THE EARLY COLONISTS OF THE MEDITERRANEAN.

BY J. RENDEL HARRIS, M.A., LITT.D., D.THEOL., ETC.

In the Contemporary Review for August, 1925, in an article entitled Adramyttium, a claim was made of a discovery that the Mediterranean Sea, in very early times, before either Greek or Roman settlements existed, had received migrations of traders and colonists from Southern Arabia. Evidence in support was given along two lines. That the trade had existed and the colonists been in possession was evident from the transfer of place-names (as in so many modern colonisations), and from the existence of places which had been named from the products which were the stock-in-trade of the first settlers. The leading instance of the former class of evidence was that of Adramyttium (the modern Edremit), in the N.E. angle of the Ægean Sea, which was shown to be the equivalent of Hadramaut, the Spice-land of S. Arabia. For the latter line of evidence, instances were given of towns named from the principal Arabian spices, such as Smyrna or Myra, towns which certainly never produced any tropical spices or incense on their own account. Nor, it was shown, need the claim that the name of a special commodity of trade might come, through time, to be attached to the place in which it was marketed, excite either surprise or incredulity, since we have before us the fact that the Egyptians called Assuan by the name of Yeb, i.e. Ivory, and the Greeks named the island below the first cataract Elephantine; to which we may perhaps add the island of Philae just above the cataract, a word suspiciously like the Arabic fil for elephant. Assuan was the headquarters of the ivory trade from the Soudan.

It is possible, we think, to detect a third class of place-names, in the form of religious associations, expressed in the use of the names of deities, who migrate with the colonists and have a care of them.
Parallels to this practise may be found in the track of Spanish explorers or Portuguese navigators, who punctuate their paths with saints and churches and festivals. It will be well to keep our eyes open for the migration of S. Arabian deities, for there is reason for believing that the god Min, who is splendidly honoured at Coptos on the Nile, where one of the chief Arabian trade-routes terminates, was specially honoured also in the incense-producing lands of S. Arabia and Ethiopia. There is no a priori reason why Min should not appear along with the Mineans and Sabeans in the Mediterranean.

Almost at the same time that our article on Adramyttium appeared, there was published by Professor D. S. Margoliouth a small volume entitled the Homer of Aristotle, which showed that his thought had been moving on parallel lines with our own in respect to the existence of prehistoric Arabian colonies in the Mediterranean.

Without discussing the general theory which Professor Margoliouth propounds for the genesis of the Homeric writings, beyond the observation that the book requires a much more thorough examination than it has yet received, we will transcribe what he has said on the subject of Adramyttium and South Arabia; our results, if correct, confirm one another, and there is no question of either priority or plagiarism. The following passages should be noted:—

(p. 88) “Of some prehistoric immigration or immigrations from Arabia traces have been found in names which figure on the map of Asia Minor, and to some extent even on that of Hellas itself. The most striking is doubtless Ἀδραμυττίον, whose identity with Hadramut does not seem doubtful. Abydos, found in the Iliad, cannot well be separated from the Abbud of Arabia, and Larissa seems in ancient as in modern times to be an accommodation to European pronunciation of the Arabic al-Arish, ‘the Hut. . . .’ It would seem that in Homer’s time little was remembered of those ancient settlements except their names.”

It will be noticed that Professor Margoliouth has, without definitely saying so, added at least four prehistoric Arabian settlements to Adramyttium, from which we started our common enquiry. On the one hand he identifies an Arabian settlement in Thessaly, with its origin in the well-known frontier castle between Egypt and Palestine; on the other hand, he identifies Abydos on the Dardanelles with an
Arabian origin, after which it is hardly possible to exclude the more famous city of Osiris on the Nile. The question is accordingly raised as to whether there was a primitive colonisation of Egypt from Arabia, which does not exclude the idea of intercolonisation, nor the existence of Egyptian colonies in Arabia; indeed the question must be left open, whether Abydos on the Dardanelles may not be a colony of Egypt itself, for why should it be assumed that Arabian civilisation spread everywhere, and Egyptian nowhere?

Our present purpose is to carry the enquiry a step further, and to find confirmation for our theory that the Mediterranean was colonised in very early times from the South. When we have made that point clear, we will go on to examine whether there are any traces of similar migrations from the East.

Much of the evidence in support of the truth of our contention regarding these early migrations, is drawn from the presence of the cowry shell amongst the ruins of early cities or in ancient tombs. The cowry comes from the Red Sea or the Indian Ocean (especially the latter), and its presence anywhere, in ancient times, far from its source, implies that it came there, in the last analysis of origins, from Arabian travellers and traders. Let us then further consider the cowry, and its diffusion.

Had we gone through the African section, in the recent Empire Exhibition at Wembley, we should have seen native women wearing two different kinds of head ornaments, some having gold coins on their foreheads, and others cowry shells worked into their hair. Yet both are expressive of the same idea, one is a direct evolution from the other. Each ornament represents, ultimately, a monetary value, for, as we have shown elsewhere, the cowry shell is currency, still, right across Africa; but in both cases, ornamental value, and its associated magical value, preceded value as currency. The connecting link between the two kinds of ornament is the gold cowry, i.e. a piece of gold shaped like a shell, and worn in the same manner as the shell.

We give some further evidence of the use of the cowry as a primitive prophylactic (especially for women), and some early instances of what may be called its “aurification.”

When Mr. and Mrs. Theodore Bent travelled, not long ago, in the Eastern Soudan, they found that the women “had glass beads and
cowries tied to their matted locks, and brass and silver rings of considerable size fastened to their noses."  

And here is an account of how the men of a Nilotic tribe decorate their hair with cowries. Ferdinand Werne in his *Expedition to discover the Sources of the White Nile* (English trans., 1849, vol. ii., p. 172) noted of a certain Nilotic tribe that "their felt morions were covered over and over with sea-shells (*Cyprea moneta*) and the inside so intertwined with their hair, that they could not take them off without cutting off the hair itself; therefore we could not persuade any of them to sell us their caps. At last one man asked a large shellfull of beads for it. Another fellow was brought to Selim Capitan, but he would not resign his morion for any price, and said that he purchased it for eight cows, and that it came from the very distant countries of KEKESO." Further proof of this use of cowries as a hair-decoration by the men may be found in Grogan (*From the Cape to Cairo*, 1900, ch. xxi.), who tells that the Nuer, a tribe adjacent to the Dinkas, "wear circlets of cowries round their hair, which they wear long, like a mop."

We may note here, also, that African women wear the cowrie not only on the head, but in the form of a girdle round the waist. Good illustrations of these are given in Professor Elliot Smith's work on the *Dragon-Myth*.

When we turn from the ordinary shell, such as is worn on camel's necks or women's hair and waistbands, to consider what I have termed the "aurified" cowry, we find evidence regarding it, which goes back to very early times. For instance, we find the gold cowry in Cyprus among antiquities of the Mycenean period. In Marshall's *British Museum Catalogue of Jewellery*, we find amongst Cypriote antiquities, the following items:—

"No. 666. Twelve gold beads of the Mycenean period stamped on either side with double-dotted ring, and diametral dotted line, perhaps cowrie shells seen from below.
Nos. 667-669. Similar objects.
No. 678. . . . two gold beads in the form of cowrie-shells, pierced on either side with two holes for stringing."

Entries such as these show us that the cowrie shell, both in its

1 *Southern Arabia*, p. 304.
natural form, and in its golden imitation, was current in the Mediterranean as early as civilisation itself.

It is, however, in Egypt that the cowry attains not merely "aurification," but the greater glory of the jeweller's art. No more splendid piece of ancient jewellery has ever been unearthed, than the Lahun Treasure, now in New York. It is composed of eight large gold cowries forming a necklace or girdle, and it is described by Mr. Guy Brunton in Lahun I, the Treasure. Incidentally, Mr. Brunton remarks, "the cowry was occasionally used as an ornament, and also as an amulet, very rarely, from pre-dynastic times. The use of cowries as amulets is a large subject." We accept the testimony as valuable coming from one who has no special interest in giving it. But no light is shed on the place of the shell in the history of civilisation. In our investigation the cowry is all-important and for this reason, that it is almost the only thing by which we can track an Arabian Civilisation in motion. Frankincense and myrrh leave no traces (unless we include in our enquiry ancient incense burners), and gold, except when made into coin or jewellery, is strictly anonymous. The shell is unmistakable. We have shown it as widely prized and used in the present, among primitive peoples, and possessing a history that stretches far back into pre-historic times. It was, in very early days, an article of commerce and a medium of exchange; it was brought from Southern Arabia. These facts, combined with the proofs we have furnished with old towns and trade centres, still traceable, bearing Arabian names, can lead only, in our judgment, to one conclusion, namely, that before Greeks or Romans appear on the page of history, the peoples of Southern Arabia were trading and colonising round the shores of the Mediterranean and in Egypt.

That ancient fable of the Phœnix, which at certain periods of time (they said 500 years), brought the dead body of its predecessor to Heliopolis in Egypt, wrapped in a nest of spices, might sooner have suggested to us that there was some early link between Heliopolis and the Spice lands, and if I remember rightly, Pliny refers the foundation of the city to the Arabians.¹ He too tells us that Coptos, on the Nile, was (I suppose in his own day) the "factory" for

¹ "Solis quoque oppidum, quod non procul Memphi in Aegypto situ discimus, Arabas conditores habere." H.N. vi. 34.
Arabian and Indian merchants. Probably, in view of the persistence of trade routes, Arab traders may have deposited their wares in Coptos at a much earlier period, but, as the name is not an Arabic one, we cannot on philological grounds claim it as an original colony.

I propose to show that there are positive traces of Arabian colonisation in Egypt itself.

If we turn to Ptolemy's description of Arabia, or to the Ptolemaic map as reconstructed by Sprenger, we shall find a reference to a town in the hinterland of the Red Sea coast of Arabia, reached from a sea-port which he calls Iambia. The name of the town is given as Lathrippa, by Ptolemy. Scholars are agreed in identifying Iambia with the modern Yambo, and Lathrippa with the ancient Arabian town Yathrib, which is no other than the world-renowned Medina, where the tomb of Mohammed is the principal sanctity. The identification, and the involved justification of Ptolemy's accuracy as a geographer, is stated in the following terms by Hogarth in his book on the Penetration of Arabia.

(p. 18) "In Lathrippa, placed inland from Iambia (Yambo), we recognise the Iathrippa of Stephen of Byzantium, the Yathrib of the early Arab traditions, now honoured as El Medina, the City of Cities.

"Where so many identifications are possible, what reasonable critic will deny that Ptolemy's map of inland Arabia was both made in good faith and represented approximately the facts of his time?"

Elsewhere, speaking of Stephen of Byzantium, Hogarth says:—

(p. 24) "this first compiler of a geographical dictionary—dreary task in which he had many Moslem followers—hardly rendered any service to Arabian topography beyond the correction of Ptolemy's Lathrippa to a form which places its identification with Yathrib-Medina beyond cavil."

We shall assume, then, the identification of Yathrib with Medina.

If we cross the Red Sea to Egypt, we shall find two cities, bearing the Greek name "Ἀθρῆβης (Ἀθρῆβης) which is suggestive of some connection with the Arabian Yathrib. One of them is in the Delta, and answers to the modern town of Benha, the other is not far from Sohag and the great White Monastery of the Copts, and lies on the
opposite side of the Nile to the town of Akhmim (Gr. Panopolis). This second Athribis has been excavated, though not completely, by Professor Petrie and his colleagues, and the results are contained in the volume of Egyptian explorations bearing the name Athribis. The excavators explored the remains of a pair of Egyptian temples, credited to the patronage of Ptolemy Physkon, and Ptolemy Auletes.

Petrie observes on his first page that "the name of this city Athribis must not be confused with Athribis in the Delta, the modern Benha. The Delta town was Hat-er-hab, 'the fortress in the midst of the plain,' the southern town is Hat-repyt, 'the fortress of Repyt,'—a lion-headed goddess, who is scarcely known elsewhere." On this supposition, the two Greek Athribis towns present a chance coincidence in name with one another. But when we find a further chance coincidence with a celebrated town in Arabia, it would seem more reasonable to say that the Egyptian names are etymological perversions, and the goddess Repyt with her lion-head a late addition to an already over-stocked Pantheon. But let us see if we can trace some further proofs of connection of the southern Athribis (Hathribis) with the outside world.

Petrie tells us that "the chief interest in the temple is what is called the Punt chamber, which is devoted to the offering of various trees from Punt." For instance, there is a sculpture of Ptolemy Auletes presenting five trees to Sekhet. Upon this and similar offerings Petrie remarks, "Another interest here is the dedication of incense-trees from Punt. The active trade down the Red Sea, carried on in Ptolemaic and Roman times, may well have brought the trees as well as the incense to Egypt, and the record here is thus in accord with the affairs of the time." The record, we think, does more than furnish additional proof of the existence of trade relations between Egypt and Arabia in the time of the latest Ptolemies. It seems to imply some special early connection between Athribis and the district where the myrrh trees grow, which Ptolemy, the geographer, places to the south-east of the Arabian Yathrib. Let us see what the hieroglyphs on the Punt-chamber say as to the import of the trees.

Petrie: Athribis, p. 18:—

"(Min) lord of Apu (Ekhmim), lofty of plume, king of the Gods in Hat-aah. . . , the good god of Punt. He set up for
him the shrine of the bull (?), and built the shrine in Punt, filling it with myrrh-trees for his mother, the mighty one, the eye of Horus, Repyt, mistress of the West.”

Here we see that Min is not only a deity in Punt: he is one also in Athribis. He has migrated along with the myrrh and the myrrh-trees, and has been put into a filial relation, in the Egyptian manner, with the imagined deity Repyt, who is, as we suggest, a derivative from the name Yathrib (Hat-repyt). Min, who thus migrated from the Regio-Smyrnifera of Ptolemy, is a heroised form, taken to be the paternal deity of the Minaean kingdom.

It will be seen, then, that we are not unduly imaginative if we affirm the existence of special historical links between Athribis in Upper Egypt and Yathrib in Arabia. Medina has crossed the Red Sea and established itself as a colony on the Nile: and it seems likely that this colony, which can be detected first at Akhmim, and then across the river from Akhmim, became Egyptianised, and finally disappeared in the absorbing numbers of the surrounding tribes. Much the same thing must have happened in Mysia, when Adramytium was invaded by Greek colonists from Delos, and ceased, in consequence, to be thought of as anything else than a Greek city. Nor need we doubt that there must have been a number of similar colonial ventures, which were superseded by later migrations, and often passed out of sight, without leaving even a name by which to be remembered.

The connection which we have suggested between Yathrib-Medina and Athribis (Hathribis) is not altogether new, and it is contradicted by Hogarth in his recent work, A History of Arabia. Nor will he allow that Punt may be regarded as Arabian. His statement is as follows:—

“The Peninsula had remained, for long ages, perhaps till after our era, singularly immune from the influences, political or social, of civilisations outside its limits. . . . Nor, in all probability, were they well acquainted with Pharaonic Egyptians. “Punt” was almost certainly not in Arabia. Queen Hatshepsut’s artist gives the land too African a look to suit the Wadi-estuaries of the south-western Peninsula; nor may Yathrib be equated with Athribis, until at least one of those myriad relics, which Egyptians have left on or in the soil wherever their arms or commerce passed, has been turned up in Hejaz” (A Hist. of Arabia, p. 8).
It will be observed that what Hogarth is objecting to is an assumed colonisation of Arabia by Egyptians; our contention is that migration actually occurred in the opposite direction, and instead of searching for Egyptian relics in Medina, we look for, and find, relics of the incense trade in Egypt, to wit, the wall paintings and sculptures of the Punt chamber. Moreover, the reference in those inscriptions to Min as the Lord of Punt, and to Punt as the home of the incense trees, is not invalidated by the contention of Hogarth that Punt is somewhere else than in Arabia. The initial mistake was in looking for Egyptian colonies in Arabia. We agree with Hogarth that Yathrib is not Egyptian. At the same time we would not go so far as to say that no Egyptian colonies existed on the eastern side of the Red Sea. Ptolemy himself suggests (and we have seen how accurate his locations are) a town named Thebes, somewhat to the south of Iambia (Yambo). We shall try to make a link between the Egyptian Thebes and the Bœotian, but we must not hastily conclude that a similar Egyptian colony might not have been found in the Red Sea. Let it suffice, for the present, to have shown that the Arabians were in evidence on the Nile at the Southern Athribis, just as the Jews were at Syene and the first cataract. The Arabian connection with Punt was by way of the Strait of Bab-el-Mandeb, and it was necessary for the reinforcement of the incense market from which they supplied the world. So there may have been a commercial reason why Min became the Lord of Punt. The traffic in incense was still in existence in the time of Strabo, when the Arabian dealers were in connection with Somaliland by way of the Strait.

Assuming that we have established the existence of S. Arabian colonies in Egypt and in the Mediterranean let us leave the investigation of Hadramyttium and its possible sister colonies, and raise a similar question regarding Egypt; for it certainly seems unlikely that the Minean kingdoms of S. Arabia should form colonies in the Mediterranean, and the greater and more ancient kingdom of Egypt remain entirely self-contained. One might as easily conceive it possible to stop the Nile from discolouring the waters of the Mediterranean, as imagine Egyptian influence confined within the Nile valley.¹

¹ E.g. What are we to say of such a statement as this in Smith's *Dict. of Ancient Geography*, s.v. Crete: "No proof of Egyptian colonisation can be adduced; and from the national character it is probable that settlers of pure Egyptian blood never crossed the Ægean."
Indeed, when we begin to shake ourselves loose from the traditional historical view, according to which Egypt contained a non-migrant population, and ask ourselves why we should accept such an antecedent improbability, we see Byblos in Syria rising before us, with its tradition of migrant divinities, and its recently uncovered treasure of Egyptian sculptures. Certainly Byblos was a colony; the gods do not travel unattended.

The ancients appear to have been well aware that the connection of Isis with Byblos was commercial as well as religious. For instance, in the Etymologicum Magnum we have the following statement:—

"Byblos. Some say that when Isis arrived from Egypt, and was wailing over Osiris, she deposited there the diadem of her head, which was made of papyrus (βύβλινον ύπάρχον), being so named from the papyrus which grows in the Nile (ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν τῷ Νείλῳ φυομένης βύβλου)."

Closely parallel to this is the statement of Stephanus of Byzantium, who gives in his De Urbibus two or three derivations for the name of the city. He says:—

"Byblos. The most ancient of all the Phoenician towns, being the foundation of Kronos, having derived its name from Byblē the daughter of Miletus. But it had its title of Byblos, from the fact that any ancient book was preserved there undamaged (βύβλου φυλακήν ἀσώνεα ἐν ταύτῃ γενέσθαι). But some say that in that city Isis, when wailing over Osiris, deposited her diadem, and this was a papyrus crown (βύβλινον) made from the Egyptian plant (?) which the Nile used to produce in the marshes (ἀπὸ τῆς φυλῆς τῆς Αἰγυπτίως ἡς ἀνέτρεψε Νείλος ἐν τοῖς ἑλεσί).

A comparison of Stephanus' language with that of the Etymologicum will show that both writers are struggling with a word, which required either correction or explanation. The troublesome vocable suggested φυλή, φόσμας, φυλακή. It is not easy to decide the original form. At all events the early tradition is clear that Byblos was a paper-town and this was the reason why Isis wore a straw hat on her arrival in the city.

Here is another early intimation of the extent of the commerce between Egypt and Byblos. In the papyrus document known as the

1 The text is in some confusion.
Admonitions of Ipwer, which is preserved at Leiden, and represents a composition of the twelfth Egyptian dynasty, we have either a record or a prophecy of a time when the social order in Egypt was threatened with disintegration. In the course of his Admonitions the sage breaks out as follows:—

"Men sail not northward to Byblos to-day. What shall we do for cedar for our mummies, with the produce of which priests are buried, and with the oil of which (chiefs) are embalmed?"

Upon which Gardiner notes: "It is now well known that Byblos was the port from which the Egyptians sought access to the Lebanon."

It will hardly be suggested that all the trade between Egypt and Byblos was in one direction; there must have been exports from Egypt as well as imports into Egypt, amongst the former we may clearly reckon the various papyrus fabrics, and it is these that have given a name to the city. The traffic to which we refer appears to have been known to Homer, as we shall presently see.

We have suggested above that Byblos was, originally, an Egyptian settlement or colony. We deduced this from the religious history of the migration of Isis in search of her husband’s relics, and from the archaeological evidence which is furnished by the excavations, in process at present, on the spot. The same conclusion might be reached by another method of enquiry. Following the analogy furnished by the existence of factories or emporia, places where special articles of commerce were deposited and from which they were distributed, it is clear that the name Byblos, which is a variant of the Greek papyrus, implies a Paper-town, a centre for the traffic in a variety of articles made from the great Egyptian reed. We do not then look for a place-name in Egypt, from which Byblos might be derived. For, as in the case of Myra and Smyrna, we have the name of a product instead. In this connection it is interesting to remember that the papyrus plant furnishes such various products as shoes, sails, cordage, etc., besides the chief product, the paper made from the pith of the reed. To any of these products the adjective Byblian (βυβλιανός) might be applied.

For instance, in the Odyssey, when the hero is preparing to take his revenge upon the suitors, who have, in his absence, been eating

up his substance, we have a situation which Butler summarises as follows:—

"Philætius slipped out and secured the gate of the outer court with a ship's cable of Byblos fibre that happened to be lying beside it."

Notice that Byblos is written with a capital letter; it is much the same as saying "with a Manilla rope." Merry's note on this peculiar βύβλινος is to the following effect:—

"Βύβλινον, a rope of byblos" is probably one made from a plant of that name, similar in character to the Egyptian papyrus. Such ropes might well find their way into Greece through the Phænicians traders."

But if our conclusion be correct, and the word Byblos but a variant form of papyrus, there is no need to distinguish between two kinds of ropes or plants. They are one. Nor is there any necessity to introduce the Phœnicians at all, if the town of Byblos was a true Egyptian colony. The Egyptians so situated would be able to sell papyrus ropes on their own account, either to Phœnicians or Greeks. It is quite likely, then, that Butler was right in spelling Byblos with a capital letter. As our knowledge of Egyptian life and history grows, we may expect to find more of their emporia and settlements in the Mediterranean. For instance there is another Thebes, close to Adramyttium; here we may find the Egyptian and S. Arabian colonists almost side by side.

We will now go in search, in more northern latitudes, of further sanctuaries or antiquities, which may suggest colonisation from the south. Let us try if we can make connection between Thebes in Egypt and Thebes in Boeotia.

We will first examine some Theban literature of the south, contained in Egyptian hymns of the time of Amenophis the third. We shall find traces of twin-cult in Egypt which suggest a parallel with the twin-cult that we know to have prevailed in Boeotia.

A person who begins the study of Egyptology very soon finds out that the Egyptian religion does not present a uniform face to his observation. That it is an evolution out of a primitive savagery, comparable with what we are able to recognise in existing African religions, becomes apparent on even a superficial survey; but this
evolution is inconsistent; it varies from place to place as well as from
time to time. Egyptian religion is not the same up the Nile from any
point as it is down the Nile; more remarkable still, it does not present
consistently the same features on opposite banks of the river, where
the populations are in early times not only hostile but of alien religious
sentiments, worshipping different deities under diverse forms. This
diversity has recently been accentuated by the observation that twin-
cult, which is one of the earliest forms of universal religion, is not
consistently represented in the Egyptian tradition. My attention was
recently drawn (by my friend, the late Professor Harsley), to the
evidence for Egyptian twin-cult furnished by one of the early religious
hymns, addressed to the Sun-god by Horus and Set, who declare
themselves to have been the architects of the temples at Luxor and
Thebes. There is nothing especially new about the hymn, which is
considered to be of high poetical beauty, except its interpretation.
It was published in 1870 by Pierret,¹ again by Birch² in 1885, and
recently by v. Günther Roeder³ in 1923. What is new in the
interpretation lies in the fact that Horus and Set, who are the assumed
authors of the Psalm, are described as (a) twins; and as (δ) architects.
Here, for instance, is a passage from the hymn in question:—

“Set the architect, and Horus the architect, he says: I
was a superintendent in thy temple, an architect in thy sanctuary,
without error, in the sanctuary which thy beloved son Amenophis
iii has built for thee (Amon-Ra). My lord had commanded me
to carry out thy building; because he knew my vigilance. . . .

Never do I take joy in lying words; my joy is in my brother,
who is like to myself in kind; over whose thoughts I have joy;
since we came together out of the mother’s womb, Set the
architect and Horus the architect.”

Putting aside the curious alternation between the “I” of the first
person singular and the “We” of the plural, the text is quite decisive
as to the twinship of Set and Horus, as to their architectural gifts, and
as to their being the patrons of truthfulness.⁴ The hymn resolves
itself into a prayer in which the twins explain that one of them was

¹ Recueil des travaux egypt. et assyr., i., pp. 70-72.
³ Urkunden zur Religion des alten Ägypten, pp. 9-12.
⁴ A point to which my friend, Dr. Rutherfurd, draws my attention.
architect on the right bank of the Nile, i.e., in Luxor; the other on the left bank, i.e., in Thebes. Now we must face certain difficulties of interpretation: first, that Horus and Set are not brothers in the ordinary Temple-lore of Egypt; second, they are not friendly, but hostile. Set is the uncle of Horus; he kills Osiris, who is the father of Horus, and is himself slain by Horus, or, at least, roughly handled, in revenge for his father’s death. The story of the quest for the scattered limbs of Osiris is amongst the best-known elements of Egyptian religion.

It is clear that the conventional Egyptian story can never have given rise to a cult in which Set and Horus were similar to one another, and actually twins by birth. Consequently we must infer that the story of Set and Horus has come down on two different lines of evolution. It is well known that twins in early religion are sometimes friendly (as Castor and Pollux), and sometimes hostile (as Romulus and Remus, or Cain and Abel, or Esau and Jacob), and in West Africa we may sometimes find adjacent tribes making opposite interpretation of twins, as for example, that they are beneficent, or that they are hostile to the community. In the Theban Hymn the twins are certainly friendly, yet we notice that they operate on opposite banks of the Nile, which often denotes hostility. In any case the inconsistency in the interpretation should be noticed. It looks as if the official twins of the Egyptian system were originally Osiris and Set; in which case the maxim that “Twin kills Twin” would be exactly illustrated.

Now with regard to their being architects of cities, temples, etc. This is one of the first characteristics of the primitive twin-cult that was discovered; it was noted in the case of Florus and Laurus, the martyred architects from Byzantium, in the case of Zethus and Amphion, the builders of the Greek Thebes, of Romulus and Remus, the founders of Rome, and in other cases, for which we may refer to the pages of my book Boanerges, in which connection we must not forget that in the Acts of Thomas, Judas Thomas, who is described as the Lord’s twin-brother, is the architect who knows how to build tombs and temples, and who actually takes service under king Gondofar to build him a palace. The affirmation of the twins as to their common passion for truthfulness is another feature which had already come to light in several directions. We recall the sanctity
of oaths taken by Castor and Pollux or by St. Thomas the Apostle, or of contracts taken in their sanctuaries. There can be no doubt that we have recovered in this Egyptian hymn a fragment of ancient twin-lore. The result is valuable, because it adds definite evidence to the suspicions which had been aroused by finding twin-priestesses in the sanctuaries at Memphis and at Thebes.

We come now to an interesting point in relation to some modern enquiries made by Professor W. J. Perry in his book, *The Children of the Sun*, as to the meaning of a certain dual element which can be detected in Egyptian government and religion. Mr. Perry finds something of the same kind in a number of vanished civilisations lying both East and West of Egypt, and makes the recurrence of such duality an argument for the dependence of these lost helio-cultures (as he calls them) upon the archaic civilisation of the Nile Valley. Thus he says that "Horus and Set in Egyptian mythology are usually represented as hostile, though, in some pyramid texts, they are friendly. These two beings are connected with Upper and Lower Egypt, respectively, and evidently the hostility between them has some historical significance." The implication appears to be that it is really the two hostile countries, Upper and Lower Egypt, that are responsible for the duality of Egyptian culture. As soon, however, as we add the discovery that they were thought of as twins, to the fact, rightly registered by Professor Perry, that Set and Horus are sometimes friendly, and sometimes hostile, we are no longer obliged to explain their concords or discords in terms of the Egyptian history. We should do better in Uganda or on the Niger. In folk-lore the Niger is an earlier river than the Nile. On the last page of his book Professor Perry shows that he has been reading Boanerges (see *The Children of the Sun* (1923), p. 502), and that he is not without a hope that his investigations may be correlated with my own. It is, however, evident at a glance that the twin-cult of which I speak is not Egyptian twin-cult but a much wider and earlier region of human speculation, whose home was in the mind of man, probably long before the Nile valley was formed or the Delta deposited: and it is generally true of these investigations into the wanderings of *The Children of the Sun*, that they need to be taken into much deeper levels.

1 *Children of the Sun*, p. 431.
At the same time I am not using the occasion for a negative criticism of Mr. Perry’s work; it may even turn out that I bring him some positive reinforcement. For example, if the twins (Set and Horus) are the architects of the Egyptian Thebes, as we know the twins (Zethus and Amphion) to have been of the Greek Thebes, we have one more suggestion for a dependence of one Thebes upon the other, and of the Boeotian culture upon the Egyptian. May it not be the case that Zethus, the rough brother of the Theban pair, is actually Set, whom Plutarch transcribes as ζῆθος? The earliest known form of the name Zethus is given us in a Pæan of Pindar—himself a Boeotian: here Thebes is spoken of as

Κύδμου στράτου καὶ ζεάθον πόλιν

And the metre makes the reading ζέαθος quite certain.

Assuming that we have recovered an earlier form of the name, it is natural to suggest that we have here a transliteration of a word with three consonants of which the middle one was silent like the Hebrew נ or the Egyptian א: we should write it in Hebrew as גא, but we do not know of any such Hebrew name. Bearing in mind, however, that the Egyptian language resembles the Hebrew in its consonantal character, we must ask whether גא is good Egyptian. There is no ζ in the Egyptian language, but just as the Hebrew גא (wolf) is supposed to be the equivalent of the Egyptian גא (jackal), the Greek form ζῆθος may be the equivalent of the Egyptian גא (Set). In that case the Theban twins, Set and Horus, have migrated to the Greek Thebes, and the one city is named after the other, just as the one twin is the transliteration of the other. The Greek tradition is to the effect that Thebes was founded by Cadmus, and this has been taken to mean that it was, at the first, a Phoenician colony. We must go further afield, therefore, than the mythical Cadmus, if we are to find the Theban origins, for, as we have said, one Thebes is the colony of the other. The first stratum of Boeotian civilisation is Egyptian.

It need hardly be said that, as in the case of Hadramyttium, proof of the existence of one colonial centre will set us on the search for others. We shall have, as we noted in our comment on Professor Margoliouth, to enquire whether the Greek Abydos is not a colonial double of the Egyptian holy city Abydos, and whether Carnac in
Brittany may not have taken its name from Karnak at Luxor, and then we must pass to the subject, in general, of Egyptian civilisation in the Mediterranean.

It is interesting, in conclusion, to point out that the Egyptian Psalm from which we made our start on the journey from Thebes to Thebes has had an external influence, and re-acted on the Hebrew Psalter. Some of its lines recall the well-known phrases of the 27th Psalm. The Egyptian text runs thus:

“'I was the overseer on the West bank of the Nile, and he upon the East bank; we both had the oversight of great buildings in Karnak and in the circuit of Thebes, the city of Amon. Grant unto me, O Amon, an old age in thy city, while I may behold thy beauty, and then be buried in the West, the place of the rest of the heart (? the heart's desire). Then I shall be united to those that are extolled, etc.”

The parallel is, of course, the 27th Psalm of the Hebrew Psalter:

“One thing have I desired of Jahveh; That will I seek after: That I may dwell in the house of Jahveh All the days of my life: To behold the beauty of Jahveh, And to enquire in his temple.”

We are in the same circle of ideas in the two Psalms; life is asked for, and long life, in the temple of the deity, and the temple is the outward symbol of the invisible Beauty and Splendour of the god.

It is customary with the makers of Classical atlases to indicate the spread of Greek and Phœnician colonisation by special maps, which show by underlinings in colour where settlements were formed by Corinth or Phocis or Tyre and Carthage. We have now added to their responsibility the duty of intimating the diffusion of S. Arabian colonies in the Mediterranean and in Egypt, and of Egyptian colonies in the Mediterranean and possibly in Arabia. At this point a new question arises. We are making use of place-names as sure guides to the location and migration of peoples, and have shown how such place-names express the home-lands (as in Hadramaut), and the products of the home-lands (as in Byblos). These are instances of colonies formed by settled peoples. We cannot in this connection
write down the S. Arabians as Nomadic; they were a powerful people, and one of the great kingdoms of early times. Hadramaut is not a name associated with a tribe, but with a strong people, sending out traders and colonisers in all directions.

But how shall we trace the movements of nomadic peoples who have no goods to sell, and no homeland, from which to name the new land, on which they ultimately settle? Only by the name of the tribe itself. In the time of Caesar, for instance, the population of Northern Europe was largely composed of tribes and peoples in motion under various forms of economic pressure. Such groups may turn up anywhere, but they will, unless they cease to be nomadic, leave no historic trace. We may write the Kelts across Galatia, and find a settlement across the Galata Bridge in Constantinople; the names will suggest their transition from motion to rest, but we cannot call them colonies, though they are numerous enough in the East to form a great people. In the West, however, we find the nomadic tendency disappearing; and if we are right in our account of the Southern Gauls, they finally formed real colonies in Sicily and elsewhere. Colonisation follows rapidly upon settlement.

Let us look at a map of an earlier type than is common in Classical atlases. It is known, now, that at one time the people of the Hittites constituted the third great empire of the Near East, dividing rule with Egypt and Assyria. The fact of empire implies that they have ceased to be nomads. Carchemish is almost as great a city as Babylon. Had they, we ask, any colonies? Can they be traced, in strange lands, by the names of cities or of districts, or by the products of their industries? Can we duplicate Carchemish as we have multiplied Thebes? Is there any town bearing a Hittite name in Western Asia Minor or in Palestine?

In view of our ignorance of Hittite language and affairs, such questions are not easily answered; but when we remember how slow we have been to recognise the fact of Egyptian colonisation, in spite of the existence of proofs, it is only reasonable to suppose that if we search for them, we shall find traces of the Hittite Empire in the West or South. Here is one instance, in confirmation. Ptolemy, in his geographical enumerations, tells us of a town in Libyan whose name he gives as Hettaia (Xerraia); that is exactly Hittite, and this fact suggests that the Hittites were not land-dwellers only. Some of
them, at all events, had gone to sea, and had found a settlement on
the Libyan coast, in the same way as the S. Arabians and the
Phœnicians.¹

If we are right in thus interpreting Ptolemy, who knew as little
of the Hittite empire as Herodotus, we are able at once to contradict
Professor Garstang’s dictum that “we see the Hittites as a purely
inland people, not taking to the sea more kindly at any rate than do
the Turkish peoples of to-day.”²

It is evident that, if Garstang’s idea of an inland and non-sea-going
Hittite people can be shown to be incorrect, that the over-seas activity
can as little be limited to a single Libyan village as the activity of the
S. Arabians to a single Ægean sea-port. We do not say positively
that there might not have been a deportation of Hittite prisoners by
the Egyptians who conquered them in Northern Syria, but it is
certainly very unlikely. Nor do we say that a group of Hittite
colonists could not have come round from Asia to Africa by land, but
again, it does not seem probable. We do say, however, that the
group of Hittite colonists in Libya may fairly be regarded as having
come there by water, say from the gulf of Alexandretta or from the
mouth of the Orontes. But in that event how could they have
avoided Cyprus? They had successfully occupied Cilicia and N. Syria, and were in touch with Egypt apparently by sea and land.
It would not be possible for them to ignore Cyprus.

In the documents from Tell-el-Amarna, which have done so much
to change our ideas as to the relations that existed between the great
empires of the East, and particularly of the Hittite and Egyptian
empires, which were at one time contiguous in Northern Syria, as far
as outposts can make frontiers, we have what looks like a cry of
distress from a Cypriote ruler to the king of Egypt. He begs the
latter to have no dealings with the Hittites. Accordingly Breasted
says:——³

“Active trade intercourse between this kingdom [the
Hittites] and Egypt had reached such proportions that the
king of Cyprus was apprehensive lest too close relations between

¹ Ptolemy, iv. 5 (ed. Müller, i. p. 678).
³ Hist. of Egypt, p. 381.
Egypt and the Hittite kingdom (Great Kheta) might endanger his own position."

The king who is actually mentioned is the king of an unknown principality called Alysia, and a reference to Breasted's map will show that he identifies Alysia with Cyprus. If the identification is correct, Cyprus was in fear of Hittite migration; evidently it was thought a very likely thing to happen. But even if this identification should prove erroneous, there is, as we shall now show, a link of a geographical nature that seems to connect the Hittites with Cyprus.

It has long been recognised that one of the oldest settlements in the island is the town of Kition in the S.E. corner, nearly the situation of the modern Larnaka: and it has been commonly assumed from the nearness of this point to the Phoenician coast, as well as from the existence of Phoenician inscriptions, that Kition was a Phoenician colony. Against this conclusion doubts have been expressed in various quarters. Gesenius, long before the re-discovery of the Hittite empire, tried to connect the name with the Biblical Kittim, whom he assumed to be Canaanites; others, from Max Müller onward, observing the importance of the Hittite factor in the history of the N.E. angle of the Mediterranean, suggested a connection between the Kittim of the Bible and the Kheta of the Egyptian documents, which describe the struggle between Rameses the Second, and the king of the Hittites, and the subsequent treaty of peace between them after the battle of Kadesh. The Biblical Heth, the Egyptian Kheta, the Ḥatti of the Hittite tablets, and the Biblical Kittim are all variant descriptions of the same people; and Kition in Cyprus is not to be regarded as originally a Phoenician town, but as a Phoenician colony which has displaced an earlier settlement, formed when the Hittites controlled all that angle of the Mediterranean, and when they were already, as we have suggested, a sea-going people, forming foreign connections outside Asia Minor.

The discovery of the Hittite settlements on the Libyan coast throws light upon the last attack which the Hittites made upon the power of Egypt. Dr. Cowley states the case as follows:—

"From Egyptian sources we learn that the Hittites took part in an invasion of Egypt from the sea in the reign of

Rameses III (twelfth century). They were no longer, however, the leading power among the allies. They merely joined in an attack which was organized from the west. It failed, and this was the last time they came into contact with Egypt."

If the Hittites were already in possession of the Libyan coast to the west of Egypt, it was natural that they should be involved in the war with Egypt, equally natural that they should be in alliance with their home-land in Asia Minor. We should not be surprised if it were to be discovered that the very name of Libya is a Hittite formation.

The naval attack on Egypt shows conclusively that Garstang's idea of the Hittite as a non-sea-going people is an illusion. A people who are afraid of blue water do not establish colonies nor build a navy.

In order to find out something more about the range of these explorations and colonisations, it will be convenient to retrace our steps to the point from which we started our enquiries, viz., the existence of a trade in spices and frankincense and myrrh between S. Arabia and the Mediterranean; from this point we were led on to consider the existence of a paper trade between Egypt and the outside world, and particularly between Egypt and Byblos of Syria. It will hardly be doubted that there are more elementary needs than spices and paper, and that whatever those needs may be, if the home supply is inadequate or non-existent, there must arise trade between places where a commodity is in excess and places where it is in defect. Amongst such elementary needs, we may be sure that Salt has the first place. It is a requirement of such insistence that it is easy to say that one form which trade-routes will take will be a link between salt-producing and salt-requiring countries. We have, for instance, pointed out elsewhere that the Amber route, from Dantzig to Olbia on the Black Sea, was also the Salt Way from the salt marshes and salt pans at Olbia to the Amber beds in the Baltic; the necessaries of life were exchanged for the luxuries. This single instance should set us enquiring for other saline centres, from which the trade in salt might be carried on over land and sea. As soon as we state this question, one answer will be that amongst the salt-producing centres and areas, the island of Cyprus will take a front place. There is a salt lake, for instance, to the East of the ancient
Kitium (modern Kiti), which is, perhaps the oldest salt works in the world. The industry is carried on to-day, and is described in the following terms by a recent traveller:

"The basin (of the lake) lies about ten feet below sea-level on the shores of Larnaca Bay, which took a far-reaching semicircular bite out of the island that lessens in extent as the years roll on. The salt of this lagoon is wonderfully free from grit and has embalming and valuable medicinal properties. . . . The town, which is still known as Salines and St. Lazarus . . . (in memory of the supposed cursing of the soil by Lazarus of Bethany) lies about a mile and a half north-east of the lake, and these are but two of its names."¹

Well, we may be sure that the salt works were not named after Lazarus, but the other name suggests immediately that the original name was Selinus. We shall show that this name is Hittite in language, and that it denotes a centre for the production of salt, a lagoon, or a salt-spring or an actual deposit of salt.

First of all we notice that on the mainland of Cilicia at the point where Cyprus comes nearest to the shore is the ancient city of Selinus, (Selinunta). Cilicia was part of the ancient Hittite Empire in the fourteenth century B.C., and we may connect Selinus with the salt-works on the south of the island by making it a salt "factory" in the East India sense, just as we showed that there were spice and paper "factories" or entrepôts in the Mediterranean. At this point we may be met with a contradiction from the Grecians, who will affirm that Selinus has nothing to do with salt, but that it denotes a place where the wild parsley² grows, whose name is Selinos, and that we can find the explanation confirmed by the coins of the famous city of Selinus in Southern Sicily, where the parsley leaf can actually be seen on the ancient coins of the place. Unfortunately for this point of view there are too many rivers, lakes and marshes which bear the name of Selinus, and we can hardly believe that the whole of the Levant was making a geographical note of the diffusion of parsley in the names of its towns or rivers.

Let us try another case and examine it carefully; we learn from Strabo that at the mouth of the Cayster there is a lagoon, by

¹ Helen C. Gordon, *Love's Island*, p. 56. ² Probably also celery.
the name of Selinusia, and that this lake and the stream that flows (the Selinûs) into it *produce great revenues.*\(^1\) The lagoon is connected with the sea, which flows into it. Now it will hardly be maintained that great revenues were to be collected from the merchandise of wild parsley! It is only salt that can furnish the wealth of a marsh that borders on the sea. So we infer that Selinûs means a salt-marsh, or salt-stream or salt-spring, and has nothing botanical to say for itself. Wherever we find a place or a river of that name, we shall suspect salt, and not prospect for parsley. For instance there is the famous Sicilian town; Strabo will tell us that Sicily has many hot springs, and that some of them, *such as those at Selinus* or at Himera, *are Salt.*\(^2\)

Evidently the Selinuntiae Thermae are older than the Greek city, with its assumed parsley-beds, which must be regarded as a Greek colony planted on an earlier one, much in the same way as the Greeks from Delos took over the Arabian colony of Adramyttium without changing its name. The name Selinûs comes from the Eastern end of the Mediterranean, and was not Greek at all. It was a salt-town and not a parsley-town. We have now only to observe the number of places and streams that bear the name, to make us sure that there

---

\(^1\) Strabo, xiv., p. 642; viii. 387.

Readers of Xenophon will recall how he planted a park, with an altar or building in imitation of the temple of Artemis at Ephesus. The place was situated on the road from Sparta to Olympia and lay about 20 stades from the temple of Zeus at Olympia (*Anabasis*, v. 111, 7). Through the park flowed a river named Selinus, “and at Ephesus likewise a Selinus river flows past the temple of Artemis. In both places, moreover, there are fish and mussels, while, in the plot at Scillus, there is hunting of all kinds.”

We have shown that the Selinus river at Ephesus had a salt-lagoon at its mouth. Did Xenophon give the name to the stream on his estate, or was there salt in it?

The passage in the *Anabasis* has recently attracted attention as being the possible source of Shakespeare’s jest about the rivers in Monmouth and Macedon, and there being “salmons in both.” Lieutenant Upcott, writing in the “Times Literary Supplement” for April 8, 1926, says:—

“I have always believed that Shakespeare must have read, or been told, of this quaint remark, and that he made Fluelen, a pedantic scholar, parody it. He was not concerned with the habitat of salmons.”

Of course this may be so, but in that case Fluelen should be himself a parody of some living scholar. Can Lieutenant Upcott find him?

---

\(^2\) θερμὸν γούν ὑδάτων ἀναβολή κατὰ πολλοὺς ἔχει τόπους ἡ νῆσος, ὅπερ τὰ μὲν Σελινοῦτα καὶ τὰ Ἄμεραία ἀλμυρά ἐστι.—Strabo, 6, p. 275.
is some underlying connection between them of a philological character. So we may ask the question as to the language to which these peculiar salt names must be referred. The word Selinūs is very nearly Latin; it is, as it stands, almost Salinus. It cannot, however, be Latin, for it is a Greek colony, dating, perhaps, from as early as 628 B.C.; neither can it be Greek, for in that case it would be formed on the basis of ἀλς, ἀλατος. We have, then, to find an Indo-Germanic language which is neither Greek nor Latin, but which is philologically nearer to the Latin than the Greek, and geographically nearer to the Greek than the Latin. At this point Hrozny comes to our aid, and finds us such startling forms as a Hittite relative and interrogative form Kuis, Kuit, Kuiskuis, etc. So we need not be surprised if Selinūs (Selinunta) should mean Salt-town in Asia Minor.

Now let us return to our first identification of the Hittites on the Libyan coast. It is a priori unlikely that the identified town is the only Hittite centre on that sea-board. So we turn to Ptolemy, and to the related Stadismus maris magni, and examine the neighbouring localities: for example:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stadismus</th>
<th>Ptolemy</th>
<th>lat.</th>
<th>long.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Selinouphis</td>
<td>Selinouz</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>31,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tυνδάρειοι σκόπελοι</td>
<td>Τ. σκ. γ'</td>
<td>55,50</td>
<td>31,30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Χαυταίον</td>
<td>Χετταία κόμη</td>
<td>55,30</td>
<td>31,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ζυγραί</td>
<td>Ζυγρίς κόμη</td>
<td>55,15</td>
<td>31,10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Ενφησίφωρα</td>
<td>Αίνφησίφωρα λεμήν</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>31,10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Here we find again a town Selinūs, almost adjacent to Chettaea, and we mark it as another Hittite settlement, either an actual salt centre, or a colony from one. We may now fairly say that we have found the Hittites in the Mediterranean. They have become, in spite of Professor Garstang, a sea-going people. The next question is whether we can trace them on the continent of Europe. Are there any transplanted names such as we found in N. Africa and in Sicily?

We will begin with Kition. We are informed by the classical geographers that there is a town of Macedonia of this name between Pella and Beroea, and it is affirmed that like Kition in Cyprus it is a Phoenician colony; "a colony of that nation occupied at a remote period the most desirable of all districts at the head of the Thermaic
We have already claimed priority for the Hittites over the Phœnicians in Cyprus, and it is quite possible that we may do the same in Macedonia. In that case we have planted them in Europe. This ought not to surprise us, in view of the fact that we had already found their salt works in the neighbourhood of Ephesus, and, by the way, there is another river Selinus in Mysia. It looks like migration made easy. But what shall we say when we find a place named Selinus not far to the east of Sparta? We will leave it to the Hellenists to prove that it was a parsley-town, and to identify the spot for us.

The identification of Selinous as at once Hittite and Salt-centre is confirmed by the observation that there was a traffic in salt between the coast of Libya and the desert on the way to the famous temple of Jupiter Ammon. The references to this traffic in early writers, from Herodotus onward, are abundant; and the salt obtained from thence was regarded by the ancients as of great purity and much superior to sea-salt. It stands to reason that the Hittites, whom we have proved to have occupied the Libyan coast, did not carry salt to Selinous, any more than owls would be transported to Athens; they went there to develop the salt industry in the Mediterranean. They came near to being salt monopolists as well as salt merchants.

While we are discussing this side of Hittite life, it may be well to remind ourselves that there was another salt-centre in Cyprus, beside the salt that was and is dug out at Larnaka (Gk. λάρναξ). This second centre was Salamis, and here the salt was obtained by the evaporation of sea-water, and was of inferior quality. Yet it appears also to have been an export centre, whatever may be the philological relation between Selinous and Salamis; and the derivations which have been current for Salamis must be replaced by one in which the first syllable is the ground-form. It will be asked how this affects Salamis near Athens? It should be a Hittite export entrepôt, or a place where the Hittites taught the Greeks the manufacture of sea-salt. The name is non-Hellenic, if the foregoing remarks are correct.

We come now to a much more difficult piece of research. If we are right in bringing the Hittites into Europe, and turning them back from a self-contained nation into a nomadic people, or at least a nation with colonies, will there be any analogy between the history of the
Hittite migrations, and those of the Cimbri or of the Kelts; we recall the case of the Kelts and of their settlement and final isolation in Galatia, as far as possible from Gaul or Ireland. And the Cimbri; are they the Kimmerians of Homer, and are they the same people who burned Sardis? did they really live in Jutland? We are clear, at all events, with regard to the Kelts; and it has been claimed in a recent book, which is so full of eccentric matter as almost to defy criticism, that the tribe of the Chatti, whom the Romans found on the other side of the Rhine in the neighbourhood of Mainz, and whom they had some difficulty in subduing, were not Germans at all, but a survival from a Hittite migration.\(^1\) Strabo actually calls them \(\chi\acute{a}t\tau\omicron\) and has an adjacent tribe named \(\chi\alpha\tau\omicron\ou\acute{a}r\omicron\)\. Their name is said, by some scholars, to survive in the modern Hesse (earlier Hassen), the province which most nearly defines their European location.

When we come to discuss the possibility that the Chatti in Rhineland are the same as the Hittites, we do not have to face any \textit{a priori} contradiction; the names are certainly equivalent, so that if there is any prejudice, it is in favour of the belief that they are ethnologically related. It has, however, been commonly taken for granted that the Chatti are either of Keltic or Germanic origin, and not to be distinguished from other Teutonic or Keltic tribes such as the Suevi, the Batavi, or their next-door neighbours, the Cherusci, or the Hermanduri. Accordingly the Western philologists have conjectured that the name means either a \textit{cat}-tribe (an admirable totem indeed!); or that it means a \textit{warrior}-tribe (which one would suppose to be too general a description to make definition), and when they found personal names like Catom\(\acute{e}\)rus for the chieftain of the tribe, they had no difficulty in explaining the suffix as the Keltic word \textit{great} (mar, m\(\ddot{\text{or}}\)), so that the tribe were either \textit{great warriors} or \textit{great cats}, all of which has an amateurish look, even when put forward by great scholars.

Let us first make a little map of the locality where the Chatti were found, when the Romans invaded Germany. They occupied, as we have said, the province of Hesse (Hassen), that is the district between the Rhine, the Main, the Saale and the Elbe. From the

\(^1\) Lieut.-Col. Waddell: \textit{Phænician Origin of Britons}. 


Romans we learn that their capital is *Mattium*, and it is hardly possible to dissociate this name from the *Mattiacci* who are located just to the north of Mainz, or from the *Thermae Mattiaceae*, whose modern equivalent is Wiesbaden. It would seem that there was something cognate between the *Chatti* and the *Mattiacci*. 

**LOCATION OF THE CHATTI.**
Having made that statement, two facts come to light:—

(i) That there was a town of the name of Matium on the Cretan sea-board; for, as Pliny says in enumerating the islands that lie off Crete to the north, "Dia is over against Matium."

(ii) That the Hittite treaties which have come to light from Boghaz-keui contain an agreement between the great Hittite king Subbilliuma, who was the antagonist of Rameses the Second, and a vassal or border prince, whose name was Mattiuaza, the king of the Mitanni. The suggestion naturally arises that Mattium is a Hittite place-name, representing in Crete a colony similar to Kitium in Cyprus, and that it occurs also in tribe names and personal names, both East and West. It must be admitted, however, that as a personal name, Mattius is widely used in the inscriptions of Central Europe; it is found, indeed, in Asia Minor at Thyatira and in Mysia, whether from Roman officials, or possible Keltic migrations. All that we can say is that the possibility of Hittite migrations as far as the Rhine is not definitely excluded.

There are some other Chattite names in Tacitus, beside the Great Cat or whatever he was; but as far as I can see at present, they do not lend themselves to elucidation.

The practical evidence of the salt way and the amber route from the Black Sea to the Baltic is not an isolated phenomenon. In the West as well as in the East of Europe, the trade lines are determined by salt and amber. In a recent article, of the first importance for the student of prehistoric civilisation, in the Geographical Journal for December, 1925, Mr. J. H. de Navarro has the following striking sentences; he is discussing the way in which at the opening of the Iron Age amber objects suddenly appear in large quantities at Hallstatt, while amber dating from this period has also been unearthed at Hallein. Concerning these deposits he says:—

"How did amber reach these places? Let us deal with the latter finds first. After leaving the Danube at Passau and turning up the Inn the route passed up the latter river until it reached the place where its waters are joined by those of the Salzach. Here it would appear to have left the Inn and proceeded along the latter stream past Salzburg and Hallein. Whether amber found its way further to the south along this route I am not at present able to say; but near

\[1 \textit{Loc. cit.}, \text{p. 492.}\]
Hallein stands a hill called the Dürenberg, in which a prehistoric salt mine was discovered.” We have underlined the salt; the writer has done it for us himself in the following passage:—

“We have not far to go to find the reason which caused this south-easterly deflection from the river Inn. It was due to the growth of the ancient salt industry. This region, which as far as Hallstatt finds are concerned, is one of the richest in Central Europe, abounds in salt. . . . The reason why Hallstatt itself was so rich in antiquities was in all probability due to the salt mine in the immediate vicinity of the celebrated burial-ground, which, possibly exploited as far back as the Bronze Age, continued to be worked into the Hallstatt period.”

We could hardly have a better instance of the tendency of the amber routes and the salt ways to combine. In the same way the salt deposits in Carniola are responsible for the excess of amber finds in that region.

Montelius, and Mr. de Navarro, who follows him, makes it pretty clear that one of the great trade routes from the north left the Elbe at its junction with the Saale, and followed the course of the river to the Thüringer Wald and so to the Rhine. The Saale, which the Romans appear to have known as Salas, is named from the salt of the region which it traverses, and Halle on the Saale has, at the present day, become one of the greatest of salt factories, and appears to have been worked from very early times. Indeed, the very name Halle is a salt name in a variant dialect, for we cannot ignore the fact that both Hallstatt and the adjacent Hallein involve the same form and are both of them salt centres. The curious thing about these place names is that the word for salt is in the Greek form, and not in the Latin. It will be observed that we have the same juxtaposition of Greek and Latin forms, in the fact that Hallein is adjacent to Salzburg and the river Salzach. The etymological parallelism is an interesting problem.¹

It may be asked whether the routes marked out by Mr. de Navarro as amber routes are also Apolline routes, as I have shown in my study of the amber routes from the Eastern Baltic. The evidence is interest-

¹ The earliest record for Hallein appears to be in A.D. 885, in the form Salina, and the earliest form for Hallstatt is Halazstat in A.D. 805. See Oesterley, Hist. geogr. Wörterbuch.
ing that there were such Apollo stations in the west, though we may not be able to mark a long series as we can from Dantzig to Delphi. Mr. de Navarro points out a series of amber deposits along the line of the Saale, e.g. at Dieskau, south-west of Halle. But it is of peculiar interest that amber was found in a grave of the earliest Bronze Age at Apolnda. He points out further that the amber route turned off in a westerly direction, in the Thüringian region, probably on a line through Meiningen and then to Fulda. It seems evident that Fulda is only a variant for Apolnda, and we suggest that the two names are consecutive stations on the amber route, similar to the Jablonov and Apollonia series in the East.

The identification which I have made above of Halle as a salt-town, and the Saale as a salt-river, is, I find, not new. It is one of the principal theses of Hehn’s monograph, Das Salz, in which he challenged all the philological experts, including apparently Pott and Grimm, who maintained that Halle was a portico, or the equivalent of a Hall, or as Paris would say of Les Halles. The philological difficulty in which we found ourselves arose, according to Hehn, in the fact that the Kelts were the people who taught the use of salt to the Germanic tribes; the Kelts, in fact, had evolved, though not with complete unanimity, the Hal form for salt, in agreement with the early Greeks. According to Hehn, and with general acceptance, it is the Kelts who are trading in salt, and are responsible for the philological overlap with the Germanic and Roman forms.¹

There remains, however, the possibility that it was Hittites who were responsible for the introduction of salt among the Germanic tribes. We know that the Hittite salt trade is of the highest antiquity; we traced it in Cyprus, Cilicia and Ephesus, and it may reasonably be suggested that they brought the use of salt from the great rivers and lakes in the Far East. Not only are they salt-factors, but, as we have shown, their language disclosed a form for “salt,” which was Roman rather than Greek. It is not necessary to assume that the river Saale got its name from Cæsar or Germanicus or Drusus. It may easily be earlier than the Roman invasion.

¹ Hehn’s illustrations from mediæval documents which constantly show such expressions as “Salinam, quam vulgo hal vocant,” are decisive as to the interpretation of Halle. It must mean either a “salt-works,” or a “salt-market.”
It is interesting to find the Chatti fighting for the possession of a salt river or salt-producing area with their neighbours the Hermanduri. Tacitus, who records the dispute (Ann., 13, 57), says that it was the salt of the stream for which they were fighting (flumen igniendo sale fecundum et conterminum), and Zeuss maintains that it was not the Saale that was the boundary in dispute, but the Werra, and that the salt was, as Tacitus suggests, obtained by throwing water impregnated with salt on a wood-fire. I find it difficult to believe that this can be the real meaning of the struggle between the Chatti and the Hermanduri. If there was a saline stream between them, it would hurt neither party, if, according to ancient custom, the water was thrown on a wood-pile. It would be quite another matter if there were salt-springs or other natural salt deposits. It seems certain that there would be a struggle for these, in times when salt was becoming a necessity of life and had almost passed into a currency.

We have shown, then, that the trade-route, whether for salt or amber, passed up the Saale and over the Thuringian forest, and, as nearly as may be, through Apolda and Fulda. Now with regard to these two names we suggest that they are parallel and almost equivalent formations, of the type which we know in Eastern Europe as Yablonov and Apollonia. It was Grimm's discovery, based on the Merseberg charms that Phol and Balder are the same person, and I have myself maintained that Balder is the apple-tree, which becomes personified as Apollo. So there is no preliminary difficulty in making a parallel between Fulda and Apolda.

The Merseberg charm for curing a horse with a sprained leg recites how Phol and Wodan went out riding, and the horse of Phol, who is also Balder, went lame. Wodan sung a charm over it, which is still good veterinary medicine.

Grimm also notes that among the Fulda traditions of gifts made to St. Boniface, a certain Count gave the Saint all the lands which he held in Pholesbrunner. This place Grimm identifies with Phulsborn, which lies not far from the Saale, equidistant from Apolda, Hornberg, and Sulza, at the same time remarking the existence of parallel formations like Baldersbrunnen. No doubt, then, that Phol and Balder are both at home in this area.

The early forms in which the names Fulda and Apolda occur in literature show a good deal of variation, and cause some perplexity to
the student of place-names. The peculiar termination *da* must, however, be right; it is characteristic of the district, as in the names Roda, Lobeda, Remda, etc. What it means is, at present, an unsolved problem.

We may sum up the result of our investigations as follows:—

(i) There is evidence for S. Arabian colonisation in Egypt: (spices, cowries).

(ii) There is evidence for Egyptian colonisation in the Ægean and on the Syrian coast: (paper and papyrus products).

(iii) There is evidence for Hittite colonies in Libya and in the Mediterranean generally (salt and salt-works): in which connection it is not excluded that Hittite migration may have reached the Rhine.