



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NEW LIGHT ON MAGAN AND MELUḪA

W. F. ALBRIGHT

AMERICAN SCHOOL IN JERUSALEM

THE RAPIDITY with which knowledge progresses in the ancient Oriental field is well illustrated by the flood of new material with reference to Magan and MeluḪa. In Schroeder's new volume, *Keilschrifttexte aus Assur verschiedenen Inhalts* (Leipzig, 1920) there is some very important evidence on the subject. Text No. 92 is a kind of geographical handbook, describing the extent and the mutual relation of the dominions of Sargon II of Assyria, but pedantically, and not always accurately, substituting names and terms from the age of Sargon of Akkad, wherever possible. Line 30 ff. reads: 120 double-hours (*bêrê*) of marching distance (*šiddu*) from the dam (*KUN* = *mihru*) of the Euphrates to the border of MeluḪa and Mari (*MĀ(!)-RĪ-KI*) which Sargon (*Šarrugina*), king of the world, when he conquered the expanse of the heavens (sic, *siḫip šamê*) with might, traversed. Here we are informed that it was 240 marching hours from the fords of the Euphrates between Mari and Sumer, or Babylonia, as follows from line 29, to the boundary between Mari and MeluḪa.¹ But where could Mari, on the middle Euphrates, and MeluḪa in Africa have possibly met? Clay has long

¹ The 240 hours from the Euphrates to the Egyptian frontier imply, at three miles an hour, an actual marching distance of about 720 miles. The actual distance in a straight line from Thapsacus to Raphia, and thence to Pelusium is five hundred miles, but during the course of a month spent in walking over Palestine and Syria, the writer learned that it required eight marching hours to cover a distance of sixteen miles measured by the map, owing to the relatively large amount of climbing and detours which is necessary in this rough country. Accordingly, the 120 double-hours are precisely what we should expect. Similarly, the 30 double-hours from Aphek to Raphia, given in Esarhaddon's report, correspond to 130 miles in straight line.

maintained that Mari is really synonymous with *MAR-TU*, or Amurru, and refers to Syria, as well as to the middle Euphrates country, but few have accepted his view. Now, however, it is proved for the seventh century B. C. by the remarkable geographical vocabulary published by Schroeder, No. 183, line 11, where Mari is explained by *mât Hatti*, the Hittite country, which in late Assyrian texts is the regular expression for Syria, including Palestine.

In late Assyrian texts, from Sargon to Aššurbânâpal, *Meluḥa* always refers to the Ethiopia *magna* of the Pianḫi dynasty, and is thus often extended to include Egypt, which formed a part of the Ethiopian Empire. Sargon II says, in his Triumphal Inscription, line 102 f., that Yamani of Ashdod fled *ana itî Muṣuri ša pāt mât Meluḥa*, "to the part (lit. border) of Egypt which is in the territory of Meluḥa". The king of Meluḥa in line 109 is the Ethiopian monarch. The same usage is found in the texts of Sennacherib. It explains the confusion in the mind of Esarhaddon's scribe when he says, describing Esarhaddon's famous desert march to Egypt, "From Magan I departed, to Meluḥa I approached", and then mentions the 30 double-hours from Aphek (Apqu = Fiq, east of the Sea of Galilee) in Samaria (Same[ri]na) to Raphia, which is just one-fourth the total distance from the Euphrates to the Egyptian frontier, in perfect agreement with the estimate given above. From Raphia, instead of taking the direct route by way of Pelusium, and attacking the strongly fortified frontier zone, Esarhaddon, gathering camels and supplies from "all" the tributary Arab sheikhs, made a terrible desert march by way, it would seem, of Suez, and outflanked the Egyptian army of defence. His description of the serpents met within the "Arabah" reads like an excerpt from the book of Numbers. In the Esarhaddon text Magan takes the place of the Mari of the geographical inscription, since under the Sargonids Egypt was included under the head of Meluḥa and there was thus no room in Africa for Magan. However, the old condition of affairs survives, as indicated by the alternation between Magan and Meluḥa in some texts and Muṣur and Meluḥa in others.

That Magan was not combined with Syria in the early period is shown by the Sumerian texts I have quoted in previous papers, and proved by a passage in the geographical text

already cited, which in this case obviously derives its information from early Babylonian sources. Lines 41 ff. state: Anami,² Kaptara (Eg. *Kptr*, Bib. Caphtor), lands beyond (*BAL-RI*) the Upper Sea (Mediterranean), Tilmun, Magana, lands beyond the Lower Sea (Persian Gulf), and the lands from the rising of the sun to the setting of the sun, which Sargon, king of the world, up to his third (year?) conquered (*qâtsu ikšudu*). So Magan is faithfully given, in accord with the old Sumerian tradition, as a land beyond the Persian Gulf by the sea route — and yet it is on the land route from the Euphrates to Meluḫa = Ethiopia!

Lest the problem should be cleared up too speedily, our new vocabulary furnishes an additional complication; line 13 has (b-d) *kûr Ma-gan-naki* = *mât Si-id-di-ri* = [*mat M*] *i-iš-r[i]*. As Col. b contains only Old Babylonian names from the third millennium, we may consider *Šiddiri* as an early form of the same word which later appears in Babylonia as *Miṣri*, *Miṣir*, and in Assyria as *Muṣri*, *Muṣur*. The word has thus originally a *d* between the *ṣ* and the *r*, just as in the later Greek form, *Μεσδ(τ)ραμ*, where the *δ* is, however, apparently a secondary parasitic element. The primary Egyptian name would then be approximately **mdēdrew*, heard by the Babylonians as **Āēdere*, which would have to be written in cuneiform as *Šid-diri*, with accentual doubling of the *d*. Later we may suppose that the Western Semites corrupted the plural, **Miṣidrîm*, 'Egyptians', into the more compatible *Miṣrîm*, from which the various forms, Amarna *Miṣri*, Heb. dual *Miṣrâyim*, singular *Maṣôr* (by popular etymology, following *maṣôr*, 'fortification') were derived by back-formation.

² The cuneiform text, as given by Schroeder, has *A-na-AZAG*, which is certainly a mistake, like *Ē-ZU* and *LIL-URU* for *MĀ-URU* = Mari elsewhere in our text. In a cramped Assyrian hand there is no noticeable difference between *AZAG* and *MI*. It is possible that Anami is the Ananim of Gen. 10 13, which may represent Cyrene, being followed by Lehabim, the Libyans of Marmarica. The Caphtorim of the next verse are naturally the people of Kaptara, or Crete. Cnossus in Crete is mentioned in a text of Esarhaddon found at Assur as Nusisi, if we may accept Peiser's identification (*OLZ* 14. 475; 15. 246). Cf. also the remarks in my paper to appear in *JPOS*, 'A Colony of Cretan Mercenaries on the Coast of the Negeb'.

The fact that Magan is in one passage termed a land of copper, so far from being against its identification with Egypt, is in favor of it. Hume, *Preliminary Report on the Geology of the Eastern Desert of Egypt*, 1907, pp. 56 f., says that copper ores are found in the eastern desert, and that there are old workings at Abskiel and Abu Hamamid, a statement confirmed by Mr. Thomas, *JEA* 7. 110. I have also been assured by a mining engineer, Mr. Walter Middleton, that there is an abundance of copper ore in the Nubian desert, in the region northwest of Port Sûdân, which to the Egyptians was the coast of Pûnt. This explains why the Egyptians and Sumerians brought malechite from *Pwnt* = Meluḥa.

Nor can there be any doubt now that the invasion of Egypt by a king of the Dynasty of Akkad was quite within the range of probability. Thanks to the remarkable discoveries of Forrer, Hrozný and others among the treasures of Boghazkeui, it is now certain that Sargon I extended his conquests far beyond Mari, or northeastern Syria, and Ibla, or northwestern Syria, into southwestern Cappadocia, where he captured the city of Buršaḥanda, Hittite Barsuhanta, between Ḫubišna = Kybistra and Tuwanuwa = Tyana. Moreover, according to a text described by Forrer, *Die acht Sprachen der Boghazköi-Inschriften*, p. 1038 f., a king of Akkad, almost certainly Sargon, fought a coalition of the kings of Kanis, near Caesarea Mazaca, Ḫatte (Boghazkeui) and Kursaura, northwest of Tyana.

Despite recent assertions, it is absolutely certain that Yari-muta, as described in the Amarna tablets, lay to the south of Phoenicia. The indications of the letters sometimes point rather to the Delta than to the Plain of Sharon, but the non-Egyptian form of the name and the Semitic names of the two functionaries, Yanḥamu and Yapa-Addi, point rather to Palestine. Moreover, Amarna, No. 296, can only mean (which does not appear to have been observed) that Gaza and Joppa, both Egyptian garrison towns, were in the district controlled directly by Yanḥamu, that is, in Yarimuta. In *JEA* 7. 80, the writer was unable to check Professor Sayce's identification of Yarimuta with 'classical Armuthia', but since this paper was written the necessary books have been acquired. There is no classical Armuthia at all! The source of it is Tompkins, *TSBA* 9. 242, *ad* 218 (of the Tuthmosis list): 'Maüti. Perhaps

the Yari-mūta of the Tel el-Amarna tablets, now (I think) Armūthia, south of Killis.' 'Armūthia' is only a bad orthography for Armūdja, a small village some three miles south of Killis, and thirty north of Aleppo, not on the coast at all, but in the heart of Syria. Moreover, instead of the Nos. 298—301 of the Tuthmosis list, quoted by Professor Sayce as Arsha, Mari, Ibl, and Qarmatia, we really have Nos. 298—299, *Ī3-r3-š3-[]*, *M3-ry-[]*, and 306—307(!) *Īy-b-r3*, *K3-r3-my-ty*. The first two identifications, as well as the fourth, are impossible, though the third is probably right. In this connection it should be observed that Professor Sayce's effort to do away with Ethiopians in the Amarna texts by creating a north-Syrian Kus (*JRAS* 1921, 54) is useless. He quotes an Assyrian letter which locates the cities of Arpad, Kullania, and Dana in the land of the *Ku-sa-a* (pronounced *Kūšā'a*), but the latter is simply the gentilic corresponding to the well-known Bit-Gūsi, or Beth Gosh. Arpad was the capital of Bit-Gūsi, and Kullania is generally located in it by Assyriologists, while there is no geographical objection to placing Dana there as well.

Since the conquests of Narām-Šin extended further toward the southwest than those of Sargon, there is no place for Magan but Egypt, unless one insists on identifying it with Winckler's ill-fated Arabian Mušri in Midian. Hall's observation (*JEA* 7. 40) that Manium is undeniably a common Semitic name is very strange; the writer would very much like to have it pointed out in other inscriptions. The ending *ium* is found also affixed by the Akkadians to non-Semitic names, as *Gutium*; it is exactly parallel to Lat. *Arminius* for *Herrmann*, &c.

It is quite premature to say that the chronological situation forbids our synchronism. Langdon's date for Narām-Šin, given in his lecture on 'The Early Chronology of Sumer and Egypt' (cf. *Near East*, May 5, 1921, p. 530 b) as 2795(3?)—2739 is a *terminus ad quem*. For the reasons previously outlined, it seems to me necessary to allow fully 125 years between the expulsion of the Guti and the accession of Ur-Nammu (formerly called Ur-Engur) v. c. 2475, which will bring the accession of Narām-Šin to at least 2875³. The new 'short chronology'

³ Thanks to the kindness of Professor Clay, I have been able to read

for Babylonia, which would reduce the date for Ur-Nammu to about 2300, has been disposed of in an article to appear in the *Revue d'Assyriologie*. Egyptian chronology naturally offers a more complicated problem, but the writer fails to see any particular difficulty in the scheme which reduces the period between the Sixth and the Twelfth Dynasty to 160 years, and allows an average of eighteen years each to the kings of the first two dynasties. Since it is steadily becoming clearer that the history of Egyptian civilization, especially in the Delta, reaches far back into the predynastic age, before 4000 B. C., why should an Egyptologist assume that the crude beginnings of Babylonian monumental art, in the days of Mesilim and Ur-Nina, must fall later than Menes? Our theory places them only two to three centuries earlier. Even with our rectification of the chronology, Egyptian art remains superior to contemporary Babylonian art, as will be easy to see on comparing, for example, the Tanite art of the Thinite period, as found by Capart in the group of 'Nile gods' in Cairo, and the Ludovisi statue at Rome, with the art of the Akkadian epoch in Babylonia.

the translation of the new dynastic fragment found in the Philadelphia Museum by Legrain. It offers very useful confirmation of the view outlined that there was an interval of some length between Utu-ġegal and Ur-Nammu. The ninth column of the tablet contained the dynasty of Utu-ġegal and the dynasty of Ur; it begins with the regnal years of the last monarch of Guti, and closes with the name of the third king of Isin, Idin-Dagân, thus containing the names of eight kings, and the record of three dynastic changes. While only the first seven lines of the column are preserved, we may estimate the number of names lost by comparing the situation in the seventh and eighth columns, where we are on firm historical ground. Col. VII contained the names of all the twelve kings of Akkad, and the five kings of Erech, with the record of two dynastic changes, and the partial account of another. Col. VIII contained the names of all twenty-one monarchs of Guti. Accordingly, Col. IX gave a least six, and probably seven names of the dynasty of Utu-ġegal — less, naturally, if there were two dynasties here instead of one, which is hardly probable, despite Lugal-anna-mundu of Adab.