Part 1: After and Before the Flood

Chapter One: The Dispersion of the Peoples after the Flood and the “Table of Nations”—Genesis 10 and its Greek Parallels

In light of the importance of the theme of the genealogical evolution of the nations from the Flood protagonist in both the biblical and Greek cultures, let me commence with the motifs relating to this generation. In this chapter, I shall examine the “table of nations” and the descendants of the Flood protagonist, the following chapter being devoted to the planting of the first vineyard in the first post-diluvian generation.

 According to the biblical account when the Flood subsided Noah and his sons left the ark “and from these the people of the whole earth were dispersed” (Gen 9:19). The following chapter is devoted to their scattering, structured as a genealogical list deriving from Noah. Although the Flood story originated in Mesopotamia, none of its versions contain this element. Ziusudra, the Sumerian Flood hero, and Utnapishtim in the Gilgamesh account win eternal life and are removed from the human sphere, no mention being made of their descendants at all.[[1]](#footnote-1) Although the end of the story of Atrahasis is fragmented, it appears to have recounted how human procreation was limited in order to prevent another Flood. Although some of the versions of the Sumerian kings list refer to the Flood as dividing the generation preceding it from that which followed it, they do not portray the Flood protagonist as the forefather of a new humankind that emerges in its wake. Westermann and others have thus concluded that the biblical “table of nations is unique and has no parallel either inside or outside the Old Testament” (1976: 501).[[2]](#footnote-2) According to Westermann (1976: 502–503), it represents an inner-biblical development created as a result of the elaboration of the Flood story and its accommodation to the following genealogical lists of the patriarchs.

 An analogy to this motif does exist, however, in the Greek genealogical genre that began to take written form during the sixth century b.c.e. or slightly earlier. Over a century ago, Samuel Driver (1905: 112 cited in Skinner, 1930: 190), Edward Meyer (1906: 231), and Hermann Gunkel (1910: 87) drew attention to the affinities between the biblical eponymous forefathers who represent groups of people in the “table of nations” and the Greek traditions. They, too, however, failed to adduce the full extent of the parallelism, merely observing that the central genealogies in both two cultures derive from the Flood protagonist—Noah, the father of Shem, Ham, and Japhet and Deucalion, the father of Hellen.[[3]](#footnote-3) This circumstance was partly due to the fact that none of the early Greek genealogical compositions have survived in full, study of them also still being its infancy during this period.

 The discovery of large numbers of papyrus fragments of the *Catalogue of Women* and publication of Fowler’s new edition of the prose genealogical works composed by the early Greek mythographers in the past few decades has substantially increased our knowledge of this literature, allowing us to properly examine the affinities it exhibits with the “table of nations” in Genesis 10. In the following, I shall present the biblical and Greek sources, tracing the various sources embedded within them. In light of the unique parallelism I shall adduce, we shall be able to endeavour to elucidate the cultural context within which this distinctive form developed in the Hebrew Bible. Although Van Seters has recently re-aroused interest in these materials, he regards the association with the Flood hero as secondary in the Greek texts: “In the Greek tradition, the flood story is put in a rather an awkward place within the time of Deucalion at the beginning of the human race before the proliferation of humankind. It is clearly secondary to the genealogies as a whole because it is absent from the earliest versions” (1992: 177).[[4]](#footnote-4)

1. The biblical “table of nations”

Genesis 10—frequently known as the “table of nations”—is in fact two “tables.” This fact is evidenced by the contradictions, doublets, rough seams, and stylistic differences in the chapter:

1. While according to v. 7, Havilah and Sabtah are the descendants of Ham and Cush, in vv. 28–29 they are said to be the offspring of Shem and Joktan;
2. While v. 13 states that the Ludim are the sons of Mizraim, in v. 22 they are said to be the descendants of Shem;
3. While v. 22 records that Asshur was one of Shem’s sons, the name “Asshur” occurs previously in v. 11, together with the names of important cities founded therein—Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and Resen.[[5]](#footnote-5)
4. While in vv. 6–7 Cush is said to be the son of Ham, his descendants including the eponymous forefathers of southern Arabia and Cush thus apparently being the eponymous ancestors of the Chushites who dwell in southern Egypt paralleling the southern Arabian tribes, vv. 8–12 state that he was the father of Nimrod who ruled in Babylon, the fact that the founding of Nineveh and other cities in Asshur is referred to in this context suggesting that Cush was associated with Mesopotamia;
5. While v. 8 records that Cush was born to Nimrod, the list summarizing Cush’s descendants in v. 7 makes no mention of Nimrod;
6. The verse dealing with the sons of Shem has a dual opening. Each unit in the “table of nations” commences with an allusion to one of Noah’s sons, after which his descendants are adduced:
“The descendants of Japhet …” (v. 2), “the descendants of Ham …” (v. 6), etc. While the same is true of v. 22 (“The descendants of Shem …”), another verse is added before the unit “Sons were born to Shem …” (v. 21);
7. Stylistic inconsistencies also abound. Thus, for example, while some of the genealogical units list the succession by a *waw* *congiuntiva* of the type “The descendants of Japhet—Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tubal, etc.” (v. 2; cf. vv. 3, 4, 6, 7, 22, 23), in others the formula consist of יל"ד in the *qal* or *pual* (10:21, 25) + the definite article את: “Mizraim begot the Ludim and the Anamim, etc.” (vv. 13–14; cf. vv. 8, 15–18, 24, 26–29).[[6]](#footnote-6)

These inconsistence suggest that Genesis 10 was not penned by a single hand. Wellhausen’s division of the chapter into two threads (1899: 6–8) resolves all the difficulties without requiring *ad hoc* explanations of any one verse. Hereby, two independent genealogical lists relating to the dispersal of the peoples throughout the earth are revealed.[[7]](#footnote-7)

* 1. *The Priestly “table of nations”*

The verses belonging to the principal stratum (1–7, 20, 22–23, 31–32) are marked by a consistent and distinctive style. This appears to have been an independent source the editor adopted as the basis of his account, incorporating it unaltered:

1 These are the generations of the sons of Noah, Shem, Ham, and Japheth

2The sons of Japheth: Gomer, Magog, Madai, Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras. 3The sons of Gomer: Ashkenaz, Riphath, and Togarmah. 4The sons of Javan: Elishah, Tarshish, the Kittim, and the Dodanim. 5From these the coastland peoples spread. These are the sons of Japheth in their lands, each with his own language, by their families, in their nations.

6The sons of Ham: Cush, Egypt, Put, and Canaan. 7The sons of Cush: Seba, Havilah, Sabtah, Raamah, and Sabteca. The sons of Raamah: Sheba and Dedan. 20 These are the sons of Ham, by their families, their languages, their lands, and their nations.

22The sons of Shem: Elam, Asshur, Arpachshad, Lud, and Aram. 23The sons of Aram: Uz, Hul, Gether, and Mash. 31 These are the sons of Shem, by their families, their languages, their lands, and their nations.

32These are the families of the sons of Noah, according to their genealogies, in their nations; and from these the nations spread abroad on the earth after the flood.

The structure of the unit is clear-cut and orderly. It opens with a heading: “And these are the sons of Noah: Shem, Ham, and Japhet” (v. 1) and concludes with a summary statement: “These are the groupings of Noah’s descendants” (v. 32). The body is divided into three sections, each of which deals with the genealogy of one son: “the descendants of x + a series of offspring connected by a *waw* *congiuntiva*: “The sons of Japhet: Gomer and Magog and Madai and Javan and Tubal” (v. 2). Each section concludes with the notation that these were the descendants of x son of Noah who were dispersed geographically and separated by language (vv. 5, 20, 31). This produces the following family tree:

The list reveals an ordered geographical worldview. The descendants of Japhet are the people who dwell north of Mesopotamia and Canaan, from Madai in the east through the islands of the sea to Asia

Minor and Greece, the home of the descendants of Javan, in the west. The descendants of Ham dwell in the south—Africa, southern Arabia, and the other side of the Red Sea, Canaan west of the Red Sea being their northern-most point. The descendants of Shem, who close the list, dwell at the centre of the ancient world, from Elam and Asshur in the east through Aram to Lod in the west.[[8]](#footnote-8) This yields a historic-geographic outlook according to which each of Noah’s sons begat offspring whose descendants dispersed across the earth, “every one after his tongue, after their families, in their nations” (Gen 10:5; cf. vv. 20, 31, 32). The unit and sub-units, orderly structure, and use of headings and conclusion, together with the unique expressions תולדות (10:1, 32) and למשפחותם (10:5, 20, 31), are all distinctive of the Priestly author in the Pentateuch. This pericope thus clearly belongs to P.[[9]](#footnote-9)

* 1. *The Yahwistic “table of nations”*

The verses in the chapter that do not belonging to P (8–19, 21, 25–30) also form a consistent, coherent sequence, customarily assigned to J:

Cush begot Nimrod; he was the first on earth to be a mighty man. 9He was a mighty hunter before the Lord; therefore it is said, “Like Nimrod a mighty hunter before the Lord.” 10The beginning of his kingdom was Babel, Erech, and Accad, all of them in the land of Shinar. 11From that land he went into Assyria, and built Nineveh, Rehoboth-ir, Calah, and 12Resen between Nineveh and Calah; that is the great city.[[10]](#footnote-10)

13Egypt begot the Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, Naphtuhim, 14Pathrusim, Casluhim (whence came the Philistines), and the Caphtorim.

15Canaan begot Sidon his first-born, and Heth, 16and the Jebusites, the Amorites, the Girgashites, 17the Hivites, the Arkites, the Sinites, 18the Arvadites, the Zemarites, and the Hamathites. Afterward the families of the Canaanites spread abroad. 19And the territory of the Canaanites extended from Sidon, in the direction of Gerar, as far as Gaza, and in the direction of Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, and Zeboi′im, as far as Lasha.

21To Shem also, the father of all the children of Eber, the elder brother of Japheth, children were born. (24Arpachshad begot Shelah; and Shelah begot Eber.)

25To Eber were born two sons: the name of the one was Peleg, for in his days the earth was divided, and his brother’s name was Joktan. 26Joktan begot Almodad, Sheleph, Hazarmaveth, Jerah, 27Hadoram, Uzal, Diklah, 28Obal, Abima-el, Sheba, 29Ophir, Havilah, and Jobab; all these were the sons of Joktan. 30The territory in which they lived extended from Mesha in the direction of Sephar to the hill country of the east.

The elements in the non-Priestly thread must be explained before we can discuss the latter. The phrases “that is the great city” (12b) and “whence came the Philistines” (14) belong to the later stages of transmission of the text and should be excluded from the early sequence. Rather than authorial glosses, they are a later copying. Clearly being displaced, the first should follow the reference to Nineveh (cf. Jonah 1:2), the second the reference to the “Caphtorim” (see Amos 9:7). A learned scribe familiar with the prophetic literature appears to have noted these on the margin, whence they were later mistakenly incorporated into the text.[[11]](#footnote-11)

Verse 24 also appears foreign to the original unit. Its genealogical data—“Arpachshad begot Shelah; and Shelah begot Eber”—is suspiciously identical to that in the Priestly survey of the history of Shem’s lineage in 11:10–16. It does not belong to P, however, because it duplicates what follows and is written in a different style.[[12]](#footnote-12) It is also inconsistent with J, Arpachshad not yet having been adduced in this stratum. As many scholars argue, it thus appears have been inserted by the editor. Having both sources to hand, he sought to align them, linking Arpachshad—referred to in P (10:22)—with Eber in J sequence (10: 21, 25), in correspondence with the following Priestly genealogy (11:10–16).[[13]](#footnote-13)

When these minor additions are removed, the remaining verses clearly constitute a coherent, orderly geographical description all the important geographical centres of the biblical world, commencing with the two greatest powers in the ancient Near East—(a) Cush (Babylon) and (b) Egypt, followed by the inhabitants west of the Euphrates—the Aramites and Arab tribes (c) Canaan and (d) the Eberites):

1. Babylon and Mesopotamia (1o:8–12). Early scholars suggested that “Cush” denotes the eponymous forefather of Babylon, the name originating from the Cushite kings who ruled southern Mesopotamia between the second half of the second millennium b.c.e. and the twelfth century b.c.e. and the כַּשֻׁ/כַּשִׁ (*Kaššu*/*Kašši*) by which Babylon was known during this period.[[14]](#footnote-14) Cush’s descendant Nimrod first ruled Babylon and then migrated northwards and founded the cities in the region of Asshur.
2. b) Mizraim (10:13–14). Here, collective nouns—the Ludim, Anamim, Lehabim, etc. —rather than the names of eponymous ancestors. This form may be influenced by the customary spelling of Mizraim.
3. c) Canaan (10:15–19). Canaan’s descendants established (themselves in) the well-known royal cities in the northern Levant—Sidon, Arka, Sin, Arvad, and Zemer.[[15]](#footnote-15) Heth does not seem to refer to the second-millennium Hittite empire—which surely would have occupied a more prestigious position, parallel to Egypt and Babylon—or Sidon’s younger brother but rather the Neo-Hittite kingdom that ruled at the beginning of the first millennium (Westermann, 1976: 521–522).
4. d) Eber and his descendants, Peleg and Joktan (10:25–30). Joktan begot the tribes of southern Arabia (the Western Semites). Peleg appears to have founded a dynasty running through Terach, Nahor, and Abraham belonging to the Aramite world, only fragments of this having survived in this narrative thread, however (Gen 11:29–30). Although this list is the most detailed in J, being the only occasion on which three generations are adduced, it is unlikely that it constitutes the most important point. The lineage is elaborated by a reference to the Aramaean and Edomite tribes, Nahor’s descendants (Gen 22:20–24), and other desert tribes, Abraham’s descendants through Ketura (Gen 25:1–4). This expansion undoubtedly points to its significance for J, representing the Israelite lineage.

The original unit in Genesis 10 attributed to J is usually thought to have been longer, providing a detailed picture corresponding to the Priestly version of the lineage of the peoples and their derivation from Noah’s three sons.[[16]](#footnote-16) According to this theory, the author of the chapter used the Priestly list as his basis, only adding things of special interest from J. The J unit seems to stand independently, however, as a virtually complete sequence covering all the important centres of the author’s world—Babylon, Egypt, Canaan, and Eber (including the Arabian tribes and Aram). It differs entirely from the Priestly “table of nations,” even the isolated reference to the well-known sons of Noah—i.e., Shem and Japhet (v. 21)—being secondary. As Gunkel (\*\*), Skinner (1930: 218–220), and others (Westermann, 1974: 525) noted early on, v. 21 is written in a rather unwieldy style. The first half (ולשם יֻלד גם הוא) lacks a subject, all the other places in which the root יל"ד occurs in the *pual*—such as Gen 4:26 or 10:25—possessing one. The second half (אבי כל בני עבר אחי יפת הגדול) is formulated as a gloss explaining the nature of the link between Shem/Eber and Japhet.

 This unit appears to have originally been an independent “table of nations” giving the lineage of the important geographical centres of the region and their dispersal, initially being unconnected to Noah’s sons. Verse 21 was introduced in order to link the original genealogical-geographical pericope with Noah’s sons. It is identifiable as belonging to the unit’s final editor because it duplicates the opening pertaining to Shem’s descendants in v. 22—such an editor having no need for any duplication of material he had just cited. It appears to have inserted by the Yahwist, responsible for collecting and compiling the diverse traditions in his composition, who attached it to the sequence of Noah’s sons with which he was familiar—Shem, Japhet, and the third son, apparently Canaan.[[17]](#footnote-17) Canaan having already been mentioned in the original document, only Shem and Japhet needed adducing. Rather clumsily, he connected Shem in his preface to the descendants of Eber, ancestor of the Arab tribes and Aram, with the phraseולשם יֻלַד גם הוא אבי כל-בני-עבר (v. 21) on the basis of the original verse ולעבר יֻלד שני בנים (v. 25) that stood before him precisely at the juncture at which he wished to insert his comment (Gunkel, 1910: 85). The usage of the root יל"ד in the *pual* without a subject in v. 21 confirms that the Yahwist employed v. 25 as his pattern, also adducing Japhet, Shem’s brother, in v. 21. While unable to identify Japhet’s descendants, he seems to have been satisfied with recalling Japhet as a way of linking the genealogical-geographic source that lay at his disposal with all Noah’s sons from the other literary traditions he incorporated into his composition.

* 1. *The blending of the sources in Genesis 10*

The two “tables” differ from one another in several significant respects. The Priestly “table” is much broader and comprehensive in both its genealogical and geographical aspects. The borders of the Yahwist “table” stretch from Lud and the islands of the sea in the west, Babylon and Asshur in the east, the cities of Canaan and Hatti in the north, and Egypt and southern Arabia in the south. The Priestly author, on the other hand, knows many more peoples, at far greater reaches—Asia Minor and the north (Javan, Tubal, Meshech, and Tiras; Cush south of Egypt) and Elam and Media east of Babylon. He is thus aware of the Medes, for example, whose important kingdom in the region was only established at the end of the eighth century or beginning of the seventh century onwards.[[18]](#footnote-18) Had J been aware of Mede’s great power and the rise of Persia, he surely would not have ignored it. It thus seems that P, with his broader geographical perspective, lived later than J.[[19]](#footnote-19) In contrast to P, J contains not only genealogical data (father, son, etc.) but also traces of ancient legends about Nimrod (10:8–10) and the division of the earth (10:25a), together with delineations of the boundaries (10:19, 30) and information concerning the foundation of cities (10:10–11). P is *a priori* composed according to the paradigm of Noah’s three sons, J being more complex and seeming to contain early material accommodated to the general narratival framework. The two tables nonetheless also exhibit significant affinities, both preserving genealogical-geographic sequences describing the people of the world as a series of eponymous ancestors born—even if at a secondary stage, as in J—from the sons of the Flood protagonist.

 The editorial task of combining the two threads into a single extant unit appears to have been a relatively straightforward one. The author adopted the Priestly list as the basis for his composition, filling it in with the second source. Copying P up until v. 7, he added material he found in J to the verse referring to Cush, unbothered by the fact that the two were not identical—one belonging to the area of Egypt, the other (כַּשִׁי) representing Babylon. He then proceeded his copying of J until the point at which he wished to bring to end the account of the descendants of Ham, then switching to P (10:20). The descendants of Shem were added in similar fashion, in this case the two sources both possessing prefaces (vv. 21–22). He then concluded with the Priestly material (vv. 31–32), the remainder of the material relating to Shem—the bulk of which he took from J (vv. 25–30) and some from P (vv. 22–23).

2. The ancient Near Eastern legacy

The principal component of the “table of nations” is the genealogical derivation of the eponymous ancestors from the Flood protagonist—i.e., the use of toponyms or ethnic groups presented as early forefathers and their arrangement in a family tree (father, son, grandson) demonstrating how they become the various nations of the world. As we have noted above, the original Mesopotamian story of the Flood contains no such genealogical motif, its hero leaving earth to live with the gods, his descendants also disappearing from view. The epigraphical findings from ancient Near Eastern civilizations similarly evince no knowledge of the genealogical genre—certainly not on the scale of the biblical “table of nations” and Greek genealogies to be discussed below. The first buds of such a tradition may nonetheless be found in two central elements of the Mesopotamian kings lists that then appear in biblical and Greek literature—namely, the idea of the Flood as the dividing line between ancient mythic history and present-day reality and the limited and rather restricted reference to eponymous ancestors as representing geographic regions or ethnic groups.

 The representation of the Flood as a historical watershed is particularly evident in the early Sumerian kings lists. The most prominent and well known of these is the *Sumerian Kings List*, which adduces the names of the kings and the years of their reign from the descent of the kingship from the sky to the first city of Eridug.[[20]](#footnote-20) Some versions of the *List* contain a brief preface that includes the names of the first kings in the world who reigned prior to the Flood. While they reigned for millennia, those who reigned after the Flood only did for several hundred years, the years of reign assuming increasingly historical rather than mythic proportions as the list progresses. As is well known, P demonstrates a closely-corresponding view with respect to the human lifespan. While the first post-diluvian generations lived hundreds of years, their descendants’ lifespan was drastically reduced. A similar notion of a divine edict reducing the number of years allotted to human kind to 120 in close proximity to the Flood occurs in J (Gen 6:3), although there the human lifespan is not specified.[[21]](#footnote-21)

 The Flood also serves as the pivotal point in regard to the first kings on earth in other Mesopotamian kings lists, such as *Lagash Kings List* (BM 23103) and the *Dynastic Chronicle* (ABC 18).[[22]](#footnote-22) Although these contain a brief account of primordial time, they lack the genealogical skeleton found in the biblical and Greek literature (Wilson, 1977: 135–136). The *Lagash* list—which opens with a list of the Sumerian kings who reigned after the Flood: “After the flood had swept over (*egir a-m]a-ru ba-ùr-ra-ta*)” (line 1)—contains a relatively broad narratival preface relating to post-diluvian humankind that recounts how the human race survived after the Flood and learnt the art of digging canals.[[23]](#footnote-23) In addition to the royal dynasty and the number of years each king reigned, the bilingual *Dynastic Chronicle* (Akkadian–Sumerian) also contains a short depiction of the primordial period.[[24]](#footnote-24) In 1980, Irving Finkel discovered more fragments belonging to this work, revealing that it was preceded by a brief preface of seven prose lines recounting how Anu, Enlil, and Ea established the kingship for human beings at the beginning of time. It then proceeds to list nine kings who reigned prior to the Flood in similar fashion to several versions of the *Sumerian Kings List*, after which it resumes the broad narrative. Although the physical state of this fragment makes it difficult to ascertain its contents, the words that have survived—Enlil (*dEn.líl*) and “the noise” (*mu7.mu7*) raised by human beings (lines 30–31) indicate that it contained an account of the Flood as distinguishing between the first generations of kings and subsequent generations.[[25]](#footnote-25) While the Flood serves as the starting point for the roster of first kings in these lists, however, they make no mention of its protagonist’s descendants and the nations to which they gave birth.

 The kings lists of the Western-Semitic dynasties who ruled in Assyria and Babylon during the first quarter of the second millennium b.c.e. also make limited use of the motif of the eponymous ancestors as representing ethnic groups or geographic regions. Composed during a period during which the Western-Semitic (Amorite) dynasties took hold of the reins of power, the employment of the names of peoples of geographical locations as the names of forefathers or early kings was a new and relatively unusual motif in the writing traditions of the Sumerian kings lists. It appears to have developed as a way of making Western-Semitic traditions known. Although it remains a very minor element, it heralds the appearance of much more complex lists in the later Western-Semitic world—i.e., the biblical literature composed centuries afterwards.

 The *Assyrian Kings List* refers to the names and reigns of each of the kings who ruled in Assyrian from its rise to Shalmaneser V (last third of the eighth century b.c.e.)[[26]](#footnote-26) Although the period of the royal dynasty in Assyria is perceived in the full list as stretching across 1500 years, the earliest stratum of the work appears to have been composed during the days of Shamash-adad, the first king (end of the eighteenth century b.c.e.) in order to demonstrate the dynastic continuity of the Assyrian royal house and establish Shamash-adad’s claim thereto. While most of the list consists of the names of the kings and the length of their respective reigns, the first seventeen names are written consecutively, without any mention of how long they reigned. At the end, they are identified as those “who lived in tents” (*šarrāni āšibūtu kultārī*) (17, line 10).

 The majority of these and similar names also appear in the *Genealogy of the* *Hammurabi* *Dynasty* (BM 80328), composed during the reign of the Babylonian king Ammi-Saduqa (seventh century b.c.e.), a descendant of Hammurabi. A comparison of the two list evinces that they parallel one another, the two Western-Semitic dynasties that held power in Assyria and Babylon at the beginning of the second millennium b.c.e. regarding themselves as deriving from a common ethnic stock. Some of the names are familiar to us from other sources as geographic names and names of Western-Semitic (Amorite) ethnic groups. It thus appears that they represent eponymous forefathers rather than actual royal figures (Finkelstein, 1996: 95–118).

 Amongst the more prominent names of the ethnic Amorite groups are the Ḫanu (line 6 in the *Assyrian Kings List*), the Ḫeana (line 4 in the *Genealogy of the* *Hammurabi* *Dynasty*)—which occurs in numerous Mesopotamian writings as a designation of the federation of Western-Semitic tribes in the region of Mari, Didanu (line 5 in the *Assyrian Kings List*)/Ditanu (line 6 of the *Genealogy of the* *Hammurabi* *Dynasty*), which appears in the form *Tidanu*/*Tidnu* as the name of an Amorite group or toponym in the Amorite space as early as the Mesopotamian inscriptions from the end of the third century, and the Amnanu (line 9 in the *Genealogy of the* *Hammurabi* *Dynasty*), the name of a tribe from the region of Mari.[[27]](#footnote-27) In distinction to the names of the kings, those of the eponymous ancestors correspond more closely to a nomadic tribal society—those “who live in tents”—undoubtedly belonging to Western-Semitic oral traditions the kings brought with them. The royal names, on the other hand, belong to the Sumerian world and its focus on the kingship and its continuous succession. These Assyrian and Babylonian kings who came from the Amorite space thus appear to have adopted the Sumerian literary model of kings lists whilst also giving expression to their own early traditions. By adding Amorite eponymous names and making them part of the Assyrian and Babylonian royal succession, they were able to strengthen their claim to power.[[28]](#footnote-28)

 As is well known, the Hebrew Bible also employs the names of places and peoples as the names of eponymous ancestors, some even belonging to the same region of Haran as Abraham’s forefathers—Serug, Nahor, and Terach.[[29]](#footnote-29) While most of the genealogical data in the biblical literature relate to eponymous forefathers, kings virtually not being recalled at all, the Western-Semitic kings lists from Assyria and Babylon allude to very few eponymous names, these being confined to the initial generations. In line with the Mesopotamian writing tradition, the primary focus of these compositions lies on the kingship and royal succession.[[30]](#footnote-30) As we have already noted, although some mention the Flood—the Flood that stands at the head of the list also undoubtedly being a Mesopotamian motif—they do not adduce the protagonist’s descendants and the peoples who derive from them.[[31]](#footnote-31) While the material that first appears in writing amongst the Western and Semitic Assyrian and Babylonian kings thus seems to have continued and developed within the Western-Semitic world, no real parallel to this motif and model in the biblical texts exists in the second millennium b.c.e.

**3. The dispersal of the ancestors in the *Catalogue of Women* and Greek genealogical literature**

In contrast to the Mesopotamian sources, the biblical “table of nations” find full parallels in the Greek genealogical literature.

*3.1 The derivation of the ethnic groups from the Flood protagonist*

Like the biblical “table of nations,” the *Catalogue of Women* and subsequent Greek genealogical traditions depict the Greek people-groupings as descending from the Greek Flood protagonist—Deucalion,e son of Prometheus (FF 2, 4 M-W) and grandson of Iapetus.[[32]](#footnote-32) Deucalion begot Hellen, the father of the Hellenes, who had three sons, the forefathers of the central Greek tribes—Dorus, Aeolus, and Xuthus: “And from Hellen, the war-loving king (φιλοπτολέμου), were born Dorus and Xuthus, and Aeolus who delighted in the battle-chariot (ἱππιοχάρμης)” (F 9 M-W = Plut. *Quaest*. *conviv*. 9.15.2 [Most]).

 These progeny are rarely ascribed any significant mythical features, most frequently being portrayed as constituting the forefathers of the Greek tribes—the Dorians, Aeolians, and Achaians—Ion being the father of the Ionians. Known from several later sources, this tradition also appears in the papyrus fragments apparently belonging to the *Catalogue of Women* discovered in the 1970s and ’80s (F 10a.20–23 M-W = P. Turner F 3, col. 1–2; P. Oxy. 2822.2):

Ξοῦθος δὲ Κ[ρείουσαν ἐπή]ρατον εἶδος ἔ̣χ̣[ουσαν

κούρην καλλ[ιπάρηον Ἐρε]χθῆο̣ς θείοιο̣

ἀθανά]των ἰ[ότητι φίλην ποι]ήσατ’ ἄκ̣[οι]τ̣ι̣ν̣,

ἥ οἱ Ἀ]χα̣ιὸν ἐγ̣[είνατ’ Ἰάονά τε κλυ]τ̣ό̣π̣ω̣λ[ο]ν

Creusa,] who had a lovely form, the beautiful-cheeked daughter] of godly Erechtheus, by the will of the immortals his dead] wife, and she bore him] Achaeus [and Ion] of the famous horses. (Parker (1987: 206)

The Ion referred to in the *Catalogue of Women* and Greek genealogical tradition as Achaeus’ brother is the same as the Javan, son of Japhet and father of Elishah, Tarshish, and the Kittim and Dodanim, in the biblical “table of nations” (Gen 10:2, 4).[[33]](#footnote-33) In both cases, this eponymous ancestor appears as a human being in the genealogical sequence, the geographic and genealogical details and literary traditions connected with Ion and Javan corresponding, of course, to the information at the authors’ disposal and their areas of interest.[[34]](#footnote-34)

 According to the *Catalogue of Women*, Deucalion and Pyrrha also had daughters who gave birth via their commingling with the gods to the people close to (but different from) the Hellenes (Finkelberg, 2005: 33–27). Thyia, for example, had intercourse with Zeus and gave birth to the eponymous ancestors of the inhabitants of northern Greece: “And she conceived and bare to Zeus who delights in the thunderbolt two sons, Magnes and Macedon, rejoicing in horses, who dwell around Pieria and Olympus (οἳ περὶ Πιερίην καὶ Ὄλυμπον δώματ’ ἔναιον)” (F 7 M-W).

 In his studies of Greek ethnic identity, Jonathan Hall (1997, 2002) has demonstrated that the *Catalogue of Women* represents the most striking reflection of the Greek-identity process that occurred during the sixth century b.c.e.[[35]](#footnote-35) During the sixth century, Hellen’s sons Dorus, Aeolus, and Xuthus were regarded as part of the Greek world, Deucalion’s other progeny being thought to lie at a further distance. The claim that the Macedonians did not belong to the Hellenes is supported by the well-known story of Alexander I—one of the ancestors of Alexander of Macedon—recounted by Herodotus. Coming to Olympus to take part in the games, his Greek rivals sought to prevent him from doing so on the grounds that “foreigners were not allowed to take part (οὐ βαρβάρων ἀγωνιστέων εἶναι τὸν ἀγῶνα ἀλλὰ Ἑλλήνων)” (5.22). Having proved to them that he—unlike they themselves—was of Argive descent, the Hellenodikoi allowed him to participate. The name of the latter suggests that were responsible, *inter alia*, for determining who was a Hellene and thus eligible to take part in the games (Hall, 1992: 130; Malkin, 2003: 22).

 According to the *Catalogue*, Hellen’s contemporaries included Graecus, born to a young girl (κούρη) in Deucalion’s house named Pandora who slept with Zeus: “And in the palace Pandora the daughter of noble Deucalion (ἀγαυοῦ Δευκαλίωνος) was joined in love with father Zeus, leader of all the gods, and bare Graecus, staunch in battle (Πανδώρη Διὶ πατρὶ θεῶν σημάντορι πάντων)” (F 5 M-W). It is unclear whether the Pandora referred to here is the first woman according to the Hesiodian tradition, according to which she is said to be the mother of Pyrrha, Deucalion’s wife, and here lies with Zeus—or Deucalion’s daughter. [[36]](#footnote-36) Irrespective of this issue, the fact that Graecus is not a Hellene indicates that the author of the *Catalogue* viewed the Grecians—the earliest tribe who dwelt in northwestern Greece in the region of Epirus and gave their name to the Western name of the country— as early close relatives rather than Hellenes. [[37]](#footnote-37)

 In addition to these eponymous ancestors born to Deucalion, the *Catalogue of Women* also contains the well-known story of the creation of the Lelegians from the stones thrown by Deucalion and Pyrrha (F 234 M-W).[[38]](#footnote-38) Constituting some of the pre-Greek peoples who dwelt in one of the strips of central Greece or Anatolia from an early age and thus not Hellenes, they are depicted as “a people gathered from the earth (λεκτοὺς ἐκ γαίης λαούς) (F 234.3 M-W). This is consistent with their portrayal as autochthonous—in contrast to some of the Hellenes, who were customarily regarded as being migrants.[[39]](#footnote-39)

 The genealogical data that arise from the first fragments of the *Catalogue of Women* can be summarized as follows[[40]](#footnote-40):

The logographers, who wrote prose genealogical works, followed the model set by the *Catalogue of Women*. Hecateus of Miletus—apparently the first member of this school—exhibits the closest affinities with this paradigm, also appearing to commence with Deucalion, albeit with minor variations.[[41]](#footnote-41) While adducing Hellen, the father of the Hellenes, in his Deucalion family tree, Hecateus regards him as the latter’s grandson rather than son, adding another full generation of three son before and after Hellen. According to this tradition, Deucalion the Flood protagonist had three sons: Pronoos, Orestheus, and Marathon (*FGrH* 1 F 13). Pronoos begat Hellen, who also appears to have begotten three sons, the fathers of the Hellenes.

Although scholars have struggled to understand the insertion of this additional generation and the nature of these heroes, the three siblings motif appears to have become a standard pattern in the depiction of the beginnings of the world or history of the peoples.

\

We have very little knowledge about the heroes of the genealogical dynasty Hecateus adduces. The name Pronoos appears to be associated with Pronoe, who according to one of the versions of the *Catalogue of Women* was Deucalion’s mother (F 4 m-W).[[42]](#footnote-42) Marathon is not known from any other source. Jacoby suggests that the name attests to the city’s rise in status after the famous battle, thus intimating the date at which the work as a whole was composed.[[43]](#footnote-43) The extra personage in the first generation is Orestheus, who reigned in the region of Aetolia, whence sprang Aetolus, the eponymous father of the Aetolians (*FGrH* 15). The appearance of the Aetolians in a separate branch from Hellen and his progeny indicates that Hecateus also did not regard them as Hellenes, making use of the genealogy in order to shape the tradition of the Greek clans and outline the relationships between the various groupings.

 Although the other logographers—such as Acusilaus of Argos, Pherecydesof Athens, and Hellanicus of Lesbos—followed the essential model of the *Catalogue of Women*, they also criticized and deviated from it at will (Toye, 1997: 554). Acusilaus of Argos wrote from an Argive perspective, thus apparently beginning with Phoroneus, the first Argive (*FGrH* 2 F 23a).[[44]](#footnote-44) His sources seem to have included the early *Phoronis Epic*, which depicts Phoroneus as the “father of mortals (πατέρα θνητῶν ἀνθρώπων)” (F 1 Kinkel). According to Julius Africanus, he linked the Argive period with the Flood (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 10.10; FGrH 2 F 23a).[[45]](#footnote-45) Phoroneus thus seems to have been presented as belonging to the antediluvian generation or close to it, in similar fashion to the view reflected in Plato’s *Timaeus* (22a), Herein, Solon recounts the history of the Greek from “Phoroneus, who is called ‘the first man,’ and about Niobe; and after the Deluge, of the survival of Deucalion and Pyrrha (Φορωνέως τε τοῦ πρώτου λεχθέντος καὶ Νιόβης, καὶ μετὰ τὸν κατακλυσμὸν αὖ περὶ Δευκαλίωνος καὶ Πύρρας ὡς διεγένοντο μυθολογεῖν)” to the Egyptian priests, then proceeding to survey their descendants. This genealogical sequence—from Phoroneus and Deucalion (which certainly continued with Hellen and his offspring)—seems to have gradually become standard during the fifth century b.c.e. In Solon’s abbreviated account (*Tim*. 22a–24e) we thus find traces of the tradition that became the most prevalent of all the Greek genealogical traditions and included Deucalion, the Flood protagonist, amongst the first generations.

 The fragmentary state of the extant early Greek genealogical works prevents us from knowing whether they contained details of the Greek story of the Flood as reflected in the later surveys of the first human beings. Its appearance, however, is not strictly necessary, an allusion or brief mention being sufficient. It is nonetheless evident that the Flood myth and the genealogical traditions linked to the figure of Deucalion and his son Hellen (according to some sources) were already well known at the beginning of the fifth century b.c.e. when the first logographers emerged, becoming fixed at some stage in the Greek genealogical survey. Quite comprehensive details of the Greek Flood story occur in the works of the early-fifth-century poets—such as Pindar and Epicharmus, the latter of whom devoted a comedy to the figure of Deucalion.[[46]](#footnote-46)

 Later sources, such as the *Library* attributed to Apollodorus, have preserved a detailed historical account of the days of Deucalion. Hints at its central elements can also be found, however, in the early mythographical works.[[47]](#footnote-47) According to the *Library*, when the Flood subsided, the ark landed on Mount Parnassus, where Deucalion and Pyrrha offered sacrifices to Zeus—who in return granted them a request. Asking for human beings, Zeus commanded them to throw stones, whence a people arose, named λαός in honor of their origin (λᾶας). Deucalion and Pyrrha had three children—Hellen, the father of the Hellenes, Amphictyon, who ruled over Attica, and Protogeneia, who through Zeus gave birth to Aethlius (1.7.2–3). Hellen also had three sons, the fathers of the Greek tribes, as also related in the *Catalogue of Women* (which without doubt refers to the tradition of the stones that turned into human beings [F 234 M-W = Strabo 7.7.2]).[[48]](#footnote-48) Hellanicus appears to relate how Deucalion and Pyrrha’s ark (λάρναξ) reached the environs of Mount Atrius in Thessaly rather than Mount Parnassus (*FGrH* 4 F 117 = Schol. Pindar *O*. 9.62b), also noting that Deucalion built an altar to the twelve gods—presumably after the Flood (*FGrH* 4 F 6a,b = Schol. Apoll. Rhod. 3.1085–1086).[[49]](#footnote-49) These details indicate that Deucalion was identified with the Flood at a very early point, his placement at the head of many Greek genealogies very likely being due to his role therein.

*3.2. The generations of the eponymous forefathers of the nations and the genealogical perspective*

In the second—and apparently also the third—book of the *Catalogue of Women*, another family line is adduced as deriving from Phoroneus, the first man according to the Argive tradition, born to the River-god Inachus, son of Oceanus and Thetis. The orientation of the genealogical tradition in the second and third books is primarily Argive in nature, covering the ancestors and heroes of the Argive strip—Argos, the eponymous forefather of the Argives, for example.[[50]](#footnote-50) This dynasty is particularly important for his purposes because, in contrast to Deucalion’s genealogy in the first book—which relates principally to the eponymous ancestors and heroes of the Greek world and the ethnic groups inhabiting it—the dynastic list deriving from Inachus and Phoroneus also includes numerous eponymous names of more remote peoples dwelling beyond Greece, many from the East (West, 1985: 76–91, 144–164; Hall, 1989: 36).

 The next figure mentioned is Io, one of the descendants of Argos, whose wanderings brought her to the lands of the eastern Mediterranean. Pindar and Aeschylus, who lived and worked at the beginning of the fifth century b.c.e., recount that Io slept with Zeus and gave birth to Epaphus, the forefather of Libya.[[51]](#footnote-51) This tradition is also reflected in the *Catalogue of Women*. Libya gave birth through Poseidon to Belus—from the loins of whose descendants issued Arabus (F 137 M-W)—and apparently Agenor, who begot Phoenix (F 138 M-W), in line with a tradition also found in other Greek sources.[[52]](#footnote-52) If we add Danaus and Aegyptus, born to Belus and his descendants (FF 127–128 M-W), to this family tree, we gain the following picture:

The majority of names following Io in this lineage are the eponymous names of divine figures linked to the East. According to other sources, Io became a heifer, her wanderings taking her to the lands of the Mediterranean.[[53]](#footnote-53) Epaphus, born to Io through her commingling with Zeus, and his descendants Belus and Agenor, are also associated with the East, the name serving as the title of the king of Egypt in many writings.[[54]](#footnote-54) Herodotus (2.38, 153, 3.27) and many others after him understood the name as the Greek parallel of Apis, the Bull-god of Memphis, where Io eventually ended up.[[55]](#footnote-55)

 Epaphus begot Libya, the eponymous nymph of the north-African country, who gave birth through Poseidon to Belus and Agenor, the latter names both being connected to the Phoenician world. As many scholars have noted, Belus is the Greek form of the name Baal, the head of the Phoenician pantheon, Agenor routinely appearing in Greek mythology as the primordial king of Phoenicia. [[56]](#footnote-56) Belus begot Aegyptus, the eponymous ancestor of Egypt, Danaus, the eponymous forefather of the Danians—the earliest Greek group in the heroic tradition.[[57]](#footnote-57) This genealogic view places the Danians—whom Homer customarily regards as representing all the Greeks—as equal in status and antiquity to the eponymous ancestor of Egypt, Aegyptus (West, 1997: 446; Hirschberger, 2004: 294). Belus also begot Thronia, who slept with Hermes and gave birth to Arabus, the eponymous forefather of the desert-dwelling Arabs. The reference in M-W 137, which recounts of the story of Casiope, Arabus’ daughter, represents the first allusion to the name “Arab” in Greek literature: “And the daughter of Arabus, whom worthy Hermaon begat with Thronia, daughter of the lord Belus.”[[58]](#footnote-58)

 While Belus begat the eponymous ancestors of many ethnic groups linked to Phoenicia—Aegyptus, Danaus, and Arabus—Agenor is only the forefather of the Phoenician heroes (including Phoenix, the eponymous ancestor of the Phoenicians themselves) (F 138 M-W).[[59]](#footnote-59) Phoenix begot Europa through Casiope, one of Belus’ descendants (F 138 M-W) and Adonis through another woman (F 139 M-W). These are all well-known Greek heroes identified with the Phoenician world.[[60]](#footnote-60) To this family the Greek genealogic traditions customarily attached Europa’s brothers—Cadmus, Cilix, and Thassos—who went in search of her.[[61]](#footnote-61) Here, too, these refer to eponymous names of places in the eastern Mediterranean basin, Cilix being the eponymous ancestor of Cilicia and Thassos the eponymous forefather of the city and island bearing that name.[[62]](#footnote-62) The subsequent offspring are also heroes associated with the Mediterranean. Europa gave birth through Zeus to Minos and Rhadamanthys who ruled in Crete and Sarpedon who ruled in Lycia.

 This genealogical pattern creates a comprehensive geographical picture of all the Mediterranean lands known to the Greeks during the Archaic period—Arabia, Egypt, Libya, Crete, and Phoenicia, most of the non-Greek figures clearly belonging to the Phoenician world. As West (1997: 446) has observed, some of these eponymous names are not attached to any mythological legend, their appearance simply serving as a link in the chain of succession. This portrait thus appears to have been intended to depict the genealogical relations linking the region of Argos with the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean—Phoenicia, Egypt, Crete, and Lycia—and establish its standing therein (West, 1985: 84; 1997: 442).[[63]](#footnote-63) Virtually no places north or west of Greece being adduced, the genealogy is clearly oriented towards the lands of the eastern Mediterranean. Several peoples are said to have arise in Egypt—represented by Io and Epaphus—Libya (symbolizing the African continent), Phoenicia (represented by Belus, Agenor, and Phoenix and their descendants), and other nations—including Aegyptus, the eponymous ancestor of Egypt itself, and Danaus, who here represents Argolis and the Greek world.

 The *Catalogue of Women*, which also refers to Phineus, another of Phoenix’s sons, further includes the story of Boreas’ son’s pursuit of the Harpies. This account contains another list of peoples and the gods who begot them:

9…Κατουδ]α̣ίων καὶ Πυγμ̣[αίων

…. .ἀπε]ι̣ρεσίων Μελάνω̣[ν

…. ….υ] τέκε Γαῖα πελώ[ρ-

…

15 Αἰθίοπάς] τε Λίβυς τε ἰδὲ Σκύ[θ]ας ἱππημο[λγού]ς.

Σκύθης μὲν γ]ένεθ’ υἱὸς ὑπερ[μ]ενέος Κρονίωνος·

…. …] Μέλανές τε καὶ Αἰ[θ]ίοπες μεγάθυμοι

ἠδὲ Κατου[]](http://www.tlg.uci.edu/help/BetaManual/online/SB.html)δαῖοι καὶ Πυγμαῖ[οι] ἀμενηνοὶ

…. ….]κρείοντος Ἐρικτύπου εἰσὶ γενέθλης.

…

21…. ..ἔθ]νεα μ[… Ὑ]περβορέων εὐίππων.

…

25 Ἄτλαντός τ’ ὄρος] α̣ἰπὺ̣ κ̣[αὶ Αἴτν]η̣ν παιπαλόεσσαν

…. … Ὀ]ρ̣τ̣υγίην Λαιστ[ρ]υ̣[γον]ίην τε γενέθλην.

ὅς τε Ποσει]δάωνος ἐρισθ[ε]νέος γένεθ’ υἱός.

…

30 ἔς τε Κεφαλλ]ήνων ἀγερώχων φῦλον ὄρουσαν,

οὓς τέκεν Ἑρ]μάωνι Καλυψὼ πότνια νύμφη·

the Underground-folk and of the feeble Pygmies; and to the tribes of the boundless Black-skins and the Libyans. Huge Earth bare these to Epaphus … Aethiopians and Libyans and mare-milking Scythians. For verily Epaphus was the child of the almighty Son of Cronos, and from him sprang the dark Libyans, and high-souled Aethiopians, and the Underground-folk and feeble Pygmies. All these are the offspring of the lord [Poseidon], the Loud-thunderer. … the well-horsed Hyperboreans … the steep Fawn mountain and rugged Etna to the isle Ortygia and the people sprung from Laestrygon who was the son of wide-reigning Poseidon. … they sped to the tribe of the haughty Cephallenians, the people of patient-souled Odysseus whom in aftertime Calypso the queenly nymph detained for Poseidon. (F 150 M-W)

In contrast to the peoples referred to earlier, the nations adduced here do not form part of the world of the Mediterranean basin and ancient Near Eastern but are mythical groups—like the pygmies, Laestrygonians, and Cephallenians and others living at the end of the world (i.e., the Ethiopians at the southern end of the world and their northern counterparts the Hyperboreans).[[64]](#footnote-64) The incorporation of these people evinces the great interest the author of the *Catalogue* exhibits in the nations of the world— their geographical location, and genealogical relation to the Greek heroes—and his desire to paint a broad and comprehensive picture of the Greek world.

 In the generations following the *Catalogue of Women*, the Greek logographers who penned prose genealogical works devoted much attention to the neighbouring peoples, describing the history of the nations and their eponymous ancestors. Pherecydes of Athens gives an account of the descendants of the Pelagus, the eponymous forefathers of the pre-hellenic inhabitants of Greece: “To Pelasges and Deianirawas born (their son) Lycaon. He married Cyllene, the naidic nympth, after whom Mount Cyllene is named” (*FGrH3* F 156).[[65]](#footnote-65) Amongst Pelasges’ descendants, Pherecydes also note the nations living in Italy and other places in the wake of the early migration waves from Greece: “Oenotrus, after whom the Oenotrians living in Italy are named, and Peucetios, after whom the Peucetians are named who lived in the Ionian Gulf.”[[66]](#footnote-66) Over time, the geographical perspective of these genealogical works appears to have expanded westwards, their interest in non-Greek peoples being exemplified primarily in the geographical and ethnographic works they wrote—such as Hecateus of Miletus’ well-known *Periegesis* or *Periodes ges*. [[67]](#footnote-67)

**4. Phoenician traditions regarding the genealogical dynasties of the peoples**

In addition to the biblical and Greek worlds, clear hints of the usage of geographical or ethnic names in genealogies also occur in Philo of Byblos, who apparently drew upon early Phoenician traditions. Amongst the first generations of those called “immortal” (θνητοὺς ἄνδρας … καλουμένους) (*FGrH* 790 F 2 = Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 1.7), Philo presents a Sidonian or Tyrean tradition that adduces two generations whose names are geographic. The first bears the names of Lebanese mountains, the second areas within the Phoenician cities (*FGrH* 790 F 2 = Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 1.9–10). The members of the first generation—Casius (Mount Zaphon), Lebanon, the Anti-Lebanon, and Berytus are called by the names of mountains, Philo of Byblos relating of them that they were of high stature and known by the mounts from which they ruled.[[68]](#footnote-68) To these—Philo not explaining precisely who—were born two brothers: Hypsouranios, who founded Tyre, and Ousoos his brother, who quarreled with him.[[69]](#footnote-69) As Eissfeldt (1938: 171–173) has demonstrated, Hypsouranios was a quarter of the ancient city of Tyre, known today from a Phoenician inscription (*KAI* 15).[[70]](#footnote-70) Ousoos is Ushu, the name of continental Tyre frequently referred to in ancient Near Eastern royal inscriptions.[[71]](#footnote-71)

 Like the tradition regarding Nimrod in the biblical “table of nations” (Gen 10:10–12), Philo also inserts a foundation story describing how Hypsouranios established (a quarter in the) city of Tyre. This appears to attribute the building of (maritime) Tyre to Sidonians from the Hypsouranios region, thereby laying claim to Sidon’s antiquity and importance in relation to Tyre and the other Phoenician cities.[[72]](#footnote-72) The sibling rivalry appears to reflect the competition between maritime Tyre—or Sidonians who claimed that they were responsible for founding the city—and Ushu (i.e., continental Tyre).[[73]](#footnote-73) A similar view of Sidon’s antiquity amongst the cities of Canaan occurs in the Yahwist “table of nations,” according to which Sidon was Canaan’s firstborn (Gen 10:15).

 A closely-corresponding notion of the genealogical derivation of cities from one another is found on hellenistic Phoenician coins. A Sidonian coin from the middle of the second century b.c.e. bears the Phoenician inscription “Of the Sidomans, metropolis of Kambe [Carthage], Hippo, Kition [Crete], Tyre (Cook, 1903: 352; Mørkholm, 1991: 30). Not only is Sidon perceived here as the most veteran of the Canaanite cities but the relationship between the cities is also portrayed in genealogical terms, Tyre being the “daughter” of Sidon, one of the colonies established by the Sidonians. This view is clearly ancient, both Genesis 10 alluding and Isaiah alluding to it: “You will rejoice no more, O you oppressed virgin daughter of Sidon. Arise, cross over to Cyprus; There also you will have no rest” (23:12 [NKJV]).[[74]](#footnote-74)

 In the continuation of his account, Philo refers to additional eponymous names: “A woman whose name is Beirut (καὶ θήλεια λεγομένη Βηρούθ)” (*FGrH* 790 F 2 = Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 1.15) and a woman by the name of Sidon, of whom he relates that “on account of her exceeding fine voice first discovered unaccompanied hymns (ἣ καθ’ ὑπερβολὴν εὐφωνίας πρώτη ὕμνον ὠιδῆς εὗρε)” (FGrH F 2 = Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 1.27).[[75]](#footnote-75) These names appear in the genealogy of other eponymous ancestors, however. The closest tradition to the biblical “table of nations” is found in a fragmentary note relating to Eisirios, the brother of Chna—undoubtedly the father of the Canaanites, “whose name is later changed to Phoenix (μετονομασθέντος Φοίνικος)” (*FGrH* 790 F 2 = Eusebius, *Praep. ev*. 1.39). The name Eisirios not being known from any other source, Bunsen (1848: 838–839) suggested emending it to εἷς Σύριος, thus reading the sentence: ὧν ἦν καὶ εἷς Σύριος—“one of whom was Sirius” (i.e., Syria). If this was the original reading, this text provides additional support for the existence of a Phoenician genealogical-geographic model resembling the biblical “table of nations,” according to which Sirius/Syria (a type of Aram or Asshur) was the brother of “Canaan” = “Phoenix” = Phoenicia.[[76]](#footnote-76)

 Although few material has survived from Phoenicia, the scanty information available gives the impression that the genealogical model of the dynasties of eponymous ancestors representing cities and peoples existed in other sources in the eastern Mediterranean basin in addition to Israel and Greece. This fact must be taken into account in the following discussion of the distinctive parallels between the Greek and biblical genealogies and the explanation thereof.

**5. Affinities and links**

The “table of nations” in Genesis exhibit similarities to the Greek genealogical writings presented above

in several key substantive, formal, and structural aspects:

The genealogical succession from the Flood protagonist. Just as the biblical “table of nations” derives the nation’s forefathers and the neighbouring peoples from Noah and his three sons, so the *Catalogue of Women* and later Greek genealogical writings derive the ancestors of the Greek ethnic groups and surrounding peoples from Deucalion.[[77]](#footnote-77) His most important son is Hellen, the father of the Hellenes, who begot the three ancestors of the central Greek groupings—Dorus, Xuthus, and Aeolus. While in the biblical text the Flood hero is the forefather of humanity as a whole, however, the Greek version highlights the fact that he was the father of the Greeks and the peoples closest to them. This distinction is of some significance, possibly indicating the secondary adoption of this model within the Greek world. If the Flood were intended to wipe out all humankind, we might expect that in the archetype the protagonist would be the forefather of humanity as a whole. In the Greek traditions relating to the first stages of the genealogy, however, the primary focus lies on the Greek world and its close environs. This concentration on inner-Greek affairs suggests the integration of local Greek genealogical types into the paradigm of the pan-human Flood—or a secondary development of the first pattern in the service of hellenizing tendencies.

The motif of the three sons. This is a particularly striking parallel. In the biblical “table of nations,” all the peoples are the descendants of Shem, Ham, or Japhet (or Shem, Japhet, and Canaan).[[78]](#footnote-78) Hecateus of Miletus also relates that the Flood protagonist had three sons: Pronoos, Orestheus, and Marathon (1 F 13 = Schol. Thucyd. 1.3.2).[[79]](#footnote-79) Pronoos begot Hellen, the ancestor of the central Greek tribes. In the *Catalogue of Women*, this model serves the central Greek tribes that issued from Hellen’s three sons—Dorus, Xuthus, and Aeolus. Although this paradigm does not appear to be remarkable, occurring frequently in folklore, in the context of the Flood protagonist—where they also represent the ancestors of a series of peoples—a striking parallel exists, the motif becoming a common principle in the Greek genealogical traditions. In later writings, we also find three offspring standing at the head of other family lines. Thus, for example, Hellanicus of Lesbos recounts in his *Argolica* that Phoroneus, the first man, had three sons—Pelasges, Iasos, and Agenor (*FGrH* 4 F 36a = Schol. Eust. [T] Hom Il. 3.75).[[80]](#footnote-80) Herodotus tells us that the Carians were the descendants of Car, the brother of Mysus, father of the Mysians, and Lydus, father of the Lydians (1.171).[[81]](#footnote-81) According to this tradition, the three brothers—Car, Mysus, and Lydus—were born to one father who was the ancestor of the peoples living in Asia Minor. Elsewhere, he records that the Scythians are the descendants of Targitaos, son of Zeus, who had three sons—Lipoxais, Arpoxais, and Koloxais (4.5–6). These family lineages may have been shaped in the spirit of the triple division between Hellen’s sons or similar Greek traditions.[[82]](#footnote-82)

The dynasties of the forefathers of the peoples. Both biblical and Greek literature contain the genealogies of the eponymous ancestors of nearby and far-off nations and geographic regions. This type also occurs to a certain extent in Phoenician writings. Due to the paucity of the latter sources, however, I shall focus primarily on the Greek and biblical texts. While the interest of the former lies principally in the Greek peoples in the immediate environs, as in the Argive family tree in the *Catalogue of Women* and logographers we also find references to the eponymous forefathers of foreigners—such as the Lybians, Egyptians, Phoenicians, Arabians, Cilicians, and others, whose names represent the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean. Some of these names play no role in the plot, not being known from Greek mythology other than as chains in family lines (West, 1997: 446). Such figures as Aegyptus and Phoenix in the *Catalogue of Women* primarily function like Javan, Mizraim, Canaan, and other eponymous ancestors in the biblical “table of nations.” It thus appears that in these and the Greek genealogical writings alike the family trees are adduced in order to define ethnic identity and determine the genealogical relations between the peoples in the region. While the biblical texts make a clear distinction between the eponymous forefathers of the surrounding nations and the Israelite patriarchs, no such clear-cut differentiation exists in the Greek material, which frequently depicts the ancestors of other peoples as descending from Greek heroes. In the biblical “table of nations,” the patriarchs constitute a separate branch within all the peoples of the area, thus naturally deriving from broader groupings. In the Greek traditions, on the other hand, a more explicit hellenizing tendency is evident, the ancestors of the nations being portrayed as issuing from the loins of Greek heroes (Bickerman, 1952: 65–81; E. Hall, 1996: 339). This Greek genealogical view may point to a secondary development within the Greek world of a basic genealogical-geographic idea.

These formal, structural, and substantive parallels between the biblical “table of nations” in Genesis 10 and the Greek genealogical literature reviewed above have no counterparts in the epigraphic findings discovered in Mesopotamia, Egypt, and Hatti—particularly with respect to the genre of genealogical writing, the scope of the family trees, the techniques employed, and historiographical tendencies. This fact stands out in light of the close analogies exhibited by the Greek and biblical corpora in relation to the derivation of the peoples of the world from the important offspring of the Flood protagonist. How is this parallelism to be explained?

It is difficult to argue that the idea developed independently in the two cultures. Nor did one influence the other, the biblical stories certainly not being disseminated across the sea during the sixth and fifth centuries b.c.e., nor the Greek traditions accessible to the Israelites. The Flood is not a Greek idea, being borrowed—as many scholars have demonstrated—from ancient Near Eastern sources.[[83]](#footnote-83) The notion of that the peoples of the world all derive from the Flood protagonist similarly does not occur in the Mesopotamian account of the Flood. We may thus surmise that the dispersal of the nations after the Flood reached both the biblical and Greek worlds via a mediating eastern version, most likely one prevalent in the first millennium in the Levant or Syria, where it was associated with a genealogical model. Scholar have already suggested that it would only have been possible to assemble such a comprehensive and detailed picture as that given in Genesis 10 within the Phoenician world, known contemporaneously as the most veteran nation amongst the seafarers, traders, and colonizers across the Mediterranean.[[84]](#footnote-84) In light of the data adduced here, we may conjecture that within this space these pieces of genealogical knowledge were poured into a historic-genealogical mould and associated with the story of the Flood. This new literary type could thence have been disseminated to diverse cultures. The links between the Phoenician and northern Syrian cultures and the peoples of the eastern Mediterranean basis—including Greece and Israel—are well known and support this possibility.[[85]](#footnote-85) I shall address the question of the origin and connection between the literary traditions in the two cultures after reviewing all the models. At this juncture, it is sufficient to note that the issue is not one of the transition of one literary work from one place to another, both instances relating to inner-traditions within each culture. At the same time, however, some models and motifs—certainly that of the organization of all the Greek traditions and their ordering within a single line deriving from the Greek Flood protagonist—were influenced by the eastern literary-genealogical type.

The Greek world contained numerous traditions about the first human beings, the offspring of the gods and various nymphs—e.g., Phoroneus, the first Argive—or autochthonous figures such as Cecrops, the first king of Athens, and Pelasges. Other myths depicted the formation of the first men from material associated with the earth—insects, trees, or a dragon’s tooth embedded in the ground (Blundel, 1986: 7–9). The author of the *Catalogue of Women* could have chosen any of these figures as the first pan-Hellenic hero from whom issued all the Greek forefathers and surrounding nations. Instead, he selected Deucalion. This choice appears to derive from the fact that the latter was already regarded in the eastern Mediterranean as the ancestor of the nations who spread across the world and in Greece as the Flood protagonist.

**6. Conclusion**

The “table of nations” model —i.e., the idea that the surrounding nations descended from the offspring of the Flood protagonist after the Flood—is not unique to biblical literature. While it has no parallels in the Mesopotamian Flood myth, it has a full analogy in the Greek genealogical writings, which describe how the surrounding nations and Greek peoples derived from Dorus, Xuthus, and Aeolus, the sons of Hellen, the son of Deucalion, the Greek Flood hero. In light of the parallelism in this regard with the biblical “table of nations” and later echoes in late Phoenician literature, we may surmise that it developed within Flood traditions widespread in the cultures of the ancient eastern Mediterranean.
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