mediterranean, as also of the western coasts of Libya, where they are more especially named Tahennū.<sup>2</sup> Now, as to the Chaldean equivalent of the Egyptian Amu, our conclusion can be but a corollary of our solution of the question above-noted<sup>3</sup> as to the racial significance of the names Kronos and Zerovan. In other words, whether the second brother, called Titan, in all the three forms of the tradition, as recorded by Berossós, the *Sibylline Oracles*, and Moses of Khor'ni—whether this second brother Titan is to be regarded as the equivalent of Amu, will depend on our previous conclusion with respect to the equivalency of Kronos-Zerovan. The name of the third brother differs, as we have seen, in all the three forms of the tradition. It is Prométhévs in Berossós; Iapetos in the *Sibylline Oracles*, and Yapedosthe in Moses of Khor'ni. That, however, all these three are equivalents of each other will probably be readily admitted; nor will it pro-

<sup>1</sup> See Brugsch, *Geograph. Inschr.* Bd. ii. SS. 88-89. 'Ich möchte die *Aamu* der Denkmäler ursprünglich für gleichbedeutend halten mit den Ammonitern der H. S.' s. 90.

<sup>2</sup> Tamahū signifies 'Men of the North,' as also does Hanebū (ha = 'behind,' and so, the north). Tahennū means clear- or bright-complexioned races. Compare Lenormant, *Origines de l'Histoire*, t. ii. 1<sup>re</sup> p. p. 201; Chabas, *Etudes sur l'Antiquité historique*, p. 174; Lefébure, *Musée Guimet*, t. i. p. 73; Ebers, *Ägypten und die Bücher Moses*, s. 109; and Tomkins, *On Mr. Flinders Petrie's Collection of Ethnographic Types*; *Trans. Anthrop. Institute*, 1888.



bably be seriously questioned that all three are equivalents of the Egyptian Tamahū? But whether Tamahū and its Chaldean equivalents originally signified, as generally imagined, the Northern White Race of Aryans may, I think, be seriously questioned. That, contrary to earlier custom, the term Tamahū, or at least Hanebū, was used, in the modern period of the Ptolemies, to denote Aryans, and indeed Greeks, we know;<sup>1</sup> and so also were its Chaldean equivalents. But three facts make it appear to me more than doubtful whether the third White Race of the Egyptian and Chaldean traditions was originally that which, in later times, we know as the Aryans.<sup>2</sup> These facts are—first, the extremely remote period to which certain results of recent research oblige us to carry back the beginnings of Egyptian and Chaldean civilisation,<sup>3</sup> and hence the origin of the Egyptian and Chaldean ethnological traditions; secondly, the comparatively very late ap-

<sup>1</sup> See Lenormant, *Origines*, t. iii. p. 22; and Chabas, *Etudes*, p. 174.

<sup>2</sup> I cannot, therefore, agree with Mr. Flinders Petrie that 'there can be little hesitation in classing the Amorites as a fair race cognate with those of the Ægean, and probably Aryan' (*Ethnographic Casts from Egypt*, in *Babylonian and Oriental Record*, May 1888, p. 136). And still less can I agree with a writer in the *Historical Review*, April 1888, who confidently alludes (p. 293) to 'the irruption of the *Aryans* into Babylonia and Chaldea in 2300 B.C.' (!) As to the facts, see next page, n. 1.

a/ <sup>3</sup> For instance, such facts with regard to Egypt as the discovery of the temple by the side of the Sphinx under the sands of the desert so early as the reign of Khūfū of the Fourth Dynasty (about 4000 B.C.), and its unknown antiquity even then, as recorded in contemporary inscription; such facts also as the existence, in the remote foretime to which that temple belongs, of hieroglyphic writing, as is specially mentioned, *on skins*; and such facts with regard to Chaldea as that, in the cuneiform inscriptions of 4000 B.C., it is already difficult or impossible to trace the original picture-hieroglyphics. See Lenormant, *Hist. Anc.* t. ii. pp. 53, 55; and as to the last, De Lacouperie, *The Old Babylonian Characters and their Chinese Derivates*, in *The Bab. and Or. Record*, March 1888, p. 78; and compare Sayce, in *Nature*, June 7, 1888, or the *Bab. and Or. Record*, August 1888. 'The oldest characters,' says Professor De Lacouperie, 'belong to the hieratic stage, and indeed to a stage of hieratic rather remote from the hieroglyphic period.' And 'in the inscriptions of Telloh, earlier than the epoch of Sargon I. (3800 B.C.), the characters,' says Professor Sayce, 'have already become cuneatic, and not unfrequently have departed so widely from their primitive appearance as to make it impossible even to guess what they were primarily intended to represent.'

t | t/



pearance on the historical arena of Aryans—that is to say, of Northern White Races speaking languages of the highly inflectional character distinctive of the race commonly called Aryan;<sup>1</sup> and thirdly, the certain existence, from a period antecedent to the historical appearance of the Aryans, of Northern White Races not speaking either Semitic or Aryan languages, and probably now represented by the Georgians and Circassians of the Caucasus.<sup>2</sup> And the general conclusion to be drawn from reflection on such facts as these appears to me to be that the three Races distinguished in the original ethnological traditions of Egypt and Chaldea were, first, the Southern White Races of connected Rotou, Pūnites, and Kūshites; secondly, the Syro-Arabian White Races, speaking what are now called Semitic languages, or rather, early forms of these languages, and constantly intruding on, and in the borderlands mixing with, the populations of the Rotou-Egyptian and Kūshite-Chaldean Empires; and thirdly, the Northern White Races, which, though as different from the Southern White Races as the Western were, in a much later age, from the Eastern Aryans—still belonged to the same Archaian White Stock, and seem, indeed, as the result of their invasions, to have established themselves as a consider-

n/ <sup>1</sup> The Aryans, where we have our first definite historical knowledge of them, are on the east of the Caspian, between the Oxus and Jaxartes; and the migrations probably recorded in the *Avesta* (*First Fargard* of the *Vendidad*) All belong to Bactria, or more generally Iran, beyond the sphere of the Chaldean Empire, not to speak of the Egyptian. The earliest date that can be assigned to these historical first movements of Aryans would seem to be from about 2000 B.C. to 1500 B.C. And, as proved by inscriptions, not till the end of the ninth century B.C. do Aryans appear on the borders of the Babylonian Empire; nor till the century in Phrygia. See *Acad. Inscript.*, *Comptes Rendus*, 1888.

<sup>2</sup> Among the facts to which I here allude are such as these:—the association of the pig with the hosts of Typhon, the enemy of Osiris and of Horus, and the probability—as was suggested to me by Professor Ramsay in discussing with him the association of the pig with the worship of Demeter—the probability that this association of the pig with Typhon indicates a race from the North where the pig is less injurious as food than in the South; the probability, as will be pointed out in discussing the *Foretime Traditions*, that the myth of Horus is in essentials the record of an actual war; and further, the variety of facts which connect certain peoples of Western Asia and of the northern coasts of the Mediterranean with the White Races of the Caucasus, facts which will be set forth in detail in the Second Part of this Essay, and one set of which I shall immediately indicate, p. 21, n. 2.

S/a

#







Khor'ni, together furnish 'des indices d'une incontestable valeur pour faire penser que le nom de la tradition sacrée babylonienne devait être . . . Yaputu ou Yuputu'<sup>1</sup>—whence both the Hebrew Yapheth and the Greek Iapetos. To sum up: an unknown name Græcised into Kronos, with Etana and Yaputu, would appear to have not improbably been the original Chaldean equivalents of the Egyptian Rotū, Amū, and Tamahū; but Tamahū, the third Egyptian, and Yaputu, the third Chaldean name probably denoted originally, not Aryan, but Northern Archaian Races. That Shem (or Schūm) and Sairima (or Selm) are respectively the Semitic and Aryan equivalents of Amū will not be disputed. And further evidence of the truth of the above contention with respect to the earlier meaning of Tamahū and Iapetos, or Yaputu, appears to be afforded by the Semitic list of the descendants of Yapheth, who cannot all be identified with Aryan Races, and some of whom at least must certainly be identified with the non-Aryan White Races of the Caucasus.<sup>2</sup> That Airya is the Aryan equivalent of Tamahū and Iapetos or Yapūtū, will not be disputed; but, in accordance with the foregoing, I would contend that it is the equivalent of these ancient names only in their later signification.

9. But the great historical lesson to be learned from these Kinship-traditions will not be thoroughly brought home without a concluding remark. While the Archaians acknowledge a fraternal relationship with the Semites and the Aryans; while the Semites acknowledge such relationship with the Archaians under the name of Ham, and with the Aryans under the name of Yapheth; and while the Aryans acknowledge a fraternal relationship with the Archaians under the name of Toura, and with the Semites under the name of

<sup>1</sup> *Origines*, t. ii. 1<sup>re</sup> P. p. 218; but compare p. 191.

<sup>2</sup> M. Lenormant (*Origines*, t. ii. 1<sup>re</sup> P.) admits that the Aryan etymologies hitherto proposed both for Magog and Madai, sons of Yapheth, cannot be maintained (pp. 466 and 500); and that Madai was peopled by the non-Aryan 'race des blancs allophyles du Caucase' (p. 474); but he still contends—against, as I think, serious objections—that the name Madai was first used by the Iranians to denote themselves (502), and hence that it denotes an Aryan people in *Gen.* x. 2.



Sairima, neither Archaicans, Semites, nor Aryans acknowledge relationship with any other Races whatever. The Negroes, indeed, under the name of Na'hasiū, are mentioned in the Egyptian ethnological traditions; but relationship with them is utterly repudiated—an entirely different origin being attributed to the Black from that assigned to the White Races.<sup>1</sup> So also it is in the Semitic, and particularly in the Hebrew ethnological traditions. The Hebrew traditions imply—as, for instance, in the legend of Cain<sup>2</sup>—that the Hebrews were from the very earliest time aware of, if not in contact with, Coloured and Black Races. But the Hebrews find no place for these other Races in their genealogies of descent from Adam, whose very name, indeed, testifies to his being the patriarch of a White Race. And so also it is in the Aryan traditions. As the name of the first man in the Hebrew traditions appears to signify 'Ruddy,' the name, or at least one of the names of the first man in the Aryan traditions, Menu, is connected with a root signifying 'mind, thought, intelligence.' And when the Aryans first, so far as we definitely know, came in contact with Coloured and Black Races, namely, on descent into the Indian valleys, they did not give these Races the name of Man at all, but refer to them only as 'living beings.' Our general conclusion, therefore, from a comparative study of those Kinship-traditions which are usually referred to as Primitive Traditions of *Mankind*—our first conclusion must, I think, be that they are only Primitive Traditions of the White Races; and further, that these Traditions testify to the existence, from the first origin of Tradition, of Higher and Lower Races. How important this fact is—corroborated as we shall find it to be by those Traditions which I have classed under the head of Foretime-traditions—how important this fact is for any scientific theory of the origin of Civilisation, I shall point out in the concluding section of this Paper.

<sup>1</sup> See the references n. i. § 1 of this Section.

<sup>2</sup> *Genesis*, iv. 16.







