The object of this article is to examine the origins of the Diaspora and to determine whether it only came into being as a result of the Assyrian and Babylonian conquests or whether these disasters served merely to accelerate a movement which already had a considerable history behind it. The implications of a pre-exilic diaspora is that its doctrine and ritual should retain elements of pre-Judaistic religion, and in fact, constitute a Hebrew non-Jewish sect amongst those whom the outside world regarded as a colony of Jews. Such a group should show signs of dissent between its old-established members and its new arrivals after the fall of Jerusalem.

The facts are in contradiction to the view that we have little information about this period—we have a great body of literature not only in Jewish sources but also in Babylonian and Assyrian records and the writings of the Persians and the Greek historians. These documents do not as a rule specifically mention the Jews but provide a large amount of indirect information in that they tell us about the conditions, the ideals, the hopes and fears, the whole way of life, of the peoples whose countries the exiles inhabited and whose circumstances they accordingly shared. To these are added those materials which specifically mention Jews; the best known of these are the tablets found by the expedition of the University of Pennsylvania at Nippur on the River Chebar. These business tablets mentioned many Jewish names in association with the great banking house of Murashu Sons—Benjamin, Hananiah, Gedaliah, Pedaiah and others who apparently found that the conditions of the Exile were not so severe that they were unable to flourish in the free enterprise which the Babylonian state maintained and protected. A similar mention occurs in the Jehoiachin Tablets discovered by the German scholar R. Koldeway in an underground room which had once been a store-room beneath a palace in Babylon. King Jehoachin had been taken captive in 597 BC and carried off to Babylon where he was pardoned by the Babylonian ruler Evil-Merodach in 560. These tablets were written before 570, so they give a glimpse of Jehoachin’s conditions before he was pardoned. The tablets give a list of the oil supplied to him and his household; for a month the
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king received about 4 gallons, his little sons 3.76 pints between them, and his eight servants .75 pints each. So we conclude from these tablets that Jehoaiachin had access to his wife, for his children were born after he was carried away captive (the eldest at this time could not have been any older than 15 and was probably a small child). He and his family occupied their own royal quarters with a kitchen (important because it implies some tolerance of the dietary laws by the Babylonian Authorities). Life as a prisoner of Babylonia could not have been too intolerable, and the fact that so much of the codification of Jewish law took place during this period, together with so deep an interest in Hebrew history and a search to find the philosophical principles underlying it, indicate that life for the educated classes was comparatively leisured; the other classes were not present in Babylon, having been left in Palestine to till the soil. It should also be stated that the prisoners could not have been too distressed by any expectation of horrors awaiting them—the attitude of Jeremiah was based in the knowledge of the conditions in Babylon, reinforced by personal acquaintance on the part of the people of Jerusalem with Mesopotamian society over millenia.

JEWS IN MESOPOTAMIA

Hebrew and Jewish contacts with Mesopotamia go back to the very origins of the community, for Abraham came originally from Ur Kasdim and in the land of his adoption the very names Jerusalem, Sinai and others are evidence of early Mesopotamian influence—the ayun is omitted from the form Jeru (= Hebrew Jer) as in Eastern Semitic and the name Sinai contains an element probably derived from Sin, the name of the East Semitic moon-goddess. Articles of Canaanite origin dating from 2nd millennium BC have been found in Mesopotamian sites and the Bible tells us that Achan found a Babylonian garment at Jericho. The exiles from Samaria and Jerusalem did not face the terror of the unknown—trade between the two areas was ancient and well-established and it is not impossible that this trade implied Hebrew traders. Such trading communities were to be reinforced by a group of prisoners who were carried into exile by the Babylonians and settled in places such as Tel-Melah, Tel-Narsha, Kerub, Addan and Immer, but mostly in Babylon. They were settled further east also in the Persian Empire; Mordecai, a Benjamite, for example, lived at Susa, whilst others lived at Thermelith and Thelsas. Many Jews felt their ties with their foster-countries growing stronger as their links with Judaea weakened. The Diaspora was beginning to assume its true position in Judaism, that of leadership, for when the chance to return came, only those
who were in relatively less responsible positions tended to return to Canaan with the nationalistic or pietistic element who were to provide the leadership in Jerusalem after the Return. Spiritual and intellectual leadership in the Jewish world has from that date usually been given by members of the Diaspora.

Freedom for the Jews did not reside in their despoiled native land, ruled by a foreign army of occupation with the aid of immigrant heathen settlers, but rather in those trading colonies where their fellow-Jews had built up prosperous businesses which, since the Jews did not control the carrying business, were probably retail. This urban tendency of Diaspora Jews probably helped to spread the Faith throughout the prosperous cities of the gentile world.¹⁴

**Jews in Egypt**

Jeremiah¹⁵ tells us that after the fall of Babylon the conspirators responsible for the murder of Gedaliah fled to Egypt, taking the prophet with them, presumably believing that they would find refuge there. There are many passages in the Bible which lead one to conclude that there were Jewish communities which by this time had long been resident in Egypt.¹⁶ It is possible, in fact, that at least one colony had been there since patriarchal times,¹⁷ having perhaps remained there since the time of the Exodus when their brethren moved out. This particular community still retained its independence in Persian times and quite likely provided a home for some at least of the refugees from Babylonian aggression. Religious belief amongst the refugees had certain elements in common with the Elephantine community. These common elements are not to be found in the reformed cult as delineated by Jeremiah and the promulgators of Deuteronomy.¹⁸

There were also other sites in Egypt which, either in name¹⁹ or by legend, preserved a memory of the Hebrew people; it is not impossible that they also represent Jewish communities which could have become places of refuge for those who fled the vengeance of the Babylonians. The age of the settlement at Alexandria is unknown but could well go back to an early group of migrants.

We have glanced at those who travelled to the two greatest centres of Jewish life outside Palestine but we have ignored the vast bulk of the people who remained in the land. If we estimate the total number of the captives carried off to Babylon as not exceeding 5000,²⁰ and estimate the small band of malcontents who fled to Egypt as not exceeding 1000—a gross exaggeration in both cases—and reckon these as about 2% of the population, we are
faced with a total population of about 300,000, of whom about 294,000 remained in the land. These were the large majority of the Hebrew people, and they showed themselves quite incapable of leading their nation—the whole future rested with the intellectual and spiritual leaders who had been carried off or else had run away from the vengeance of their conquerors.

Jews over Jordan

The most obvious places in which to seek Jewish trading colonies wherein the refugees from Jerusalem may have found refuge are those foreign nations which lie close to the city itself and are connected to Hebrew territory by land routes. These would be Edom, Moab, Ammon, Damascus and the cities of Phoenicia. Did the hatred which developed between Judah and these nations reflect the reaction of non-Hebrews to the sudden immigration of refugees from Jerusalem? Hostility to refugees always grows wherever ambitious expatriates become more prosperous than the indigenes and offend their host-nation by their exclusiveness.

We know that in an earlier period trading-links made a chain connecting the Jews of these cities with their fellow-religionists elsewhere. There were Hebrew trading enclaves in Damascus as early as the time of Ahab and probably much earlier. In the reign of Ahaz, as a result of military conquest, large numbers of Judaean captives had been carried off to Damascus. There is no record of their return to Judah, so it seems that their descendants probably settled there. By the time of Asa relations between the two nations had improved to such an extent that a league had been negotiated. A sidelight on Judaean and Israelite influence on Syria is given us by the Elijah/Elisha stories—there were Hebrew spies right inside the secret councils of the king of Syria, and the chief collector of the fruits of their spying was the prophet himself: this is sure evidence that there were Jews in Damascus who had lived there long enough to get into influential positions, and it is realistic to suppose that they were prepared to help their co-religionists from Jerusalem.

It is not unlikely that the problematical state of Yaudi near Hamath owed its origin to some such enterprise. The system of “daughter” cities was a Palestinian as well as a Sumerian one, and it seems probable that Yaudi was a “daughter” of Judah just as Ur on the Euphrates was a “daughter” of Ur Kasdim and Sidonia in Spain was a “daughter” of Phoenician Sidon.

An early Hebrew presence in countries beyond the Jordan is attested in Jer. 40:11-12: “When all the Jews who were in
Moab and among the Ammonites and in Edom and in other lands heard that the King of Babylon had left a remnant in Judah . . . they returned from all the places to which they had been driven”. One might look more closely at the theory which finds the basic elements of the Hebrew concept of deity in Dushara, Lord of Seir, and connect Petra with Mount Sinai as suggestive of close early links with Edom. Hebrew legend, as contained in the Book of Ruth, preserves an ancient and probably reliable tradition of close association between Hebrews and Moabites—the important point for this article is that the Hebrews regarded Moab as a place of refuge in time of trouble. The Hebrews seem to have left traces of their own tradition in Moab, and perhaps a Hebrew community settled there permanently, for Mesha, the non-Hebrew king of Moab, is the earliest person known from any extant inscription to have used the Tetragrammaton as the name of the God of the Hebrews. Many passages in the Old Testament refer to the common Abrahamic descent of the Hebrews and Edom and the Herodians felt themselves fitted by descent for the Hebrew monarchy. These circumstances probably made the cities east of Jordan attractive as places of security for the refugees. Association with Ammon is also attested in the Bible. It seems that the Hebrews had long enjoyed a close association with those nations living north-east of the Dead Sea—the blood of the assimilated tribes of Gad, Manasseh and Reuben probably flowed in their veins—and besides this remote connection we know that David conquered Ammon, and later Herod thought fit to build extensively there.

JEWS IN THE INCENSE KINGDOMS

Another ancient settlement of Hebrews—possibly the most romantic and least credible of them all—is that which found itself spread over the Land of Punt. The origin of this series of communities is ascribed to Solomon, who is supposed, in Jewish legend, to have seduced the Queen of Sheba and to have begotten a son. The story goes that she returned to Shabwa accompanied by a great retinue of young men from the best families in Judea, selected by Solomon so that a properly constituted royal court could be set up for the little boy. It has been the pleasure of the Kings of Ethiopia to claim this descent, and whilst reason tells us to discount the legend there may well be a basis of truth which has been obscured by later accretions. The mysterious word Sinim in Is. 49:12 (cf. Ezek. 29:10) is now thought, on the evidence of the Qumran material, to be a textual corruption for Syene, which would indicate an ancient Jewish settlement in the border of Kush, mention of which occurs as early as Gen. 10:6
(the brother of Canaan); cf. 2 Kings 19:9 (why did the King of Assyria fear Kushite intervention on behalf of Jerusalem?).

On both sides of the Red Sea are extremely old Jewish communities, the African one so affected by their environment that they have become indistinguishable from the black people around them. These are the Falashas. Attempts to settle them in modern Israel have not been completely successful, possibly because they belong so completely to an earlier stratum of Hebrew religion that they are strangers in a strange land inhabited by their fellow Jews. The Yemenite Jews, on the other side of the Red Sea, are part of this very ancient group, and the content of some of their legends is such that it may well be of pre-exilic date. Formerly they were, apart from their religion, indistinguishable from their Arab neighbours but this group is now settled in Israel. Hugh Scott thinks that they had their origin in trading enterprises undertaken by Hiram and Solomon. They settled first in the Hedjaz, but in the time of Muhammad were expelled from the Hedjaz and journeyed to the Yemen. It is worth looking at Arab legends. Ibn Khaldun says that the children of Israel captured Medina from the Amalekites, and settled "between the region of Medina and Khaybur in the Hedjaz". The Amalekites, described by Balaam as "the first of the nations", find a place in the history of the Hadramaut.

JEWBS IN CENTRAL ASIA, INDIA AND CHINA

There are many other legends about the early settlement of the Jews, most of which I do not intend to discuss, save briefly to mention them (cf. Is. 11:11). There are the immemorially-old communities in Central Asia whither an ancient connection with the silk trade may have attracted them. It is certain that silk was being imported from China into Palestine as early as the 8th century BC and the Silk Route near Balch divided into two as it went westward—one road to Samarkand, Bokhara, Khiva and on to the West, whilst the other ran south to Baghdad, Palmyra and Damascus. It seems probable that there were Jewish colonies scattered along the Silk Road, and that this was the link that brought them to Central Asia, India and at last China itself. The word Sinim in Is. 49:12 was formerly translated China, which certainly seemed to fill the requirements of the passage—some place far off and to the east—but modern commentators have rejected this interpretation.

Ibn Khaldun (op. cit.) tells us that Nebuchadrecessar settled some of his prisoners at Ispahan, an extremely valuable piece of information in view of the unmistakable Persian influence which is said to
be discernible in the culture of the Jews of Cochin and K’ai Feng. This is probably to be connected with the fact that by 550 BC the so-called Aramaic script had reached N.W. India; it was presumably carried there by Jews (cf. Is. 11:11).

The Jews of Honan Province, living until last century at K’ai Feng, and represented by certain assimilated families that are still there, seem to have accompanied Timur to China from their previous home in India, whither they had come from Persia. This interesting community has certain distinctive features which may link them with the Babylonian galuth but possibly with an earlier period. They did not possess the Talmud nor know the name “Jew” (but called themselves Israelites) nor did they use the Greek loan-word “synagogue”. They had a Central Assembly Court, with a high seat for Moses where the Law was read—an earlier practice than that introduced by Ezra. In their Holy of Holies they had an ark kept in complete darkness and containing thirteen veiled scrolls—does this preserve a memory of the thirteen veils in Solomon’s temple? The conductor of worship wore a veil over his face as he read the Law—as in very early times but not paralleled in Judaism. Similarly Samuel’s ephod and those worn by the priests of Nob were likewise made of linen whereas earlier ones were metal. This may well be a survival of ritual introduced by members of a pre-Exilic diaspora.

The beginning of each season was celebrated in a way that has no rabbinic parallels, and was also foreign to the Chinese neighbours of this community, in the form of a solemn seven-day fast—the fact that it was of seven-day duration has a Semitic echo, so it seems not unreasonable to suppose that it was part of the original cultus of the group. In addition, some of the regular feasts of Judaism were observed as fasts by the Jews of K’ai Feng, almost certainly an earlier observance. The observance of Succoth, which was instituted after the time of Ezra, was not kept at K’ai Feng, nor were the Maccabean festivals of Hannukah and Purim. The evidence seems to indicate that they were separated from the rest of Jewry not later than the Babylonian exile, and moved from Persia to India, whence they followed the cotton trade to China. White suggests about the 10th century AD, but their legends make the date of this migration about 1st century AD. They continued to exist as a community until early this century when the last traces of their distinctive beliefs and observances were finally eliminated and even the site of their synagogue was saved from heathen desecration only by the action of the Anglican Bishop of Honan. It seems possible that this was one of the already-existing Diaspora communities which were places of refuge during the
troubles of the 6th century BC. About the first century AD the square Aramaic script also appeared in Chinese Turkestan, and White comments that this coincides with the overthrow of the Scytho-Parthian empire and the re-settlement of the displaced in Chinese Turkestan; the implication is that these new settlers included communities of Jews, and is evidence of the very early date of Jewish settlement in India.

**JEWS IN PHOENICIA**

The Phoenician Empire was not built up from an urge towards *imperium* but rather towards *emporium*. It was the greatest trading complex of ancient times, it taught the Greeks seamen-ship and the Jews international commerce. The fact that it was developed by Phoenician courage and enterprise from a shadowy forerunner does not detract from the greatness of its achievement. There is little doubt that the Ugaritis were the cultural ancestors of the Phoenicians of Hebrew times and that so far as the Eastern Mediterranean is concerned the Phoenicians followed in the routes they had worked out.

Ancient tradition associates the founding of Gades with the Trojan war and Lixus even earlier than that, so that a date of 1100 BC is imperative. Such an early date is imperative if the foundation of Nora in Sardinia as determined by the discovery of a single inscription, can be accepted as 9th century BC. It is usual nowadays to place the foundation of Gades a century later than this, and to make it roughly contemporary with the establishment of Motya and Carthage and perhaps certain other North African colonies; in this case Utica, which is older than Carthage, would be probably contemporary with Nora. However, Phoenician enterprise was not confined to a shadowy traversing of the sea lanes of the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. We are fairly certain that they penetrated the Atlantic Ocean on their way along the western coast of Spain.

To what extent could the Hebrews and Phoenicians have become associated in the centuries immediately following the settlement? Merneptah's stele mentions Israel as resident in Palestine in the middle of the thirteenth century BC, which is about the date of the destruction of Ugarit. In the inscriptions from this city certain scholars believe they have discovered the name Israel, which is historically possible if the statements in Gen. 15:18; Deut. 1:7; 11:24; Josh. 1:4 be treated as accurate in claiming that the Hebrew conquest extended as far as the River Euphrates, which would have included Ugarit. The Ugaritic texts also mention a people named the *ha-pi-ru* whom it is dangerous to allow to
enter one's home (cf. Deut. 6:10; 11). There is no question that these people were known long before this date both in Mesopotamia and Canaan, and it seems likely that Israel was one of their groups.

There was undoubtedly a very early association between the Hebrews and the people of the Mediterranean littoral. The earliest Biblical reference is probably Deut. 33:18, 19, 23: clearly very early because Asher was still in existence and like Dan (Gen. 49:13) was a seafaring people. Asher may have had as eponym the deity who gave her name to Ugaritic devotion. Similarly, the name ZBLN is mentioned in Ugaritic and may refer to the Hebrew tribe of Zebulon, in which case the extract from the Blessing of Jacob (Gen. 49:13, cf. the Song of Moses, Deut. 33:18, 19) is of the utmost importance:

Zebulon dwells by the sea-shore
his shore is a haven for ships
and his frontier rests in Sidon.

Similarly, Jud. 18:27-8 tells the story of Dan after the tribe moved inland; it would seem that these events took place before the entrance of Abraham into Palestine (Gen. 14:14) and a reference to Dan in Jer. 8:16 (cf. Jud. 20:1) seems to have an ancient mythological background.

One is entitled to ask whether these tribes were Semitic at all. It seems much more likely that they were Aegean in origin, and became incorporated in the Hebrew confederacy as the result of religious assimilation, a composite origin such as the Lebanese scholar Baramki assigns to the Phoenicians themselves and as the Israeli scholar Yadin has put forward in a recent article regarding the tribe of Dan.

It would appear that there was a very early association between Phoenician and Hebrew. This undoubtedly developed on a commercial basis as the centuries passed and both communities found it impossible to survive as nations but feasible to live as economic communities. It was difficult to make commercial treaties with an amphictyony but directly the Hebrews acquired for themselves a king, like the other nations, the road for co-operation with the Phoenicians lay open. They realized that the strategic wisdom of David, exhibited by his establishment of his capital on the invulnerable hill of Zion, enabled him to control the trade route from Phoenicia to the rich Philistine communities of the Shephelah and to Egypt. This was a strong inducement to them to find a modus vivendi with the Hebrews in view of the great extent of Phoenician trade with Egypt, and to this must also be
added the fact that Hebrew hostility would also threaten the trade route overland to Aqaba which was the most convenient communication between Phoenicia and her extensive mercantile interests on the Red Sea and further east. This route, which gave the Phoenician traders a certain independence from Egypt, since at no place did this itinerary traverse Egyptian territory, added to the need for a Hebrew-Phoenician rapprochement. So it becomes obvious that the treaty between Solomon and Hiram was one of equal convenience, and it was accompanied by an arrangement to provide for the worship of the Tyrian deities in the Temple at Jerusalem. The forms of worship which Solomon instituted were the earliest forms which the ancestors of most of his subjects had followed and which had the veneer of conservative acceptance about them—it is hard to realise that the reforms of the prophets were innovations which the bulk of the people, as well as the highly respectable elder clergy, regarded as quite incompatible with established religion. The trading relationship between Hiram and Solomon proved so profitable that it survived the break-up of the Hebrew kingdom. The northern state inherited Solomon’s commercial empire, and the close association with Phoenicia was strengthened by a series of royal marriages. Dido (Elissa = ? Elat) the traditional first ruler of Carthage, which was by now the well-established western counterpart of Tyre and Sidon, was a close relative of Jezebel, wife of Ahab, king of Israel, and it would be strange if Hebrew traders had not taken part in Carthaginian enterprises. Perhaps the very ancient colonies of Moroccan Jews may owe their origins to some such circumstances. This trading agreement was still successful in the time of Jehoshaphat. Pushing beyond their Spanish colonies, perhaps under pressure of Greek competition, Phoenician search for trade led them to France, Britain and the Baltic. They themselves claimed to have circumnavigated Africa, and it is possible that they were almost as familiar with the Indian Ocean as with the Mediterranean. It would only be reasonable to assume that Hebrew merchants accompanied them. Ezekiel certainly knew the wealth that was derived from this trade, although he strongly rejected the luxury and neglect of God that went with it. It is hard to see how these two mercantile nations, whose activities were so largely similar, could have avoided a degree of association in their colonies overseas, especially in the Mediterranean basin.

The results of this study are inconclusive but suggestive. It does seem that there were many places where Jews probably established themselves throughout the trading empire of the Phoenicians, and these may have provided places of refuge for those who fled the disasters which overwhelmed their homeland early in the sixth century BC.
1. In both the Old Testament and the Apocrypha—Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Ezra-Nehemiah, Judith, Tobit.
2. Not only in illustrations of Assyrian and Babylonian triumphs, etc., but also in their historical records and the victory steles of their kings.
3. Herodotus, Eusebius, Josephus, Philo.
4. This is the River Chebar of Ezekiel 1:1, the Nar Kabari or Great Canal.
6. 2 Kings 25:12.
7. Jeremiah 27:4ff, 29:4ff, 24:5, etc.
11. Ezra 8:1ff, Neh. 7:6ff, 1 Esdras 5:7, 2:3.
12. Esther 2:5.
13. 1 Esdras 5:36.
16. These passages all refer, or appear to refer, to a period earlier than the fall of Jerusalem in 581 BC; the most evident are Ezek. 16:26; 23:2-4, 8, 19, 27. See also my article Date of the Foundation of the Jewish Colony at Elephantine, JNES vol. 27, No. 2, April, 1960, p. 89ff.
17. This is the Elephantine community, the origin of which the writer tried inconclusively to examine in the above article.
18. The worship of the Queen of Heaven, with appropriate rites as described in Jer. 44:17ff are not unlike the religious practices of the Elephantine community—there would have been little to alienate the two groups of Jews on doctrinal grounds. Anat-Yahu of Elephantine was the counterpart of Anat-Baal of Ugarit.
19. Tell el-Yehudieh, near Shubn el-Kanatir ("the mound of the Jew’s daughter") is one such site. After the unsuccessful war of 168 BC many Jews were allowed to take refuge and build a temple on the remains of this deserted palace of Rameses III. Had there been an earlier Jewish settlement there which suggested the selection of this particular site?
22. I Kings 15:19ff.; 2Chr. 16:2; 1 Kings 20:34 reads, "And (Benhadad) said unto him: the cities which my father took from thy father, I shall restore; and thou shalt make streets for thee in Damascus as my father made in Samaria". Ahab agreed. This ancient Near Eastern practice of "making streets" as a trading centre for national elements may be the origin of the ghetto system.
23. 2 Ch. 28:5.
24. 2 Ch. 16:3ff.
26. Num. 21:25, 32; 32:42; Josh. 15:28, 45, 47; 17:11, 16; Jud. 1:27; 11:26; Jer. 49:2; Neh. 11:25-31; 1 Ch. 18:1; 2 Sam. 8:1.
27. This view is based on such passages of the O.T. as Jud. 5:4; Deut. 53:2; Is. 21:11. The identification of Seir and Petra is unquestioned. After the fall of Jerusalem the Edomites were expelled from Seir by the Babylonians because they assisted Gedeliah against Nebuchad­rezzar; had the Edomite stand been inspired by resident Jews anxious

28. The Mesha Inscription, dating from the 9th or 10th century BC earlier than the earliest written prophets Amos, Hosea and Micah, is one of the most intriguing of Canaanite inscriptions. It is written in a language very closely akin to Biblical Hebrew and shows some knowledge of the Hebrew cultus of the time. This inscription was carved some 300 or 400 years before the Exile, so it is not unreasonable to assume that there were long-standing Jewish contacts here also which could have afforded a home to the escapees.

29. Gen. 25:30; 36:9, 42; 1 Sam. 14:47; 2 Sam. 8:13 (amending Massoretic Text); 1 Chr. 18:12; Ps. 60:2.

30. Ruth 4:3. The Book of Ruth is thought by some to have been written in its present form as an apologia for the Edomite origin of the Herodian family; it demonstrates the partly-Moabite origin of the Davidic line.


32. The relevant passages dealing with the settlement are:
Manasseh Num. 32:39-42; Josh. 16:9; 17:5-11.
Gad Num. 32:1-5; Deut. 3:12, 16, 17; 29:8.

These tribes disappeared within a few centuries and the obvious conclusion is that they were assimilated by the indigenes. After the Return an attempt was made to re-establish Manasseh. Yahwism was the only distinguishing feature between Hebrews and Canaanites and as the religion of these eastern tribes was syncretistic their ultimate disappearance was inevitable.

33. The Land of Punt extended on both sides of the Red Sea, the modern Yemen and Ethiopia being the territorial heirs of Punt. The word “Punt” is thought to be cognate with the name “Phoenician”—cf. the western form “Punic” used by Latin writers when discussing Phoenician settlements in the West. It was perhaps through people of Punic stock living in this area that Hiram and Solomon were able to set up their trading establishment.

34. E. A. Wallis Budge: Menelik.

35. One of the titles of the Emperor of Ethiopia is “Lion of Judah”.

36. Modern scholars are beginning to learn to be more chary about discarding tradition; often traditions prove to be basically true accounts of forgotten history.

37. Unlike his modern counterpart, the early Jew was a great proselytizer. In New Testament times he would “compass land and sea to make one proselyte”; so perhaps these black Jews are Hamites rather than Semites, just as the modern immigrants into Israel are probably strongly Aryan and Slav rather than Semitic.


42. My impressions of these communities on a recent trip to Central Asia is that they have survived quite securely under the Soviet—I saw Jews in Bokhara, dressed in traditional garb, going as freely to worship as Christians do in Georgia SSR.

43. Amos 3:12.

44. A century before the possible transliteration by Ezra into the square script.
45. The K'ai-Feng community is said to have come into China in three groups:
1. Under the Sung dynasty;
2. Under the Han dynasty;
3. Under the Chou dynasty—before 250 BC. The local Chinese originally referred to this as "the Indian religion", which Bishop W. C. White: *Chinese Jews* (University of Toronto Press, Toronto, 1942) thinks can indicate a connection with the Cochin Jews. The Cochin Jews have records of some of their number going to China, and as they themselves received migrants from time to time we perhaps have an explanation how names of the Babylonian period—Hamam, Esther, Ezra and others—came into use at K’ai-Feng. The names were easily adopted but religious conservatism prevented any similarly modernizing influence to affect the local manner of worship.

46. So also in the Massoretic text of 2 Kings 16:18.
47. Neh 8:1-8.
48. Cf. 1 Kings 8:12, 21.
49. Cf. Exod. 34:31-5, quoted by 2 Chr. 3:12-16.
50. 1 Sam. 2:18.
51. 1 Sam. 22:18.
52. Jud. 8:26ff.; 17:1-14.
53. Lev. 23.
54. Succoth is the usual later name for a festival of great antiquity, cf. A. Bertholet: *A History of Hebrew Civilization*, 1926.
55. Homer, whose work (according to Page, Nilsson, Victor Berard and others) is largely Mycenean in origin, set down, in the greatest epics of the Ancient Western world, accounts of voyaging which it is reasonable to believe were based on Phoenician sources. Homeric voyaging is earlier than Phoenician times as we know them from biblical and classical sources but it is well within the period of Ugarit’s greatness. Thus Jacques Jeurgon (*Archaic Carthage in the Western Mediterranean* in *Archaeologia Viva*, 1970, p.23) refers to “the expansion, which, originating in the fertile strip of land made known to us through the excavations at Ras Shamra (Ugarit) stretched across the southern shores of the Western Mediterranean.” The classical authors themselves preserved legends of great interest in this regard; thus Procopius and Suidas (quoted by Ginsburg: *Legends of the Jews*, vol. 6, p. 177) say that some Canaanites migrated from Canaan in the time of Joshua and settled in Tangier, where a pillar still existed in classical times which read, “We are Canaanites who were driven out of our country by the robber Joshua”. There is also a legend preserved by Ginsburg (p. 178) that the Girgashites migrated to the Caucasus—a legend supported by an indigenous legend in the Caucasus; perhaps there is some historical nucleus within these legends of early Canaanite flight from before the invading Hebrews.
56. Five hundred years before the time of Solomon the Ugaritis, who wrote their records in a language closely akin to Biblical Hebrew, seem to have made long sea voyages in ships of some size. Homer, whose stories originated towards the end of the II Mill. BC, well before the traditional Phoenician period, tells how the “Phoenicians” captured Eumaeus as a child and sold him into slavery.
57. Evidence of Phoenician visitors has been found in the Azores, Britain and along the Atlantic coast of Spain and Africa. Pierre Honore: *In Quest of the White God* (Hutchinson, London, 1963) has a chapter “The White God, the Cretans and the Phoenicians” in which he speculates on possible Phoenician voyages to the Americas.
58. About 1240 BC.

61. All the great collections of sarcophagi, statues and Egyptian trade goods yielded by the soil of Palestine were probably imported by sea, since their very bulk would have made land transport prohibitively expensive. Those in Jerusalem or Shechem who wanted the sophisticated products of the Aegean peoples were dependent on Phoenician carriers, and the presence of Phoenician enclaves in Judah is suggested by the ready acceptance which Jezebel and her entourage found there. Elijah felt completely isolated in his struggle against Tyrian worship of Baal. Kings 19:10.

62. 1 Kings 11:18ff.


64. As already indicated, it was perhaps the extension of an earlier treaty, 1 Kings 1:5; there was certainly a trading settlement in Phoenicia at this time, 1 Kings 5:13ff.; 9:1ff.; 1 Kings 22:48-49 says that when Jehoshaphat’s ships were wrecked Ahab offered seamen which Jehoshaphat refused—one concludes they both had reserves of seamen, probably Phoenician, upon which they could draw. The Phoenicians already had a naval establishment at Ezion Geber.