AN INTRODUCTION

TO THE

STUDY OF THE BABYLONIANS AND ASSYRIANS

BY

EUGENE FAIR

Kirksville, Missouri
Journal Printing Company
1907

PREFACE.

The writing of this pamphlet has been brought about wholly by the needs of the writer's classes in Oriental History. So far as he knows, there is no outline of this subject which is suitable to his purposes. The usual works are either too extensive or out-of-date. There is no attempt made at originality. The facts have been drawn largely from such works as Goodspeed's History of the Babylonians and Assyrians, Rogers' History of Babylonia and Assyria, Maspero's Life in Ancient Egypt and Assyria, Dawn of Civilization, Struggle of the Nations and Passing of the Empires; Perrot and Chipiez's History of Art in Chaldea and Assyria; Sayce's Babylonians and Assyrians; Clay's Light on the Old Testament from Babel.

Special thanks are due to President John R. Kirk, Professor E. M. Violette and Mrs. Fair for consultation and encouragement in many ways. In the body of the text G. stands for Goodspeed's History of the Babylonians and Assyrians.

CHAPTER I.

Natural Environments and the People.

The dominating physical characteristic of Babylonia and Assyria was the Tigris and Euphrates rivers. The most distant sources of these streams are between 38 and 40 degrees North latitude, in the lofty Armenian table-lands which are some 7000 feet above the sea level, while their mouths leading into the Persian gulf have a North latitude of about 31 degrees. After breaking through the southern border of these table-lands, the one on the eastern, the other on the western edge, both rivers flow south east, generally speaking, through a country whose northern border is about 800 miles from the Persian gulf.

On the basis of the geological structure, this region may be divided into two parts of about the same length. From the northern limit for about 400 miles the rivers fall from an altitude of 1100 feet down to one of 100 feet. Their courses for that distance are through a plain of "secondary formation" composed of limestone and selenite. From this plain on, the streams flow through their own deposits of loam, sand, clay and pebbles, i. e., through a low, flat alluvial district.

The northern one of these two divisions the Greeks called Mesopotamia. It is roughly marked out by the mountains on the north, rivers on the northeast and southwest and the lowlands on the southeast; there are no marked division lines between it on the one hand and on the other the desert to the south west and the mountains to the north east.

Its area is something over 55,000 square miles. Particular physical characteristics divide Mesopotamia into two parts; the northern or high part with a fertile soil diversified by mountain spurs and rivers of some importance, such as the Khabur; the part between the Khabur and the alluvium, a steppe region hardly to be distinguished from the nearby desert and like the latter the home of wandering tribes.

The mountains on the northeast of the southern division of

the Tigro-Euphrates valley give to these lowlands a general south western slope. One of the results of this has been that the Euphrates has spread over the neighboring desert and thereby added to the alluvial area. This is not all the land making that has been and is going on, for the land is pushing itself into the Persian gulf at the rate of about 72 feet each year. The area of Babylonia at present is about 30,000 square miles; in the ancient period the area was about 23,000 square miles, about one-third the size of Missouri. Naturally it is a great moorland ending in the south in swamps and marshes, merging into the western desert at a distance of some 20 or 30 miles from the Euphrates and extending east of the Tigris from 30 to 50 miles.

Amid all these diversified physical features, the rivers were the one great unifying element. They made the land fertile and were the chief means of communication. Like the Nile they both inundate, being fed by the mountain snows. The Euphrates is the longer stream. It rises north of the Taurus range and flows south west to latitude about 37 degrees, where it turns due south into the plain region. It keeps this southern direction for about 100 miles and then turns to the south east keeping that direction to its mouth. Its entire length is about 1780 miles. In its upper course it is a larger stream than in its lower, it has but two tributaries in passing through Mesopotamia, and, with the exception of some contributions from the Tigris, none further on. At the mouth of the Khabur it is 1200 feet wide and about 18 feet deep with a velocity 4 miles an hour; while at the northern end of the alluvium it is 750 feet wide and about 20 feet deep with a velocity of $2\frac{1}{2}$ miles an hour. Toward the southern part of the alluvium the stream gets larger again, but never recovers its maximum size. The Tigris rises on the south eastern slopes of the Taurus. Its length is about 1150 miles; "its depth, volume and velocity much greater than those of the Euphrates" (G. p. 7). It has numerous tributaries from the mountains to the east. Its inundation period is from about the first of March to the middle of June, that of the Euphrates from the first of March to the first of September. In both cases the water sometimes rises very high. Loftus, in

the spring of 1849 A. D. calculated that the average height of the Tigris was about 17 feet.

Because of the great volume of water and velocity, the rivers have dug channels through the strata of Mesopotamia. The Euphrates has even formed a canyon from two to three miles wide with a depth of 100 to 300 feet below the steppe. The tributaries of the Tigris have also dug deep trenches. In the alluvial plain the rivers raise themselves above the surrounding lands similar to the Mississippi in its lower courses.

The natural surroundings of Babylonia and Assyria do not lead to isolation. It would seem that the natural boundaries on the east should be the Zagros mountains, but these mountains descend gradually to the plain, and are therefore not hard to cross. There was no definite boundary on the west; in the northwest there was a gentle rise toward the mountains bordering the Mediterranean; in the southwest the only barrier between the valley, and Arabia and the Jordan river was the desert which by no means shut out the movements of man. On the north the rivers had opened up routes into the Armenian plateau, with its fertile valleys and diversified resources. On the south the Persian gulf, though it presented difficulties in navigation, furnished a natural means of communication with both the rich coasts of Arabia and India.

The climate of the Tigro-Euphrates valley is not so variable as the latitude would seem to indicate. The year has two seasons. From November to May may be called winter, during which time the rain falls. The rest of the year may be called summer, a period of drought. The temperature of the rainy season is very changeable. Mesopotamia is cut off from the mild winds of the Mediterranean and exposed to the cold winds from the north, so snow and ice are common. The winter climate of Babylonia is very mild, even frost is uncommon.

The temperature in summer is very high over the whole valley. There are no records to show the range of temperature, but "in Baghdad the average maximum daily temperture indoors during June and July is set down as 107 degrees F., and it often goes up to 120 or 122" (Rogers, p. 277).

Added to this oppressive heat are often sand and dust storms which frequently endanger life. Many of these disagreeable features were undoubtedly modified in ancient times by the excellent system of canals and irrigation, and even modern travellers speak of the remarkably dry climate and the coolness of the nights.

Generally speaking the vegetation of the Tigro-Euphrates valley was rich and varied. This was especially so with Babylonia, where the great cereals, such as wheat, barley, oats and millet grew in prodigal abundance. Wheat and barley are supposed to be indigenous.

The great yields of these cereals was of course subject to the floods of winter and the excessive heat or sandstorms of summer. As in Egypt there was a great lack of trees of any size. The date-palm and fig, introduced by man, flourished remarkably well. The vine was introduced also but was cultivated very little. The apple, apricot, almond, acacia, cypress, tamarisk and plane tree were by no means uncommon. The date palm mentioned above was the most useful of all the trees because of its fruit, juice for drink and fiber for many purposes. In Babylonia marsh plants grew abundantly. There was a great range and abundance of herbs and vegetables. In fertility the valley was very similar to the Nile.

Just as in Egypt many of the animals were not indigenous. The camel, sheep, goat, horse and dog were all imported. The ox, hog and ass were natives and ran wild. The gazelle, lion, elephant and ostrich were once found in the land. With the advance of man several of these animals disappeared as did many other beasts of the chase which we have not mentioned. A few serpents were found, but only three varieties were poisonous. The rivers were full of fish and birds abounded in the swamps.

With all nature's gifts neither metal nor stone was found in Babylonia. Northern Mesopotamia was more fortunate, here were found limestone, alabaster, marble, basalt, copper, lead and iron. The steppe region furnished salt. In both southern and northern Mesopotamia bitumen was found, a very good material for building purposes.

The valley of the Tigris and Euphrates was well fitted to become the center of one of the oldest civilizations. In natural resources it was sufficient unto itself, but by its very position it had close connection with many other lands and people, thereby influencing them profoundly and permanently.

The first races to settle in this country of the rivers, so far as is known, represented several different types. One of the most important of these was the Semites, who spoke a dialect similar to the Hebrews and Phoenicians. It was thought for a long time by some scholars that these Semites came from the northern mountain region. It was thought that traces of their occupation could be identified there. Other scholars have thought that their original home was somewhere in northern Africa. The test of language, if that be a strong test, is the main support for this view. But most of learned men now hold that the place of their origin was southern Arabia from which they came in successive migratory waves (Keane, Man Past and Present, p. 490 ff). The monuments give evidence that side by side with the Semites was another race whose character is ill defined. They are provisionally called Sumerians. "They came, it would appear, from some northern country; they brought with them from their original home a curious system of writing, which, modified, transformed and adopted by ten different nations, has preserved for us all that we know in regard to the majority of the empires which rose and fell in Western Asia before the Persian conquest. Semite or Sumérian, it is still doubtful which preceded the other at the mouths of the Euphrates" (Maspero, Dawn of Civilization, p. 550 ff.).

It appears that the Sumerians were all-powerful at first, but when history dawns they had closely mingled with the Semites. Their language gave way to the Semitic tongue. The religion of the two peoples became assimilated. Nothing is known, in fact, of times when these two races were strangers, so it is hard to say how much one borrowed from the other. But this we do know, that they formed a single nation of such marked characteristics that it remained practically the same for hundreds of years.

They were conquered many times but always managed to absorb their conquerors.

The Assyrian people sprang out of the Babylonian, but being less exposed to invasion, the former remained of much purer Semitic blood than the latter. The Assyrians, however, borrowed most of their civilization from the Babylonians. After the ascendancy of both these people in the valley region, another of Semitic blood held sway—these were the Kaldeans. They probably also came from Arabia, but when we first know of them they were around the mouths of the two rivers. Therefore we shall deal with essentially a Semitic people.

* * *

CHAPTER II.

The City States of Babylonia and Their Unification Under Babylon (From an Unknown Date to 2000 B. C.)

Before attempting to trace the history of the Babylonians and Assyrians, it is well to notice the main sources of our information. The most important of all these are the monuments which have been found, chiefly in the mounds which cover the country. The most numerous of these sources are the clay tablets which have to do with nearly every aspect of the history. But the royal inscriptions began very early, the kings had their names and titles put, in some way, upon all their own constructions. Statuettes, vases, and even bricks in the large buildings have the royal name or some other indication of royal power upon them. This name and title writing continued throughout Babylonian history. Along with these there developed narrative inscriptions. Some of these deal with the deeds of the king in annualistic order, and so are very valuable in helping to fix events in the order of their succession. Others narrate the campaigns of the kings and are very valuable for the mere statement of events, but are often not dated. Still others, of these narrative descriptions, may be called votive inscriptions, since they have so many boastful

phrases about the king. These are useful, but the sequence of events is not observed and they are often far from the truth. Practically all the inscriptions having to do with war are Assyrian.

A second source of information is the Egyptian texts, which is of little use for direct knowledge but may be used to clear up doubtful information gained from native monuments.

A third source, probably more important than the second, is the Old Testament. More knowledge of the Old Testament has been gained through a study of Assyrian sources than the Assyrian sources have gained from the Old Testament, but it is the latter that has inspired many to take up Assyrian studies. Isaiah, Nahum, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and 2 Kings give much desirable knowledge for our subject.

Certain Greek and Latin writings are also sources for our subject. They were once the main source, but are now, generally speaking, less valuable than any one of the other sources. They have value, however, in elucidating the other sources. The most important of all these writers is Berosus, a contemporary of Alexander the Great (356-323 B. C.). He was a native Babylonian, and a priest of Bel. He wrote a work on Babylonian history, which has come to us only in the excerpts taken by Greek and Latin writers. There are a number of other writers who are of some value, the most noted of whom is Herodotus, a Greek, living about 450 B. C. There are many reasons for believing that he visited the Mesopotamian valley, and his descriptions of things that he saw himself may be relied upon to some extent, but in most cases his work must be used with caution.

With all our sources many gaps occur in the historical narrative, which must be bridged over partially by inferences and conjectures until more is known.

The dress of the men, during the period we have under consideration, was not elaborate. The foundation dress among all classes was the kilt or petticoat. This was worn very short by the mass of the people, but the king and his family wore it long. Rulers were sometimes shown wearing quilted skirts reaching to the ankles, and with no head gear or upper garment, but they did

wear quilted caps or pointed hats. The priests also had a dress which distinguished them from other classes; it was flounced and descended to the feet. This class also wore goat skins flung over their shoulders. It seems probable that an upper garment, something like our shirt, was sometimes worn, and long robes were not uncommon. It must be inferred also that fashions often changed. Probably many went in nature's garb or, at the most, wore only a loin cloth. Sandals were known but the Babylonians usually went barefooted. The monuments show that the men at first shaved both the head and the face, but by the time of Sargon (3800 B. C.) both the hair and beard were worn long. This custom continued to be followed.

Representations of women are very rare, but what there are show that their dress was not essentially different from that of the men. They appear to have worn the hair long.

Both sexes were fond of jewelry. They had rings, bracelets and necklaces. The women, as in Egypt, also wore anklets. The men carried walking sticks and all who could afford it, wore an engraved cylinder of stone attached to the wrist by a ring. This cylinder was used as a seal.

The houses of the majority of the people were low and simple, with thick mud walls and flat reed or mud roofs. They had narrow, dirty streets which received the sweepings from the houses. When the street became too full of these scourings, the house was built up another story; the floor and the single door were raised to correspond. The door was the usual means of getting air and light, though there were sometimes small apertures in the walls for this purpose. The house, it appears, had a conical shape and contained no more than one or two rooms. Many of the houses served also as manufactories and shops. We may infer, from later times, that the houses of the higher classes and the kings were larger. They probably had two stories, many more openings and were built around an open court. Gardens and palm trees often surrounded these better houses which were usually located in commanding positions.

The furniture in all kinds of houses was very scanty from

the modern viewpoint. Chairs and stools of various forms were common. Mats were used to sleep on. In the better houses were also rugs and couches. They had metal and flint knives, bowls of stone and terra-cotta, some kind of an oven for baking, and a stick with which to kindle the fire.

Stone, copper, bronze, gold and silver were used in making many articles both for ornament and use. Much of this work was very similar to that done by the predynastic Egyptians.

Naturally the main industries were agricultural in nature. Goats, sheep and cattle, by the hundred, were enumerated as the property of the temples. Pastoral life was active and so there were many herdsmen and shepherds, many of whom were constantly coming in from the neighboring desert. The chief pasture lands were west of the Euphrates. Herdsmen were paid to look after the owner's stock. But the raising of grains, fruits and vegetables took up the time of most of the people. This led to a vast system of canals. The names of at least three of the months were connected with agriculture and the land was named for what it produced. The king collected his taxes in grain, storing it in the royal granaries. It appears that the farm year began in September, at which time "the farmer, usually a tenant of a rich noble, made his contract. The rent was ordinarily one-third of the farm's production, but sometimes the tenant and land-lord divided equally. Great care was taken that the tenant should keep everything in good order. Oxen were used for farm work and numerous agricultural implements were employed. Sowing and reaping, ploughing and threshing, irrigating and cultivating these constituted the chief events in the lives of the great mass of the Babylonian people, and made their land one of the richest and most prosperous regions in all the world" (G. p. 72 ff.).

There were also other occupations of prominence besides farming. Mention is made in the inscriptions, of the dyer, weaver, potter, metal-worker, leather-worker, smith, carpenter, vintner, surveyor and brick-maker. Probably the most prominent of these occupations were weaving and brick-making. The Babylonians were famous for their woolen cloths and rugs, and, since

neither stone nor timber could be obtained with ease, brick was used in vast quantities. A splendid clay for the purpose, was there; reeds were mixed with the clay and also used in drying it; and the heat of the sun usually maintained an even temperature. Bricks, baked in kilns, were used as facing for buildings, especially for temples and palaces.

Babylonia had a foreign commerce from the very earliest times of which we know. This was due largely to its position and its wants. It obtained, by way of the Persian Gulf, teak-wood and cotton from India; from over the Arabian deserts, by caravan, stone, copper, spices and gold from Sinai; from the Syrian mountains, cedar-wood; and, from the eastern mountains marble and precious metals. Much of this was brought in as raw material and then worked up by the Babylonian artisans. Grain, fruit, woven articles and many other things were sent to the less favored regions. This trade was all in the hands of the Babylonians.

Among the Babylonians themselves, metals were the usual medium of exchange. These metals, usually gold and silver, were both weighed, and fashioned into bars. The shekel, mina and talent were the standard weights. There were 60 shekels in a mina and 60 minas in a talent. Though there was considerable variation, from time to time, it appears that a silver shekel was equivalent to about 75 cents, while a gold shekel was worth about ten times that of a silver shekel. "Money was loaned, at first on the condition of the borrower performing a certain amount of labor for it, later on an agreement to pay interest, usually at a very high rate" (G. p. 77).

This matter of money naturally brings up the question of how property was held and used. Land could be held as private property. Probably pasture land was held in common. Theoretically, the king was owner of all the land by divine right, but he "distributed it among his vassals, either in fee or perpetual possession (G. p. 77). Land surveys were made, and boundary stones set up. The ground could be leased and willed from one person to another. Land was not the only source of wealth. Grain, manufactured goods and precious metals formed a considerable amount of wealth.

Education was for practical purposes, as among the Egyptians. There are indications that the child of well- to-do parents was sent to school at a very early age (probably four), having been in the care of a nurse during infancy. Children of both sexes were treated the same, it seems. This was natural since women could transact business on their own account. The main object in going to school was to learn to read and write. Very few, outside the priestly class, knew how to read and write. Naturally then the schools were connected with the temples. The child's tasks were by no means easy, for he must learn by heart some 500 signs of the cuneiform system of writing. But in the private letters and school books surviving, most words were spelled correctly. The scribes had done much in classifying and arranging the signs for the benefit of the pupils. Dictionaries were compiled, which contained Sumerian words and expressions, with their Semitic synonyms. Grammars were drawn up; there were also reading books with extracts from the standard literature, chiefly the Sumerian. Commentaries were written on ancient works. Pupils wrote exercises, either from copies or from memory. The writing was done mostly on clay by means of a stylus, though papyrus was sometimes used. The scribes were looked up to for their accomplishments; this was the right attitude, for upon them depended much.

The Babylonians' advance in learning for this time was by no means unimportant. All of the learning was dominated by religion. The priests sought for knowledge, not as an end in itself, but for religious purposes. The facts then discovered were expressed in religious forms and looked upon from religious viewpoints. "The notion of the universe, for example, was primarily that of a region where men and gods dwelt; its compartments were arranged to provide the proper accommodations for them. The earth was figured as an inverted basket or bowl (the mountain of the world), its edges resting on the great watery deep. On its outer surface dwelt mankind. Within its crust was the dark abode of the dead. Above and encompassing it, resting on the waters, was another hemisphere, the heaven, on the under

side of which moved the sun, moon and stars; on the outer side was supported another vast deep, behind which in eternal light dwelt the gods. On the east and west of heaven were gates through which the sun passed at morning and night in his movements under the heavenly dome. In a chamber just outside the eastern gate, the gods met to determine the destinies of the universe "(G. p. 92 ff., see also, Maspero's, Dawn of Civilization p. 542). Everything in nature was supposed to be revealing the will of the gods to men. Since it was to man's best advantage to know the will of the gods, the priests studied the stars, winds, rocks, etc., and interpreted what they read there in terms of their religion. Medicine was mostly a repetition of formulæ to drive out the demons of disease; but a book on medicine has survived which gives a list of medicinal herbs, so some real progress was made. Mathematics, also, had its beginning in religion. The heavens were mapped out and the courses of the stars and planets were traced in order to understand their relations to human destiny. Astrology had its birth in Babylonia, it was the mother of astronomy. Nature, in almost all its phases, was studied, in order to interpret the will of the gods. Augury flourished. A numerical system had been worked out. This was compounded of the decimal and sexagesimal series. The basis was the "soss," 60; the "ner" was 600; and the "sar" was 3600. The handbreadth was the standard for all measures of length, capacity, area and weight. The people of this time also divided the circle into degrees, minutes and seconds. They also made the signs of the zodiac as we know them, and marked off the ecliptic into twelve regions. They knew, too, the year of 365¼ days, but 12 months of 30 days each made up the year, and to make this common year equal to the solar year, they added a month to the former when it was necessary. "The month was divided into weeks of seven days; the day, from sunrise to sunrise, into twelve double hours of sixty minutes" (G. p. 94). They knew when eclipses of the sun and moon would occur. The year began at the time our March comes. The water clock and sun-dial were invented by the Babylonians of this period.

The remains show that much had been done in the development of art. The remains before Sargon's time are mostly of stone and metal, and were found at Shirpula. King Ur Nina (4200 B. C.) is represented with his family, on a bas-relief. He has a basket upon his head, his shoulders and breast are bare, and he has a skirt about his waist which descends to his feet. His children are represented as of much smaller stature than he, and their hands are clasped in obeisance to the king. The bodies are represented in full, but the heads and feet are in profile—this of course produces a bad effect. The whole is crude but it has a vigor and simplicity about it that is striking (For cut of bas-relief, see Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 707). Another bas-relief of about the same value, but much more complex, is that of one of Ur Nina's immediate successors. The scenes have to do largely with war (For cuts, see Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 605 ff.). Another one of the immediate successors of Ur Nina left a silver vase which is the finest piece of metal work found before Sargon's time (See Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 757). Sculpture of the time of Sargon shows a marked advance over that of the time we have just noticed. One of the best bas-reliefs is that of Naram Sin. Even in its fragmentary condition, it shows a royal figure with a conical cap and full beard; a garment is thrown over the breast and left shoulder while the bare right arm grasps a weapon. This work shows excellent art (For cut of this bas-relief, see Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 602). But the best sculpture of the whole period is shown in the statues of Gudea of Shirpurla (3100 B. C.). The work is done in very hard stone, yet the details are not neglected. The king has his hands clasped upon his breast in humble submission before the gods. The heads are gone but other statues show that in some cases a thick cap is worn on the head, in others the head is shaven and left bare. A garment is worn similar to that in the Naram Sin bas-relief. Much attention is given to the drapery. Every thing is simple and direct (See Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 611 ff.).

Many smaller objects show the artist's ability; there were alabaster and terra-cotta vases, copper and bronze statuettes

and numerous other objects of various sorts. The pottery is rude and inartistic. The engraving of seal cylinders was a fine art (See Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 601).

All the art of the time aimed to represent a perfect realism. There was little idea of the general and ideal. Even the gods are represented as human beings, no better or no worse. This realism was both the strength and the weakness of the sculpture. Another handicap to the work of the sculptor was his having to represent drapery on every human form. This caused a stiffness and monotony that was not commendable.

The indications are that there was no painting done which was worthy of the name in the modern sense, but such is not the case with the architecture. Since there was little timber and stone, clay was the usual material employed. The main principles of the architecture were worked out in connection with the temples and palaces. These were built upon rectangular brick platforms, the one at Shirpurla being 40 feet high and that at Nippur 45 feet high. The palace was rectangular in shape, made of brick, one story high, and its corners usually faced the cardinal points of the compass. The walls were vertical, as a rule, and very thick; the rooms were dark and small; the passage ways were narrow and often vaulted. The roofs were usually flat. Courts, open to the air, were common. The various parts of the palace were well planned. Great buttresses of brick held the sides of the platform in place and huge pilasters of brick did the same for the palace walls. A staircase, leading from the plain, gave access to the platform. In order to protect the platform from the rains, terra-cotta drains were inserted in it to carry off the water. Shafts in the walls of the palace admitted air and sunshine. Sometimes the temple, too, was a series of one-story buildings, but usually it was a series of solid brick masses, one above the other, and each one smaller than the one below it. Either a staircase or an inclined plane, led from one story to the other. Shrines were often placed in the various stories, but the shrine of the chief god was at the top. The indications are that the dimensions of these temples, varied. The remains of a tem-

ple, at Ur, show that its lower story was 198 feet in length, by 173 feet in width—the height of the whole temple being, apparently, about 70 feet. This temple was, however, very small in comparison with many others. The most impressive thing, about both palaces and temples must have been the great mass of material employed. The monotony of the construction was relieved in many ways; stucco was used, both without and within to protect the bricks; pieces of terra-cotta were imbedded in the stucco, or designs were painted upon it; enameled bricks were used for the outer coatings of the walls. Tree trunks were used to support the roofs of the palaces, these were often covered with metal sheathing. Babylonia is probably the birth place of both the decorated wall and the slender column. "The earliest known keyed arch has been unearthed at Nippur" (G. p. 99). The palace doors were hung in great blocks of stone, the stones being hollowed out in the center to receive the door-posts. This was about the only use made of stone.

The literature of the time was dominated by a religious atmosphere. There were psalms, hymns, myths, ritual prescripts and votive inscriptions. The astronomical and astrological texts are from the priests; poetry whether descriptive or epic deals with the gods and heroes. Important royal inscriptions have been found which date far back of the time of Sargon. It is thought that Sargon aided much in this literary development and that a series of religious texts were prepared for his library at Agade. It is probable that every ruler who obtained dominion over a wider territory than his own city-state, likewise, encouraged the development of literature. Gudea of Shirpula had long narratives of his acts placed on his statues. But the chief patron of the literature of the time was Hammurabi (about 2250 B. C.) who unified the cities of Babylonia. Previous works were gathered together during his time and put into the form we now have them. Religion determined the style of this literature and the difficulty of working on the clay tablets, upon which the utterances were preserved, caused them to be very much compressed. Set phrases and repetitions were common, as in the religious literature of the

Egyptians. It seems that poetry was the earliest means of expression. The lyrical form of it is found in the psalms, prayers and hymns connected with the temple worship. Narrative poems describe the doings of the heroes of the distant past; and in the tale of Gilgamesh, we have an epic of twelve books. This epic has rhythm, balancing of parts, and variation of expression for about the same ideas. Some even think that metre and strophes may be found.

We do not know who the authors of the writings were, but they were probably the results of the work of many individual priests, from generation to generation. A book was made up of clay tablets, numbered like and corresponding to our pages. For identification, each tablet had upon it the opening words of the book. These books were placed on shelves in the temple-chambers. It is not known whether these libraries were open to the public, but it seems reasonable to suppose that the literature interested only the priests and upper classes.

The contemporary Egyptian literature was hardly the equal of the Babylonian literature; the latter's influence upon other people's was marked. "Its mythological conceptions re-appear in Hebrew imaginary; its epic figures in Greek religious lore. The dependence of the Hebrew narratives of the creation and deluge upon similar Babylonian stories may be uncertain, but the form of the hymns, their lyrical and rhythmical structure, has, in all probability, formed the model for Hebrew psalmody, while many of the expressions of religious feeling and aspiration, first wrought out in the temples of Babylonia, have entered into the sacred language of universal religion" (G. p. 91 ff.).

No one force so strongly influenced the Babylonians of this time, as their religion. The methods of writing, literature, art, medicine, mathematics, astrology and law, all, appear to have had their origin with the priests. As in Egypt, the religion can hardly be separated from the state. Each city-state had its own god and temple. Thus the religion at first was local. Many of the gods were nature-gods. The same nature-god was often worshipped in several places under different aspects. The

inscriptions of Gudea of Shirpurla show that there was a well organized pantheon of deites, both male and female. Anu, "the heaven" was in theory, the head of this pantheon. These things show an advanced tendency, religious unification.

There was, however, another very different side to the religion, which is spoken of in the literature of the time, where the gods are rarely mentioned. Instead, the world is full of good and evil spirits. They determine the condition and destiny of men. Sickness and death are brought about by evil demons. As the good spirits overcame the evil, it was the tendency of the former to develop into gods. "Thus, 'the spirit of heaven' became Anu; the 'lord of earth' or the 'spirit of earth' was identified with Ea of Eridu; the 'lord of demons' was found again in Bel of Nippur" (G. p. 101). Anu, Ea, and Bel became the first Babylonian triad. These spirits retreated before the great gods and took their places in private worship, exercising there a great influence. It was, however, a new phase in religion to have the superior powers, as the sun, moon and stars, taking a leading part. Yet practically all nature powers exercised a divine influence upon man. To interpret these powers was the great task of astrology. "The religious temper produced by such an idea of god was two-fold. On the one hand the divine influence was felt as a pure power, arbitrary, and not to be counted on; hence to be averted at all hazards, restrained by magical means, or rendered favorable by an elaborate ritual. Or, the worshipper felt in the divine presence, a sense of ill-desert, and, in his desire for harmony with the divine ruler, flung himself in confession and appeal upon the mercy of his god in those remarkable Penitential Psalms in which fear, suffering, and a sense of guilt are so joined together as almost to defy analysis and to forbid a final judgment as to the essence of the ethical quality. Those who first felt the emotions which these psalms reveal were certainly on the road leading to the heights of moral aspiration and renewal. The difficulty was that the element of physical power in the gods was ineradicable and, corresponding to it, the use of magic to constrain the divine beings crept into all religious activity and endeav-

or, thus thwarting all moral progress. Though men recognized that their world had been won from chaos to cosmos by the gods under whose authority they lived, * * * they conceived of the victory in terms of the natural physical universe, not as a conquest of sin by the power of holiness and truth" (G. p. 103).

The worship was probably at first conducted by the priest, who finally became king. Thus the state was represented before the gods. When this step was made the king divided his priestly powers among other priests who had many duties. They sang or recited the hymns, sacrificed animals (a careful distinction was made between clean and unclean animals), poured out libations and burnt incense. We have noticed that they wore a special dress; they also conducted the religious festivals, and conducted religious processions "in which the gods were carried about in arks, ships or chests" (G. p. 104). They worked out the idea of lucky and unlucky days and instituted a Sabbath. Everything indicates a powerful priest-hood.

There was a belief in the future life; the burial customs show that, food and drink were placed in the graves. If the Babylonian thought of his god as a "pure power, arbitrary, undefined and not to be counted on," as he often did, then the hereafter was a dark and dismal place to him and to this place he was confined. There was, however, a higher idea of the future life in harmony with higher religious aspirations. This is indicated in the Epic of Gilgamesh. According this view some have reached, after death, a blessed home filled with the light and glory of eternal peace. The darker view re-appeared in the Sheol of the Hebrews "into which all, whether good or bad, descended, there to prolong a sad and shadowy existence" (G. p. 105).

The Babylonian ideas of the future life were not nearly so clear as the contemporary Egyptian ideas. This may account in some manner for the lack of careful attention to the burial of the dead; but probably as much care was taken as the materials justified, for there were no rock cliffs near at hand. There was great variation in the form of the tombs, but the most common material used in their construction was brick, both sun-

dried and burnt. One form was that of a vaulted chamber (Maspero, Dawn of Civ. p. 684; Perrot and Chipiez, Vol. I, p. 222). The remains were walled in by the bricks. Above the vertical sides, the bricks were arranged corbel-wise. The usual dimensions so far as is known, were 7 feet long, 5 feet high and about 3½ feet wide. There were no doors and the whole was constructed with such care that neither dust nor water could get in. Sometimes more than one body was enclosed in such a tomb, and there were always placed within many things which the deceased had used while living, such as vases, cups, jars, weapons, cylinders, sticks, etc. Another method of burial was to place the body upon an area covered with burnt bricks, and then to cover the whole with a large terra-cotta lid. The lid was made of several pieces which were joined together by reeds soaked in bitumen. This lid was about 7 feet long, 3 feet high and 3 feet wide and narrowed toward the top. The top was divided into eight divisions by flat bands of the terra-cotta. The body lay on its side, usually the left (Perrot and Chipiez, Vol. I., p. 357 ff., Maspero, Dawn of Civ. p. 587). Sometimes the terra-cotta lid was dome-shaped and much more simple. Skeletons of children have been found between two hollow plates, and full grown bodies in a sort of a double vase, into which the bodies must have been placed with difficulty. Sometimes the body was placed in two cylindrical jars, about 2 feet in diameter, these jars were sealed together, end to end, with bitumen. One of the other ends was left open to permit the escape of gases from the decomposing body. Small though they were, these coffins contained more, vases and dishes for the use of the deceased. These were mostly of earthenware, but some were of bronze. There was always a bronze arrow-head in each coffin and the hands and feet were often adorned with iron rings. In several cases gold and ivory ornaments have been found. Bodies were often cremated (Description of cremation, Maspero, Dawn of Civ., p. 687).

The importance of the temple has already been noticed. There was one characteristic that all types of temple seem to have had; they were composed of rectangular masses, superim-

posed upon each other, decreasing in size from bottom to top. They remind us of the stepped pyramid of the Egyptians. Probably the oldest type of the Babylonian temple was the "rectangular Chaldean temple" (name given by Perrot and Chipiez). "This first type is characterized by the form of its lower, and the situation of its upper stages. The latter are not placed in the centre of the platform on which they stand; they are thrown back much nearer to one of the two shorter sides than to the other, so that the building has a front and a back. The front is almost entirely taken up with staircases. The staircase leading from the first story to the second must alone have been concealed in the interior of the building, an arrangement which avoided the necessity for breaking up the ample solidity of that imposing stage" (Perrot and Chipiez, Vol. I. p. 371 ff.). The temple was placed upon a huge platform which was reached by a wide flight of stairs. Upon this first platform was a second, reached by two lateral ramps. The lowest stage of the temple had huge buttresses on every side. A large rectangular plinth was placed between the first and second stage. A rectangular chapel placed on top of the second stage crowned the whole building. It seems very likely that this chapel was decorated with metal plaques and glazed brick, though most of the temple could hardly have been higher than 135 feet.

It is thought that the highest temples were those whose square masses were placed centrally one upon another; this method would better distribute the weight. One type of this variety of temple may be called the square single-ramped Chaldean temple, so named because there was but one way of getting to the top. It had seven stages, was practically a solid mass of sundried brick, and may have been 450 feet in height. Probably on its top were placed statues of the gods and within at least two of its stages, were chapels. Another type of this variety of temple may be called the square double-ramped Chaldean temple, so named because of the two ways of getting to the top. This type had seven stages, was practically a solid mass of sundried brick, and may have been 600 feet in height. The chapel in this case was in the top stage and was surmounted by a dome which was

covered with chiselled gold. Probably within the fifth stage was a sepulchral chamber of the god, in which his oracle was consulted.

Through a study of these several types of temples one can get some idea of the advance in the architecture of temple building, an idea indeed that must increase our respect for the people who reared such great edifices.

Such mighty works imply the presence of a strong central government. This we shall find to be the case, but before attempting to discuss this organization, it is well to notice something of the beginnings of social and political life. These beginnings are far back of recorded history, for the oldest inscriptions not only indicate the full operation of a social and political life, but show that agriculture was the chief occupation; that canals distributed the river waters over the land; that kings ruled over city-states; that the industries were highly developed; that language was reduced to a written form and was employed for literary purposes; and that religion was an essential element of life. Priests and temples were prominent.

It appears that the earliest cities developed in the southernmost part of Babylonia. Close to the Persian gulf, on the west side of the Euphrates, was Eridu, the seat of the temple of Ea, god of the waters. About 10 miles to the west of Eridu, was Ur (means "the city," is at present called Mugheir). It was once, like Eridu, a commercial city on the gulf. "Here was the temple of Sin, the moon god, the ruins of which rise 70 feet above the plain" (G. p. 52). North and west about 30 miles, across the Euphrates river was Larsam (modern Senkereh, Biblical Ellasar). Here the sun-god Shamash had his temple. North west of Larsam about 12 miles, was Uruk (modern Warka, Biblical Erech). Here the goddess Ishtar was worshiped. North of Larsam about 12 miles, was Mar, about which little is known. About 35 miles east of Mar was Shirpurla, or Lagash (modern Tello), the eastern frontier city of very early times, though 50 miles from the Tigris. These six cities form a group of communities which were flourishing at the dawn of history. Near the center of the Babylonian

plain, 150 miles north of Uruk, was Nippur (modern Niffer). The patron deity here was Bel, god of the terrestial world. Nippur, was a great city, both politically and religiously; Bel was looked upon as father of the gods.

In northern Babylonia was also a group of prehistoric communities. The most important one of these was Kutha (modern, Tel Ibrahim, bibical Cuthah), which was in the center of this northern plain. Nergal the god of the world of the dead was its patron deity. North of this was Sippar, where Shamash had a temple. Agade, once the capital of Akkad, was probably in the vicinity of Sippar. There were several other cities which played an important part in prehistoric days, whose sites are uncertain. Babylon and Borsippa may have existed in prehistoric times, but they were unimportant then. It does not seem unreasonable to suppose that the civilization, connected with the various communities in Babylonia, dates back to 5000 B. C.

These communities were active, increasing in size and desirous of controlling each other. No connected account of their struggles can be given, but the general tendencies to be noted are those of unification and expansion. Naturally the first struggle was concerned with the local supremacy in Babylonia. This contest lasted from at least 4500 B. C. to 3800 B. C. From 3800 B. C. to about 2250 B. C. the local supremacy in Babylonia shifted from city to city as before, but there was expansion beyond Babylonia as far as the Mediterranean and the northern mountains. Finally the power of Babylonia both at home and abroad was consolidated by the king of the city of Babylon, and so Babylonia came to stand for an united state. In the struggle which took place between 4500 and 3800 B. C. there seems to have been a common enmity between the northern group of cities, on the one hand, and the southern group of cities on the other. It reminds one, somewhat, of the struggle between Upper and Lower Egypt. As has been said, the authority shifted from one city to another.

With the coming of Sargon I, king of the city of Agade, we are introduced to the second stage in early Babylonian history.

The time of this great ruler was about 3800 B. C. He was a great conqueror. "Within Babylonia, he was lord of Nippur, Shirpurla, Kish, Babylon and Uruk. Beyond its borders, he and his son carried their arms westward to the Mediterranean, northward into Armenia, eastward into Elam and among the northeastern peoples, and southward into Arabia and the islands of the Persian gulf" (G. p. 63). Thus the ideal of unity within Babylonia, and an empire without, was practically attained by Sargon and his son. The immediate successors of these rulers seem to have done little to keep Babylonia unified and the empire intact; but from Sargon's time on, the ideal of a single empire was kept constantly in mind. It seems, from inscriptions, that Shirpurla next became prominent. The most prominent of the kings of this city, from the standpoint of the remains left to us, was Gudea (about 3100 B. C.). He left little record of warlike deeds, the only one being a record of his conquest of Anshan in Elam, but he built temples and palaces on a large scale. It is not unreasonable to infer, from these building operations, that he ruled over an empire of considerable extent. Something must have occurred to weaken the power of Shirpurla, since about 3000 B. C. it acknowledged the supremacy of Ur. The rulers of Ur were, also, very proud of their temples which they built in all parts of Babylonia; Gudea's work had been confined to Shirpurla. The kings of Ur assumed also the title of "King of Shumer and Akkad," the first time such a thing had been done by Babylonian rulers. It seems then that the idea of an united Babylonia was again realized, though the authority of Ur over many of the cities must have been very slight. In fact Ur suffered an eclipse of power for several generations after 3000 B. C.; but her power was reasserted about 2800 B. C., and she continued to be the leading city in Babylonia until about 2400 B. C. During this period her rulers made expeditions into Arabia, Syria and Elam. Of course the temple building went on as before.

Still there were a number of things which undermined the power of Ur. Some of the other Babylonian cities were waxing strong, especially Larsam and Babylon. Again the Elamites were coming in from the eastern highlands.

The Elamites at first raided the cities and carried the booty back home with them, but later settled down in Babylonia. It seems that the Elamite supremacy was complete by 2300 B. C. The center of this power was among the southern group of cities. In fact the local power of the various southern cities was completely submerged, and the ancient rivalry between them was gone. But the Elamites weakened themselves by amalgamating with the Babylonians. The way was thus open for another power to assert itself, by driving out the foreigners and uniting all Babylonia. This step was taken by the city-state of Babylon, whose strength we shall notice, a little later, in discussing the times of Hammurabi.

The first form of government to be recognized in Babylonia was centered in the various city-states already noticed. Each one of these communities had its own god, with a temple for his worship; in a word religion was the greatest unifying element in the city-state. At the head of each city-state was a king; the first and foremost duties of the king were religious; indeed it seems very probable that the kingship had its origin in the priesthood. The king was supposed to get divine blessings for the state and people; he must also protect the state against all her enemies. The king looked after the canals and encouraged the various industries of his land. The good king desired to be considered the father of his people. Legally the king's power was absolute; upon him depended almost wholly the power of the state. Still there were certain constitutional principles in operation which were evolved largely by the needs of commerce and the industries.

Foreigners were admitted into Babylonia, and protected, even obtaining citizenship with little difficulty. There were various ways of obtaining revenues for the state. The state lands were surveyed, and taxes levied on the basis of the surveys. "Custom duties were paid at the city gates" (G. p. 83). Dues to the temples were also paid. All of these regulations show a strong political organization, but that which shows this organization at its best is the legal system of the times.

Fragments of law codes are found to be in existence before the time of Hammurabi (2250 B. C.). Comparatively speaking, these deal with almost everything our laws do to-day. There were, for example, laws concerning marriage, divorce, stealing, inheritance, loans, partnership, interest, etc. It seems that written contracts were common in all business arrangements. These contracts were signed in the presence of witnesses. Difficulties and disputes could be settled in several ways. By common agreement an arbitrator might be chosen whose decision was binding. Sometimes an appeal was made to the king, "who with his elders, heard the complaint and rendered judgment" (G. p. 84). Again, cases were sometimes tried before a court of judges. Whatever process was used, when the decision was made, it was written out in full, duly signed and sealed. So strong was the idea of justice among all men that the king himself was not considered above the law.

The unit of the society of the time was the family. It had its own laws and religion. As has been said, private property was recognized, but, in many cases, the consent of the family had to be given if one of its members sold a piece of land. The father was looked upon as the head of the family, and there were only traces of the former equal right of the mother. The father gave his daughter in marriage for a stipulated sum, which varied according to the bridegroom's wealth; this was called terhatu, "bride money." "This together with the gift of the husband and her dowry, formed the marriage-portion which was given to the bride. It would hardly be right to call the money which was paid the price of the bride, as the transaction was primarily for prudential purposes. It gave her protection against ill treatment and infidelity on the part of her husband, as well as divorce" (Clay, Light on the Old Testament from Babel, p. 208). "Polygamy and concubinage were not uncommon" (G. p. 79). The wife was practically under the absolute control of her husband. Divorce was very easy on the part of the husband. It was considered a great misfortune for married persons not to have children, it was the supreme end of all marriage.

There was a marked differentiation in the society of the times. Lowest in the scale were the slaves who were employed in almost all walks of life, on the farms, in the temples, and by the manufacturers. They were obtained in several ways. Many were captives, others were purchased in foreign countries, some had been degraded from the position of free-laborers, and still others were the children of slaves. Slaves were hired out by rich owners and the priests of the temples. The Babylonian slaves were well treated. The laws gave them the right of protection, the privileges of earning money and holding property; it was also possible for them to purchase freedom. Other laws show that young children could not be separated from their slave-parents.

Just above the slave, stood the free laborer who worked for wages. He was the competitor of the slave. Some contracts on the clay tablets go to show that the free laborer received from three to five dollars a year. He made a written contract with his employer, concerning the time of employment and rate of wages. The number of free laborers must have been few in comparison to the number of slaves, the tendency was for them to become slaves.

Another class was composed of the tenant farmers. The great proprietors rented to them their farms; the tenant hired his own laborers and superintended the work. This was the usual method of farming the great estates. There is only a slight indication of a free peasant proprietor, he had been replaced by the rich man and the tenant farmer. Tradesmen and artisans were numerous in the cities and were held in high esteem. It is not certain whether they had organized into guilds or not. The merchants had their business well organized and must have been a very influential class.

The highest class in society was the aristocracy, of which the king was the head. These nobles lived alternately at the court and on their estates. What evidence we have shows that they held their estates by a sort of feudal tenure; they paid tribute to the king and owed him military services. The great nobles had numerous slaves and dependants.

Mention has already been made of the rise and fall of the several city-states in Babylonia, of the conquest of Babylonia by the Elamites, and their consequent amalgamation with the Babylonian civilization, and that an opportunity was given for another state to rise into power, which state was Babylon. This city did not begin to be important until about 2500 B. C. After that time Babylon rapidly advanced in power. Beginning about 2400 B. C. six kings succeeded each other in regular order. We know little about any of them except the sixth, Hammurabi (2250 B. C.). Though this dynasty may have been of Arabian origin, it nevertheless championed the native cause against foreign overlords, and, during the reign of Hammurabi, the Elamites were overthrown. Furthermore Hammurabi united all Babylonia under his power and controlled the country on the east to the mountains of Elam. The king also developed the economic resources of the country. He dug canals to supply water in case of drouth, drained marshes, reclaimed waste-lands; new communities sprang up and depopulated districts were again made prosperous. Means were provided for defending and preserving the irrigation system. Numerous building operations were carried on. It seems that a palace was constructed in the vicinity of Bagdad, and that a wall was built near the Tigris as a protection against both floods and the Elamites. The records mention other fortifications, but more is known about the building of temples. It will be remembered that the temple was both a business and religious center. Hammurabi raised these sacred buildings throughout the land.

The government of Babylonia during Hammurabi's time, was thoroughly centralized. The king did not merely collect tribute from the various cities and permit them to have local independence, but he appointed his own officials to rule these communities. Constant communication was kept up between the court and the various parts of the empire. There was great commercial activity. Land became more valuable. The king maintained a careful watch over the courts and created a court of appeals at Babylon, which was open to even the humblest cit-

izen. A calendar was established for state purposes. There was also a royal post system. Life was more secure, property was safer than ever before. Babylon was the heart and center of both trade and the administration of the government of the whole land. All the other cities were provincial in nature, local centers of religion and administration.

The central position of Babylon is well shown by the changes which took place in religion. Marduk, once the local god of Babylon, became the head of the Babylonian pantheon. It seems that the other gods were consciously and purposely degraded in the interests of unifying the state, but it is reasonable to suppose that, even in the natural order of development, Marduk should become the supreme god of the empire.

Literature also felt the unifying forces of imperial rule. "Under the fostering care of the priest-hood of Babylon, the older writings were collected, edited and arranged in the temple libraries of the capital city" (G. p. 116). There was a common literary culture throughout Babylonia. The priests modified the older literature so that Marduk took the leading role among the gods. Systems of theology and cosmology began to be worked out, which were afterwards elaborated by generations of scholars and became a great influence in the ancient world.

However great Hammurabi's achievements were in other respects he is chiefly remembered for his code of laws. This code was discovered in 1901-'02 A. D., at Susa, by the French archeologist, M. de Morgan. "It is the longest cuneiform inscription known, and perhaps the most important monument of antiquity thus far discovered in the history of excavations" (Clay, p. 201). The inscription is on a block of diorite which is about 7 feet 4 inches in height and averages about 20 inches in width. On the top part of the stone Hammurabi is depicted in bas-relief, receiving the code from the sun-god Shamash. "Beneath the bas-relief are sixteen parallel columns running beltwise, beneath which five additional lines had been erased, and the stone polished" (Clay, p. 202). On the other side of the stone are 28 parallel columns. This stone was probably a copy of the

original code, which has been lost. There are many indications of other copies throughout Babylonia. There are three main parts to the inscription; prologue, code and epilogue. Considering the laws which were erased, there were originally about 280 paragraphs of them. The number of laws on different subjects varies, sometimes there is only one, sometimes as many as thirty. Most scholars hold that there is no logical arrangement in the code, but Professor Lyon of Harvard says, that "In the skillful arrangement of its material, the code has never been excelled, and it has probably never been approached" (Clay, p. 205). One must read the code and conclude for himself.

The prologue recites the titles of Hammurabi; the names of the cities over which he ruled and the gods he worshiped; and lauds the king for his great deeds.

The subject matter of the code itself covers a wide range, of which the following will give some idea: "Witch craft, witnesses, judges; concerning offenses involving the purity of justice, as tampering with witnesses, jury, or judge; crimes of various sorts, as theft, receiving stolen goods, kidnaping, fugitive slaves, burglary; duties of public officers in their administration; laws relating to landlords, tenants, creditors, debtors; canal and water rights, licenses, messengers, gardners, slander, family relationship, marriage, divorce, desertion, breach of promise, adultery, unchastity, concubinage, rights of women, purchase money of brides, inheritance, adoption, responsibility for all kinds of assaults; fees of surgeons, branding of slaves, fees and responsibilities of builders and boatmen, hiring of boats; agricultural life, the purchase and punishment of slaves who repudiate their Masters, etc., "(Clay, p. 205 ff.).

In the epilogue praise is given to the king for his justice, and humanity; every official is charged to observe the laws; blessings are given to those who shall faithfully administer the same; and curses pronounced upon those who do otherwise.

The origin of the code is uncertain; but it is very likely that it drew from both the then existing customs and older codes, or fragments of codes. Since Babylonia had been for centuries in

political confusion, this code must have been of inestimable value in establishing uniform legislation. To legislate for an empire was a great task, but Hammurabi did his work well, so well indeed, that the code remained in use for more than 2000 years. The code was in no small degree responsible for causing all the later generations in Babylonia to look back upon the time of Hammurabi as the golden age in their history. It is not only of great value in outlining the history of its time, but is of surpassing interest because it is the oldest body of laws known. Its connection with the Old Testament events is fascinating in the extreme. Most scholars hold that the Amraphel of Genesis is identical with Hammurabi. This being the case Abraham was a contemporary of Hammurabi. The exact connection between the Babylonian and Mosaic codes, if there is any, is a much disputed point. Some scholars reason that, since the Babylonian code is older and that both the thought and phraseology of the two are so similar, there must be a dependence of the later code upon the older. Others say that both codes had a common origin in Arabia: (1) Since this was the original home of the Semites; (2) Because Moses was influenced by his father-in-law Jethro who lived on the borders of Arabia (Exodus 18:14-27); (3) Because it is probable that the kings of Hammurabi's dynasty were of Arabian origin. Still others hold that the similarity of the two codes is due to like conditions and that there need not have been any connection whatever between the codes; in a word, since human nature is the same everywhere, "similar conditions will give rise to similar laws" (Clay, p. 232). For the present, at least, this interesting problem must remain unsolved.

Five kings of the same dynasty followed Hammurabi. It seems that son succeeded father in regular order. Few inscriptions of these kings have come down to us, but all evidence shows that during the 150 years of their rule, the work of Hammurabi remained permanent. So the first epoch of Babylonian history closed, with the country united under Babylon, about 2000 B. C.

CHAPTER III.

The Rise of Assyria and its Struggles With Kassite Babylonia (2000-1000 B. C.)

In considering the thousand years (2000-1000 B. C.) it is our intention to confine ourselves mostly to the political and constitutional history. Historians have a clearer conception of this phase of the subject than of any other, because most of the records that remain deal with this phase; furthermore, the records that remain on other phases of our subject, do not show many great and fundamental changes.

Beginning after the reign of the last king of Hammurabi's dynasty (about 2098 B. C.), there is a period of darkness in Babylonia. It appears to some scholars that a new dynasty of kings began to reign, who held the power for about 370 years. Their origin is unknown; some think they were natives of the city of Babylon, others that they originated in Uruk, and still others that they were contemporaneous with the dynasty of Hammurabi. Judging from the length of their rules, there must have been peace and prosperity. But it is strange that none of their memorials have been found.

On the kings list (records of the reigns of kings, kept by the Babylonian priests), these kings are known as the "second dynasty." They are followed, on the same list, by a third dynasty which held power from about 1720 to 1150 B. C. Considerable is known about this dynasty, but the knowledge is of a very fragmentary character. "The king's list is badly broken in the middle of the dynasty, so that only the first six and the last eleven or twelve of the names are intact, leaving thirteen or fourteen to be otherwise supplied and the order of succession to be determined from imperfect and inconclusive data" (G. p. 122).

There is only one royal inscription of any length left us. The tablets found at Nippur by the expedition under the direction of Hilprecht and the Tell el-Amarna letters give some valuable information. With all this, our knowledge of the time

is as yet indefinite. Having these considerations in mind, Goodspeed divides the period roughly into four epochs: "first, the beginning of Kassite rule; second, the appearance of Assyria as a possible rival of Kassite Babylonia; third, the culmination of the dynasty and the struggle with Assyria; fourth, the decline and disappearance of the Kassites" (G. p. 122 ff.).

The names and inscriptions prove that the dynasty was not Babylonian. The kings were Kassites, a people who lived north of Elam in the high valleys. Their racial characteristics are not known. Having been located in the mountain passes, through which Babylonian commerce was carried on, they early became acquainted with the great civilization of the river countries. Several possible reasons may account for their coming into Babylonia: (1) A desire for wealth and a knowledge of the fact that Babylonia was getting politically weaker; (2) A tendency to wander about; (3) Pressure of other people from the east. Good evidence shows that they had long been a menace to Babylonia before they gained control and settled there. They seem first to have settled in the southern part of Babylonia. They soon amalgamated with the native Babylonians; the kings bore the old royal titles, worshiped and served the Babylonian gods and used the language of the conquered.

Little is known of the first few kings of the Kassite dynasty, but about 1600 B. C., as a long inscription indicates, one of the kings boasts of ruling over all Babylonia and practically all the country east of it to Elam; he also boasts of restoring temples and their worship.

But in the list of his conquests no mention is made of Assyria, a nation soon to come into close contact with Babylonia. Before this time the Assyrians must have been dependent upon Babylonia. Their customs, language and physical characteristics indicate that their ancestors were Babylonians. How early they settled to the north of Babylonia is not known. Their earliest center of settlement was at Assur, on the west bank of the Tigris, midway between the mouths of the Upper and Lower Zab. Here was a line of low hills along the river, which protected

them from nomads of the steppe region. The Tigris protected them from the mountaineers on the east, nearby was a fertile soil which supplied the necessities of life, while a few miles north were bitumen springs, valuable both in building and commerce. The early rulers of Assur were viceroys of Babylonia. The first time Assur is mentioned, so far as is known, is in a letter by Hammurabi. The city then apparently was considered a part of that great king's dominions, but evidently, sometime during the Kassite period, Assur not only became independent but also extended her authority northward over Arbela, Nineveh and Kalkhi.

The physical characteristics of this land influenced, to a marked degree, its inhabitants. The soil was not very fertile; to the northeast were mountains from which it lay open to inroads from both men and wild animals; to the west and southwest lay an open country. Under these conditions then, it is little wonder that the Assyrians loved war and the chase above all other pursuits. It seems very likely, as has been noted, that Assur became independent during the Kassite period, and that she became a city of refuge for the Babylonians who fled from their conquerors. Neither is it going too far to assume that the movement of these refugees toward the north, aroused in the kings of Assur (once viceroys) a desire to deliver the homeland from the Kassites, but this ambition was not fully realized for centuries.

The five hundred years (2000-1500 B. C.), during which Assyria had its beginnings, and Babylonia decayed and passed under the rule of the Kassites, was a period of transition in the oriental world of antiquity. It will be recalled that during that time, Egypt was invaded, and held for some time, by the Hyksos. This movement, no doubt, aroused the whole region between the Nile and the Euphrates, which had been dominated, in many ways, for ages by Babylonian civilization. These disturbances are very likely reflected "in the patriarchal traditions of the Hebrews" (G. p. 131). Peoples from the north, descended and occupied the upper sources of the Euphrates, thus interfering

with the Babylonian commercial highway to the Mediterranean. Now just at the time Babylonia should have met this crisis she suffered the invasion by the Kassites and her power was questioned by Assyria. But Syria Palestine was to know another master.

About the close of the sixteenth century B. C. Egypt engaged in a desperate struggle with the Hyksos, and succeeded not only in expelling them, but, followed them into Asia. Western Asia was from that time on the battle ground of Egypt, on the one hand, and of the master ruler of the Tigro-Euphrates valley, on the other. "From that time forth the politics of the kings was to be world-politics; the balance of power was to be a burning question; international diplomacy came into being. The three great powers were Egypt, Assyria and Babylonia. Lesser kingdoms appeared as Egypt advanced into the East,—Mittanni in northwestern Mesopotamia, whose people used the cuneiform script to express a language which cannot yet be understood, Alasia in north western Syria, and the Hittites just rounding into form in the highlands of north eastern Syria and destined to play so brilliant a part, if at present a puzzling one, in the history of the coming centuries. At first, Egypt carried all before her. Under the successive Pharaohs of the Eighteenth Dynasty, her armies passed victoriously up and down along the eastern Mediterranean and even crossed the Euphrates. All Syria became an Egyptian province, paying tribute to the empire of the Nile. Egyptian civilization was dominant throughout the whole region" (G. p. 132 ff.).

The valuable western trade was lost by the Tigro-Euphrates kingdoms to Egypt. The former nations looked up to Egypt as an arbiter; Egypt sent and received gifts from them; marriages between the several royal families took place,—in a word there were international relations of far-reaching importance.

The expansion movement on the part of Egypt caused an intenser rivalry between Assyria and Babylonia. The boundary line between them was a constant source of trouble. We hear of the kings settling the dispute by a treaty about 1450 B. C.

and another about 1400 B. C. A similar treaty was made about 1325 B. C., and at the same time a marriage connection was consummated between the two royal houses. So by this time Assyria may be looked upon as the equal of Babylonia. A son of the marriage spoken of above, became king of Babylonia, but the Kassite nobles rebelled against him and slew him; whereupon, his royal relative, the king of Assyria, avenged the murder by killing the usurper of the Babylonian throne and placing in his stead a son of the king whom the Kassites had slain. A brief period of peace seems to have ensued, broken at times by actual warfare, for it must be remembered that the Kassites were still the dominant power in Babylonia.

During this time Assyria extended her boundaries toward the north and east. About 1300 B. C. Assyria, under the leadership of Shalmaneser I, began to expand westward. By this time the Hittites had pushed south to Palestine, and eastward into Mesopotamia, from the region of the Halys river. These people met the Egyptians on equal terms. As will be remembered, the Egyptian territory north of Palestine was given up to these people. The pressure of Egypt was thus removed from Assyria. Shalmaneser marched across the Euphrates, conquering as he went. This may have had much to do with the transfer of his capital from Assur to Kalkhi (Calah), where he built a city which lasted till the end of the Assyrian empire. It seems that this king held both original Assyria and most of Mesopotamia north of Assur. It is not known what relations, if any, he had with Babylonia. The son and successor of Shalmaneser I, Tukulti Ninib (about 1250 B. C.), succeeded in defeating the Babylonians and holding the entire valley from the Persian gulf northward. During the same reign the Elamites invaded Babylonia. The death of Tukulti Ninib relieved Babylonia and she again became free from Assyria, for a brief period, still being ruled by the Kassites. But the Kassites were overcome by rulers of native origin (about 1140 B. C.), after holding power in Babylonia, in varying degrees, for nearly 600 years. It is well to note some of the general aspects of this period, in connection with both Babylonia and Assyria.

It would seem reasonable to suppose that the rude and barbarous Kassites would have destroyed, as far as possible, the great civilization they found on coming into Babylonia. Such was not the case, however. Within a century after entering the valley the Kassites were actively engaged in developing and perpetuating the Babylonian civilization. They lost all desire to return to their native home. The conquerors were not without use to the Babylonians. They brought some new words into the old language, which broadened the content of the thought, this produced a dialect; they introduced some new gods; but probably their greatest contribution was the infusion of new and vigorous blood into a people, doubtless, somewhat enfeebled.

In the matter of government the Kassites followed, generally, Babylonian precedents. They gave to Babylonia a common name; heretofore the kings had called themselves rulers of certain cities, but now the Kassite ruler spoke of himself as "King of Karduniash."

Though the Kassites built temples in many places, it seems they did not place Marduk of Babylonia so much in the forefront as had Hammurabi and his successors. The temple of Bel at Nippur became prominent. Indeed these foreign rulers may represent a reaction against the supremacy of Marduk. The king's residence during this period was in Babylon, but even though this is true, Hilprecht in summing up the Kassite contribution to Babylonia, says "By restoring the former glory of Ekur, the ancient national sanctuary in Nippur, so deeply rooted in the hearts of the Babylonian people, and by stepping forward as the champions of the sacred rights of the father of the gods they were able to bring about a reconciliation and a final melting together of the Kassite and Semitic elements" (G. p. 146).

The relations of the several nations to each other have already been spoken of. These relations demanded some settled agreements—so we have the beginnings of international law. The first treaty known belongs to this period (treaty between Ramses II and the Hittites) we hear for the first time of a "brotherhood of nations." Ambassadors passed freely back and forth between

the Nile and the Euphrates. Their persons were held sacred and they were protected by the nation through whose territory they were passing.

Had we the records it would be interesting to trace in detail the influence of Egypt upon the Babylonians during this period. We have enough information to show that Egypt's influence along the line of commerce and trade was very great. At first the Babylonian traders were cut off from the west, so they turned their attention in other directions. "According to the testimony drawn from the finds at Nippur, they brought gypsum from Mesopotamia, marble and limestone from the Persian mountains, cedar and cypress from the Zagros, lapis lazuli from Bactria, and cobalt for coloring material, presumably, from China" (G. p. 148). Finally, by international agreement, trade was resumed with Syria-Palestine. There are proofs that articles of commerce came all the way from the island of Euboea to Babylonia. Moreover there was a brick trade with Egypt itself. Egypt received in return for her gold, horses, chariots, lapis lazuli, enamel, costly furniture and works of art.

The remains show that the industries were in a prosperous condition during this period. Work in gold, bronze and glass was skilfully done.

We have practically no remains to show the nature of the sculpture, architecture or literature; new discoveries will probably in time fill out the gaps in our knowledge.

Though there was a constant struggle during this time, between Assyria and Babylonia, it must be kept in mind that the former nation had fundamentally a Babylonian civilization, just as the Kassites had. Why was it then that Assyria tried persistently to get possession of Babylonia? Lust for conquest on the part of the Assyrians and a desire on the part of some of the Babylonians to be united with Assyria had something to do with keeping alive Assyria's ambition. No dobt the feeling that the south was the homeland and, therefore must be recovered played its part. But the real reasons for Assyria's expansion were political and economic. "The original Assyria had neither a

natural frontier nor sufficient arable land to protect and sustain a nation. Hence the people, if they were not constantly to stand guard, must expand until a natural barrier was met; they must also reach out to control the only other source of wealth in the ancient world, commerce. In the way of attainment of both these objects stood, primarily, Babylonia. The Babylonian war was, therefore, a vital condition of Assyria's progress" (G. p. 151).

War was, naturally, the main occupation of the Assyrian kings and their immediate followers. The court was always surrounded by warriors who formed an aristocracy in the state. It seems that these warriors were Assyrian clansmen, led by their chiefs. It was customary for the king to give his name to the first full year of his reign; dating from this year the prominent warriors, appointed by the king each year, gave, in turn, their names to the official year. The name of the person giving his name to the year, or the record of that event, was called the "limu." As time went on the limu lists became a matter of patriotic pride to the rulers; they aid us materially to-day in the matter of Assyrian chronology This system was in use by at least 1300 B. C. "It was Assyria's original contribution to historical progress, and passed over from the east to reappear in Athens, where a similar official was called archon eponymos" (G. p. 153).

It seems that the Assyrian kings of this period were more interested in erecting palaces than temples, although they by no means neglected the latter. Not enough remains come down to us to warrant any safe general conclusions on the literature, art and industries of the time. Besides the record of the exchange of certain things with Egypt, mentioned before, there remain a few alabaster jars, several royal inscriptions and a bronze sword. These are nearly all the records we have of the literature, art and industries.

"If the power of an ancient civilization to dominate a rude people was impressively exhibited in the victory of Babylonian culture over the Kassites, not less significant was the spectacle of the renaissance of that culture as the Kassite domination began

to wane. Contemporaneous with the splitting off of Assyria and its incessant inroads upon Karduniash was the advance of Egypt into Syria and its appearance upon the Euphrates. The reign of the Semite in Western Asia and the long era of Babylonian leadership in civilization seemed about to come to an end. But so deeply rooted and so vigorous was this culture, even in Syria, that the Egyptian conquerors were compelled to use the Babylonian speech in their diplomatic correspondence with the princes and governors of the provinces and to teach it to their officials in the Egyptian capital. And when the authority of the Pharaohs decayed and their armies disappeared from Syria, the new kingdom on the Tigris came forward and girded itself for the task of unifying under its own leadership the Semitic peoples of Western Asia, and of making that same Babylonian culture prevail from the Persian gulf to the Mediterranean" (G. p. 154).

Having noticed to some extent the history of Babylonia and Assyria from about 2000 to 1140 B. C., or during the Kassite period, let us now give our attention to the history of the same countries during the last one hundred and fifty years of the second milennium B. C. It has been noticed that Assyria had declined since the days of Shalmaneser and his successors. Peoples (the Mushki were probably the leaders) between the Mediterranean and the Black Seas had not only pushed across the head-waters of the Euphrates but had broken up the Hittite confederation and pressed the Hittites so hard that they hindered Assyrian expansion in the west. This inroad on Assyria was probably what gave the Kassites a chance to revive, but as has been said this revival was only transient, and soon a native dynasty held power over Babylonia. Little is known of the kings of this dynasty (the fourth) with the exception of Nebuchadrezzar I, who seems to have been the greatest of them all. The throne was held by this dynasty to about 1000 B. C.

Nebuchadrezzar I wished to restore the glories of his ancient fatherland. This was by no means an easy task. Not only had Babylonia been fought over, for centuries, by both the Kassites and Assyrians but, toward the end of the Kassite period, she had

been invaded by the Elamites. Nebuchadrezzar expelled the Elamites and established a fortress, with a governor over it at Holwan. Other expeditions were made to the northeast of this fortress. It had been centuries since any Babylonian king had even set up a claim to Syria-Palestine, but Nebuchadrezzar I was anxious to emulate the deeds of the distant past. He seems to have reached the Mediterranean, for he speaks of himself as "conqueror of the West-land."

Babylonia's expeditions both to the north east and to the Mediterranean aroused Assyria to the extent that there was trouble between the two countries; but it seems not to have amounted to much as neither country was in condition to carry it on; Assyria had greater tasks to perform on the north west in restoring her ancient boundaries there; Babylonia had not recovered from her struggles with the Kassites and Elamites.

For several generations, the crown of Assyria had passed from father to son, finally passing to Tiglathpileser I (about 1100 B. C.). He was a young and vigorous prince, ready and ambitious to gain new lands and wealth for his native state. Since Assyria was hemmed in on the south by Babylonia her natural outlet was toward the northwest. The great rivers had opened up the way, and for more than three centuries great kings, like Shalmaneser I, had invaded this region, so that it seemed the natural place of exploit for Assyrian arms. The trader had preceded the soldier into the northwest; this fact illustrates the economic aspect of the situation. In later times this northwest country was called Armenia; it had an area of some 60,000 square miles, its greatest length was about 500 miles, its width about half its length; it was about 7000 feet above sea level. Within this mountainous region were fertile plains, and in its midst Lake Van (a salt lake.) It was a wild grand country, upon whose mountain slopes was much timber and where were rich deposits of iron, silver and copper. Fruits and grains of the temperate zone were plentiful. Assyria was not the only country which desired to control Armenia. The Mushki were, at the beginning of Tiglathpileser I's reign, hurling themselves within its borders. The Assyrian king im-

mediately resented the movement of the Mushki, marched upon them, and conquered their forces. He conducted several campaigns, with success, into the north and west, until his boundary in those directions extended in a huge arc from Lake Van, around the head-waters of the Tigris and Euphrates, to the northeastern corner of the Mediterranean. He also carried on campaigns toward the south with the result that all Mesopotamia came under the control of Assyria. This in turn gave to Assyria the control of the trade route from the Persian gulf to the Mediterranean. The Babylonian throne was not usurped during this reign. Visits were made from time to time to the Lake Van region, where near one of the sources of the Tigris the great king left his own effigy on a stone slab, with a proclamation of his conquest of the northern peoples. Records of later kings go to show that Tiglathpileser I also made an expedition into Syria and there received gifts from the king of Egypt. Besides his military operations, the king was a great hunter; lions, wild oxen and elephants fell before his lance and trusty bow.

The countries conquered were organized under Assyrian rule. The details of the organization are not known to any extent. Hostages and regular tribute were required. Sometimes captured tribes were deported; rebels were treated with great cruelty; peoples who resisted attack were mercilessly slaughtered and their property was plundered. If the tribes submitted obediently, life was spared, property remained safe and their chiefs continued in power under Assyrian overlordship.

Tiglathpileser I carefully attended to the economic conditions of his native land. He brought in new breeds of animals and valuable forest and fruit trees. He rebuilt cities, restored palaces in the various cities and filled the granaries and storehouses with provisions. Probably the most splendid building work was done on the temples. "Of the temple of Anu and Adad he says: I built it from foundation to roof larger and grander than before, and erected also two temple towers, fitting ornaments of their great divinities. The splendid temple, a brilliant and magnificent dwelling, the habitation of their joys, the house for

their delight, shining as bright as the stars on heaven's firmament and richly decorated with ornaments through the skill of my artists, I planned, devised, and thought out, built and completed. I made its interior brilliant like the dome of the heavens; decorated its walls like the splendor of the rising stars, and made it grand with resplendent brilliancy. I reared its temple tower to heaven and completed its roof with burnt brick; located therein the upper terrace, containing the chamber of their great divinities; and led into the interior Anu and Adad, the great gods, and made them to dwell in their lofty house, thus gladdening the heart of their great divinities" (G. p. 171). This shows great achievement, and we should judge from this and other inscriptions that the nation as a whole was in a very prosperous condition. It seems that about three prosperous reigns followed that of Tiglathpileser I and then "the Assyrian kingdom goes out in darkness. The first chapter of her imperial history is finished about 1050 B. C." (G. p. 173).

* * *

CHAPTER IV.

The Great Age of Assyrian History (1000-600 B. C.)

It is natural to inquire what were the causes of the dark period in Assyrian history beginning about 1000 B. C. Very few remains are left of the time. There are some inscribed bricks giving scattered information, and some reference to the time is made in later inscriptions but that is all. Even the king's lists are broken and confused, so that exact dates are uncertain. What information we have shows that both Babylonia and Assyria were in decay. In Babylonia dynasties followed in rapid succession; the Elamites conquered the country and held it for a few years. The indications are that several rulers occupied the throne of Assyria during this dark period. The real cause of the decline of the Tigro-Euphrates kingdoms was the attacks of surrounding peoples. It seems right to ascribe the downfall of Assyria partly to other causes. The kingdom under Tiglathpi-

leser I had been somewhat exhausted by the numerous campaigns; many vigorous men had been lost; the resources of the land spent in wars were not compensated for by the booty which was brought in. But the great fact to notice is that this internal weakness was brought about just at the time when mighty movements were taking place on the outside. These movements reduced Assyria to its original condition; its provinces were gone. Babylon was thrown into confusion by the same movements, and foreign trade was cut off from both kingdoms.

The greatest of these movements was the Aramean migration starting in the Arabian peninsula. For centuries, at various times these nomads had wandered into middle Mesopotamia. The stragglers among them, it seems, were absorbed into the valley civilization, but when they became too formidable they were driven back. At about 1000 B. C. however, they came in great numbers. Probably they wandered around from place to place at first, but they finally settled down in upper Mesopotamia around the Euphrates. It can not be determined with absolute certainty just why they came, but it is probable, kingdoms having been formed in southern Arabia extended their power northward and forced the Arameans out of Arabia.

This reason would also account for the inroads made into Babylonia by the Kaldi at about the same time. At any rate, from this time on the Kaldi are found near the mouths of the great rivers. They waged war for the possession of Babylonia. Their coming may account for the rapid change in Babylonian dynasties from about 1000 to 950 B. C.

It seems that Assyrian power was also swept away in the Armenian regions. It is probable that just about this time the Phrygians from Europe were entering Asia Minor. There are also traditions of a Cilician kingdom which welded together the tribes north and east of the gulf of Issus as far as Armenia. At any rate, whatever new peoples may have entered Asia, or whatever new combinations may have been made, it is evident that Assyria not only lost her provinces to the northwest, but also her trade in that direction. The Assyrian power to the north and east,

in the Lake Van region, was also broken to pieces by a new people called the Urarti.

The weakness of both the Mesopotamian kingdoms and Egypt at this time gave an opportunity for the development of weak states and the creation of new ones; the opportunity was improved. The Philistines on the southeastern coast of the Mediterranean became strong and aggressive, and controlled the routes of trade from Egypt to Syria. To the east of this coast, in the hill country and plateaus, pressed by the Philistines and inspired by the worship of a common god, Yahweh, the Hebrews formed also an independent state. Under the leadership of the warrior, David, and the wise Solomon, this kingdom became known far and wide. During this time Tyre became active and assumed the leadership of the Phoenician cities which were now the commercial centers of both the eastern and western worlds. Various city-states in Syria became prominent, and fought among themselves; among these were Hamath, Khalman, Patin and Samal. Some of the Arameans moved into eastern Syria and laid the foundations for the later kingdom of Damascus. It seemed, for the time, that oriental civilization had gravitated toward western Asia. This movement toward centralization of power in Syria was at its height about 950 B. C.

But by this time the ancient kingdoms of Egypt, Babylonia and Assyria began to show signs of revival. Sheshonk had usurped the throne of Egypt, and soon followed this up by conquering Palestine as far north as the sea of Galilee. The signs of revival are not so evident in Babylonia. A new dynasty had been founded in Assyria. The crown was apparently descending in regular order in the same family. Nothing is known of the Tiglathpileser who was the founder of the line; but we hear of his son, and successor, building fortresses, digging canals and restoring temples. The grandson of the founder built up the walls of Assur, and, according to one of his descendants, waged war in every direction. There are, however, no records of his wars, except with Babylonia; in this case the Assyrian king was victorious, but did not undertake to seize the throne of Babylonia.

The fourth king of this Assyrian line penetrated the northern country to the sources of the Tigris. He recorded his victories there, alongside the record of Tiglathpileser I whom he no doubt wished to emulate. Great promise was given during his reign, of what would be done in the future.

With the next king, Ashurnacirpal III (885-860 B. C.), the real revival of Assyrian power came. The king began his reign by invading the north, thus following up the work of his father. There had been a great change here since the time of Tiglathpileser I; the peoples were better united and hence harder to manage. There was also greater commotion in these regions than ever before. The Assyrian king boldly entered this country and conquered, with apparent ease, a strong tribe of the Nairi. During the same movement he also conquered the people on the east, to the Zagros mountains, and on the south, with the exception of the Zamua, to the Lower Zab.

The country between northern Mesopotamia and the Taurus mountains, bounded on the east by Lake Van, and on the west by the Euphrates, was next taken. A governor was appointed over this whole region, who resided at Tushkha.

By the time this work was accomplished, a chieftain had united all Zamua; this action not only threatened the eastern border of Assyria but cut off the trade routes to the east. After severe fighting, and a long pursuit of the leaders of Zamua, even to northern Babylonia, Assyria was entirely victorious. "Fortified posts were established in Zamua, and a governor was appointed with his seat at Kalkhi" (G. p. 190).

The achievements related above occupied the first six years of the king's reign. Ashurnacirpal now changed his capital to Kalkhi. He probably thought this the most advantageous center for his power. While the rebuilding of his capital city was going on, the king turned his attention toward the west. The Arameans had established their power over the lands bordering the Euphrates, from the Khabur northward to the mountains. But they were in commotion again and endangering both the Assyrian border and the trade routes to the west. The Assyrian

king made several campaigns into this region with the result that all northern Mesopotamia fell into his hands. He came into contact with a Babylonian army during these campaigns, but it by no means thwarted his plans.

The last campaign in the west brought Ashurnacirpal to the Mediterranean. It seems that the coast was conquered from Tyre to the gulf of Issus. So thorough had been the great king's work in all directions that his campaigns ceased when his reign was about half over. He had not extended Assyrian influence so far as had Tiglathpileser I, but otherwise his work compares very favorably with that of the earlier king. Their manner of leading their armies, their custom of collecting tribute, their requirement of hostages and their treatment of enemies were very similar. Ashurnacirpal, however, improved the army by adding a cavalry squadron to the infantry and chariots; the cavalry could be used in many places where the other parts of the army could not. He also incorporated the troops of the conquered peoples in his army. This measure worked in two directions; it took away the fighting forces of his enemies; it saved Assyria from too great a drain on both her men and economic resources. There was also a danger in this measure, if the foreign element in the army cared to assert itself, but the danger was not evident during the reign of Ashurnacirpal III.

In the organization of his conquered lands Ashurnacirpal III surpassed all former Assyrian kings. He had a series of fortresses to guard his exposed boundaries and a number of centers of power within the Empire. It is not clear just what the powers of the various officials holding these posts were, but it seems evident that some of the officials were Assyrians, and others, native rulers, who had submitted and had been confirmed in their powers. Though not entirely a new measure, it is significant to notice that the plan of settling Assyrian colonists in the conquered lands was pushed further than ever before.

Ashurnacirpal III's method of reducing a people to subjection was of the severest kind. It seems to have had the desired effect in checking rebellion for the time. In the inscription on

one of his standards he has this to say about conquering Tela, a city near the head waters of the Tigris. "I drew near to the city of Tela. The city was very strong; three walls surrounded it. The inhabitants trusted to their strong walls and numerous soldiers; they did not come down or embrace my feet. With battle and slaughter I assaulted and took the city. Three thousand warriors I slew in battle. Their booty and possessions, cattle, sheep, I carried away; many captives I burned with fire. Many of their soldiers I took alive; of some I cut off hands and limbs; of others the noses, ears and arms; of many soldiers I put out the eyes. I reared a column of the living and a column of heads. I hung up on high their heads on trees in the vicinity of their city. Their boys and girls I burned up in the flame. I devastated the city, dug it up, in fire burned it; I annihilated it". Such punishments were meted out to the rebellious and the foreign communities that resisted the might of Assyria. Otherwise the Assyrian ruler does not seem to have been especially cruel. But generally speaking the king had his own way, for the cities had not as yet learned to unite against their common enemy.

Ashurnacirpal III received much wealth from spoils and tribute. Zamua furnished excellent horses. The mountain regions furnished plentiful supplies of cattle, sheep, grain, wine, copper, gold and silver. But the richest returns came from the Arameans. They furnished "horses, cattle, sheep, chariots, harness, armor, silver, gold, lead, copper, variegated garments and linen cloths, wood and metal work, and furniture in ivory and gold" (G. p. 198). These were the chief articles of wealth but some of the Aramean communities sent plates of ivory, beautiful couches, thrones, gold weapons, cloths of rich color, the most costly furniture, precious stones and woods, and female slaves. Cedar was the chief contribution of Syria.

The king made use of this wealth in his great enterprises at Kalkhi. Before his campaigns were over he had started a temple; but his greatest building work was the construction of his palace. It was built on the west side of a great rectangular platform running from north to south, on the east bank of the Tigris.

The city was to the north east but near at hand, and the temple was on the north western corner of the rectangular platform. The palace was built of brick faced with stone, was about 350 feet square, and divided into large open courts, narrow covered galleries and small dark rooms. Some glazed tile was used for interior lining; but the chief decoration was a series of alabaster slabs carved in low relief, depicting scenes from the life of the king. The entrances to this magnificent building were on the north, and consisted of three door ways flanked with human-headed bulls. "Every where is the combination of energy with repose, of massive strength with dignity; though crude and imperfect in the technique of the sculptor, the reliefs are the most vivid and lifelike achievements of Assyrian art, the counterpart in stone of the grandiose story of the king's campaigns, which is written above and on either side of them. The narrow galleries were spanned with cedar beams and decorated with silver and gold and bronze. The priceless ivories of the west showing by subject and style the unmistakable influence of Egypt, have been picked up from the palace walls by modern explorers" (G. p. 200). The principles of this art were borrowed chiefly from Babylonia. The king had a palace at Nineveh, also, and built temples in several places. He constructed an acqueduct between the Upper Zab and Kalkhi which supplied his capital with water. Ashurnacirpal's chief contribution to the economic welfare of his country was no doubt through the great wealth brought in by his wars. In forming an estimate of the character of Ashurnacirpal III, it must be kept constantly in mind: (1) That his cruelty was exercised mainly for the purpose of striking terror to his enemies in order to obtain obedience; (2) That he had statesman-like qualities which were very commendable for the age in which he lived, in a word he was something more than a rude heartless conqueror bent wholly on murder and bloodshed.

The descendents of Ashurnacirpal III held the throne for more than a century (860-745 B. C.). This royal family finally disappeared during a revolution. During that time Assyria had to face new peoples, new political problems and internal troubles

which are now hard to trace. After all, though, the same main historical features develop along the same lines as before. There are the same great military activities, the same efforts at expansion, the same methods of governing the people within the empire, and the same attitude toward foreigners. Generally speaking, then, the work of the various kings may be considered as a whole. This does not mean that the special achievements of any particular king will be omitted.

Before entering upon this general discussion it may be well to note the order in which the kings succeeded each other and some of the general aspects of their reigns. Shalmaneser II succeeded his father Ashurnacirpal III as king. His reign (860-825 B. C.) was mostly occupied by wars in every direction. Rebellions were put down, and attempts made to conquer new peoples. A black basalt obelisk, left by the king, records year by year 32 of his military operations; the account recorded thereon is supplemented by other monumental evidence. Shamshi Adad IV, son of Shalmaneser II, followed his father and reigned from about 825-812 B. C. He left a monolithic inscription which covers about half of his reign. Adadnirari III (812-783 B. C.), son of Shamshi Adad IV, was the next king; no satisfactory annals of his reign have come down to us, but he apparently ruled strongly and well. The next three kings were Shalmaneser III (783-773 B. C.), Ashurdan III (773-755 B. C.) and Ashurnirari II (755-745 B. C.). We have no royal inscription from any one of these; their names appear on the limu lists alone, together with a few other references which indicate that Assyria was now in decay.

Some few facts are known about the political and economic developments in Assyria during the century (860-745 B. C.) we have under consideration. For the first three reigns the spoils of war and tribute came in abundantly. Apparently Shalmaneser II levied definite yearly taxes upon some of the subject communities. It seems that the kings were also more moderate in their demands than Ashurnacirpal III had been. Revolts were less frequent and the horrors of war were somewhat mitigated.

Internal troubles, however, tested the powers of the kings.

The usual family difficulties of the reigning house, appeared. The king was at times in danger from the commander-in-chief of the army. These difficulties on the part of the king gave rise to rebellion even in the reign of Shalmaneser III. Cities became rebellious at times. Externally, the border peoples had to be constantly watched.

Though they had these grave problems to meet, the earlier kings of this century, at least, showed a desire to develop their country along high lines. Both in Assur and Nineveh traces of the building operations of Shalmaneser II remain. At Kalkhi, his real capital, he built upon a great mound his palace, few remains of which have been found. In this palace stood the black basalt obelisk, referred to above, and two great winged-bulls, carved in very high relief on slabs fourteen feet square. Nine miles east of Kalkhi were found some bronze sheathings apparently from double doors which had closed a gate way some twenty-eight feet in height. These sheathings show scenes from the life of Shalmaneser II. There is a marked skill shown in both the handling of the metal and in the choice of scenes presented. The royal inscriptions are practically the only literary remains left. These show about the same form and content as those of Ashur-nacirpal's time. Shalmaneser II is said to have founded a royal library at Kalkhi, with a librarian who cared for the contents of the same. The collections found in the library were chiefly Babylonian religious texts, either original or copies. During the reign of Adadnirari III " was produced the diplomatic document known as the 'Synchronistic History of Assyria and Babylonia,' a summary of the political relations between the kings of these countries from the earliest period" (G. p. 209). This history reached back to sometime before 1460 B. C. Assyrian civilization was influencing surrounding nations, the kings of Urartu wrote their inscriptions in the Assyrian language.

A new tendency may be observed in the religious life of the time, a tendency to emphasize more and more the ethical side of religion. The gods of war are of course praised in high sounding phrases, but it is important to note that the sun-god, Shamash,

is now placed on almost an equal standing with the national god, Ashur, and that to Shamash are applied such titles as "ordainer of all things," "director of mankind" and "judge of the world." The worship of Nabu, the Babylonian god of wisdom and learning, was encouraged during the reign of Adadnirari III. In the inscriptions, magnifying this god, finer aspirations are expressed than ever before in Assyrian life.

Assyria also made some advance in her policy of expansion, during this century, During the reign of Shalmaneser II, two factions struggled for the throne of Babylonia, one of these asked the aid of the Assyrian king, which the latter gladly gave. The combined forces won the throne of Babylonia and naturally Assyria was considered the suzerain of that country. Shalmaneser's authority was questioned by the Kaldi, but they were put down by him and compelled to pay tribute. The next two Assyrian kings after Shalmaneser II held, with some difficulty, the supremacy over Babylonia. It is uncertain as to whether the last three kings of this family held sway over Babylonia; the weakness of their rules would suggest that they did not, but no monument confirms this idea.

The problem of controlling the west and north was more serious than that of controlling Babylonia. Upon coming to the throne Shalmaneser II found several small states about Karkhemish leagued against him; he overcame this rebellion and proceeded southward into new lands.

"Three leading states divided the region between them; namely, Hamath, Damascus and Israel. Eighty miles south of Khalman, the southern border of Assyrian authority in Syria, lay Hamath, at the entrance to Coele Syria; one hundred miles farther south was Damascus; the border of Israel met the confines of Damascus yet fifty miles west of south. Each state controlled the country round about it. Israel dominated Judah, Moab and Edom; Damascus and Hamath were in treaty relations with the Phoenician ports on the coast near to them" (G. p. 213). These several states were engaged in constant war one with the other, but upon the advance of Shalmaneser II they formed a

coalition which we have noticed, was defeated at Qarqar on the Orontes 854 B. C. The Assyrian king waged many more campaigns in this region; though he was victorious in many, he gained absolute control of the country only as far south as the Lebanon mountains. Many cities south of these mountains sent to him tribute; but the Assyrian kings of this period were unable to get possession of the southern trade routes. They naturally sought commercial outlets in other directions, these they found toward the north west, whither Tiglathpileser I had gone so long before. Three campaigns were made against Qui (Cilicia), where the rich city of Tarsus was located; another against Tabal. Thus the valuable trade with Asia Minor was opened up, and Assyrian civilization found its way to the peoples of the west. These brilliant undertakings were carried on mostly during the reign of Shalmaneser II, but it is doubtful if Assyria held any of Syria by 745 B. C.

During this period there was also constant struggle with the peoples of the northern and eastern frontiers. The chief nation on the north was Urartu which was seeking to expand from north of Lake Van toward the south and west. The Assyrian kings held them in check for a time but could not continue to to do so. The same thing happened with regard to the Madai (Medians) on the east. "In these latter people is to be recognized the first wave of that Indo-European migration which was to exercise so important an influence upon the later history of Western Asia" (G. p. 220). In the midst of this assault on Assyria by Urartu and the Medians the house founded by Ashurnacirpal III, fell. These kings had performed some great services. Through their great military operations they had extended the Assyrian territory, especially toward the north west and north east, this meant an extension of trade, and the spread of Assyrian civilization. Again the very agression of Assyria caused other peoples, more or less disunited, to unite; and thus the empire of the Tigris was confronted by nations almost as strong and vigorous as herself. In short, the very life of the Assyrian state was threatened.

But upon the accession of Tiglathpileser III, the founder of a new house (745-727 B. C.), a great change for the better came in Assyrian affairs. This would seem to indicate that one of the main causes of her disasters was the weakness of the later rulers of the house of Ashurnacirpal III. Many writers think that these rulers identified their interests with the priests, and that the priests dominated the commercial activities of the empire. But the army, composed chiefly of the free peasants, and led by local officials was opposed to this combination. "The disasters on the frontiers brought commercial stringency which, as in every ancient state, bore most heavily, not upon the men of wealth, but upon the poorer classes. The king unwisely threw himself into the hands of the priests. Sooner or later this attitude was bound to antagonize the army. King, priestly lords and merchant princes went down before a rebellion, starting from Kalkhi, the seat of the army. The new king represented, therefore, the re-assertion of the strongest forces in the state, the native farmers and soldiers, led by the ablest general among them" (G. p. 224 ff.).

It is worthy of notice that Tiglathpileser III, in his inscriptions, says little of his ancestral rights to the throne. Neither do we hear of temple building. Ashur was the great god of the state, the conquering hero, whose worship the king established in the conquered cities.

There are several sources of information concerning the reign of Tiglathpileser III. The limu list for his time is complete. In many instances the Old Testament is of special value. A few bricks were found at Nineveh which are of some value. But the remains of his palace at Kalkhi furnish the best knowledge of his time. His annals and laudatory account of his campaigns were written on the slabs which adorned the palace. The size of the mound of Shalmaneser II was increased and the palace placed thereon. On the side next to the Tigris the mound was faced with alabaster slabs. The palace faced the north. It had a portico of Syrian style, on that side. Pylons flanked the entrance way. It had more woodwork in its construction than any Assyrian building of importance before this time; cypress and cedar-wood

were especially prominent. The double doors were sheathed in bronze, and the entrance way was flanked with carved figures. The building evidently did not survive long after its construction. This may have been due partly to the material used in it but it is more reasonable to suppose that another king began to use the materials in building his own palace, which was never finished. Nearly every year of the kings reign (745-727 B. C.) was marked by a military campaign. These campaigns were on a broader scale than ever before. This was natural since most of the small states of Western Asia had disappeared before the power of a few great states. In the south were the Kaldi, stronger than ever and anxious to seize Babylonia; on the north was Urartu expanding in every direction; in the west there was a strong tendency toward unity, but no one state was sure of permanent leadership. Egypt also had strong national aspirations. Unity was coming to be based on political rather than racial grounds. The time was ripe for the ideal of a world-empire to be practically realized. Tiglathpileser III had much to do with the realization of this ideal.

His first military expedition outside of Assyria was toward the south. "Aramean tribes, forever moving restlessly across the southern Mesopotamian plain from the Euphrates to the Tigris, had grown bolder during these years, and, in spite of the endeavors of the Assyrian kings, had entered Babylonia, occupied the Tigris basin from the lower Zab to the Uknu, and were in possession of some of the ancient cities of Akkad. Aramean states were forming, similar to those of Western Mesopotamia which had been overcome with so much difficulty by Ashurnacirpal III and Shalmaneser II" (G. p. 227). The Assyrian king was not long in wresting entire control from these Aramean states. He settled thousands of their inhabitants in the mountain regions of the northeast. Fortresses were built, canals put in repair, and entire Babylonia was organized under direct Assyrian rule. It was a number of years before Babylonia again needed the attention of Assyria.

The Assyrian army next penetrated the east (744 B. C.), it

even reached the southern shores of the Caspian Sea. Fortresses were built in this region and the Medes were forced, for the time at least, to respect Assyrian authority.

The next four years (743-740 B. C.) were spent by the king in campaigning in the west. Practically all the territory west of the Euphrates had been lost to Assyria during the last years of the house of Ashurnacirpal III. Northern Syria had been re-organized under the lead of the city-state of Arpad. Urartu, which now held control of the country between Lake Urmia and Cilicia, was supporting Arpad. Tiglathpileser III broke this coalition to pieces and not only recovered all of northern Syria, but forced the central northern states, between the Tigris and the Euphrates, to pay tribute. Within the next few years, central Syria, around Hamath, was conquered and the king of Israel and the queen of Arabia sent tribute (2 Kings XV 19, 20).

Having for the time settled matters in the west, Tiglathpileser penetrated into the very heart of Urartu; the capital of this state, on the western shore of Lake Van, was beseiged, but not taken, and the entire kingdom ravaged far and wide.

Troubles in the west again called the Assyrian king into that region. Israel, Damascus (2 Kings XVI 5; Isa. VII 1 ff.), the Philistine cities (2 Chron. XXVIII 18), and especially Gaza joined in an attack upon Judah. Edom also joined the league (2 Chron. XXVIII, 17). Ahaz, the king of Judah called upon Tiglathpileser III for aid, against the advice of the prophet Isaiah (Isa. VII 3 ff.). The Assyrian king gladly responded and "for three years (734-732 B. C. h) he campaigned from Damascus to the border of Egypt" (G. p. 232). The Philistine cities were doubtless attacked first; at any rate, they were brought under subjection, all yielding with little resistance, except Gaza. Israel was next attacked (2 Kings XV 29), and finally, submitted; a part of it remained under a vassal king but the northern half passed into the actual possession of Assyria. The attention of Tiglathpileser III was next turned toward Damascus. This state was destroyed, and the lands, over which it ruled, made an Assyrian province (2 Kings XVI 9). Thus all Syria-Palestine came under the

control of the great Assyrian king. The queen of Arabia having withheld her tribute, was forced to renew it, and an Assyrian official was assigned permanently to her court.

It has been noticed that early in his reign, Tiglathpilèser III asserted his control over Babylonia. Since that time, a period of thirteen years, had elapsed, and the Kaldi, or Kaldeans, were again attempting to control the country; in fact one of the Kaldean princes had seized the throne. Again, the Assyrian king marched into the country, and, after hard fighting, deposed the usurper and made himself king, under the name of Pulu. Just why he assumed a new title is not known, but it is probable that it expressed his relation to the priest-hoods, and their gods, which were so dominant in Babylonian life. If this be the case his rule was a burden as much as an honor. What ever may have been the burden, to rule Babylonia had been the goal of the Assyrian kings for centuries (such a goal had been reached by Tukulti Ninib 500 years before); but Tiglathpileser III lived only about one year after attaining this ambition. He was followed by Shalmaneser IV

The empire of Tiglathpileser III was the largest as yet controlled by any oriental monarch. Its northern boundary was, roughly, an east-and-west line extending from Cilicia to the Caspian Sea; its western boundary was the Mediterranean and Egypt; on the south it reached to the Persian gulf and into Arabia to an indefinite extent; its eastern boundary was, roughly, a north-and-south line extending from the Caspian Sea to the Persian gulf, but excluding the Kingdom of Elam.

The administration of the government was more efficient than any attained before this. The king had a genius for organization. True enough, he continued the custom of former kings, in establishing fortresses in the conquered territory, and in the appointment of officials who represented Assyria in these countries; but he also attempted to bring the conquered countries into closer relation to Assyria, and to give the officials more and better defined powers. The basis of the local government was the city and the land attached to it. He organized several of

these cities into one district and placed over this district a government official appointed by, and responsible to, the crown. The chief duties of the official were to preserve order, collect the regular tribute, and to ward off any foreign attacks. There were ten of these districts, all in the Assyrian border lands. The Assyrian tributary states were managed as of old; they were allowed local freedom, under vassal kings. The former custom of deporting peoples was likewise followed, but the deportations were made on a much larger scale, and again, most of the peoples were sent, not into Assyria, but into the various subjugated lands; for example,—135,000 Babylonians were sent into Syria. "The colonists exposed to the same hatreds as the original Assyrian conquerors, soon forgot to look upon the latter as the oppressors of all, and, allowing their present grudge to efface the memory of past injuries, did not hesitate to make common cause with them. In time of peace the governor did his best to protect them against molestation on the part of the natives, and in return for this they rallied round him whenever the latter threatened to get out of his hand, and helped him to stifle the revolt, or hold it in check until the arrival of re-inforcements. Thanks to their help, the empire was consolidated and maintained without too many violent outbreaks in regions far removed from the capital and beyond the immediate reach of the sovereign" (Maspero, Passing of the Empires p. 200 ff.).

It is not known whether Shalmaneser IV was a son of Tiglathpileser III. The limu list indicates that Shalmaneser reigned only five years (727-722 B. C.). Babylonian records show that he was king of that country. The west had been quiet for a number of years and it seems that at first, it accepted the rule of Shalmaneser IV and paid tribute as before. But trouble was stirred up in Palestine, either by the king of Egypt or the Arabian kingdom of Mucri,—upon this point scholars do not agree (2 Kings XVII 4). Israel rebelled, and probably Tyre. Good evidence indicates that the latter was conquered, and all Phoenicia over ran, but Israel was still under siege when the king died and was succeeded, without opposition, by Sargon II (722 B. C.); though

we have no proofs that Sargon II was a son, or even a relative of Shalmaneser IV.

In his foreign policy and administration of the government, Sargon II (722-705 B. C.) followed very closely the work of Tiglathpileser III. From the standpoint of splendor and centralized power in the government, Sargon II surpassed all his predecessors. But the sources indicate that he reversed the policy of the last two kings and favored the commercial and priestly interests thereby neglecting the peasantry. Many of the inscriptions are of a religious nature; no preceding Assyrian ruler had glorified the gods so much. Old cults were revived, the triad of Anu, Bel and Ea again appeared, and the gates of the king's great city and palace were named in honor of the different gods.

Of course much of the kings time was spent in war. Samaria fell during the first year of his reign, and 27,000 persons, the best element in the state, were sent to Mesopotamia and Media. Israel was formed into an Assyrian province; it was partially resettled with captives from Babylonia and Syria.

It was but natural that Sargon II should want to become king of Babylonia, but he was deprived of this honor until toward the close of his reign. In the meantime a Kaldean prince, aided by the Elamites, held the Babylonian throne. The Elamites had not interfered with the affairs of the valley for centuries, but they were now pushed westward by the Medes, thus throwing them into very close contact with the Assyrians. Early in his reign, the Assyrian king made an attempt to break up the Kaldean and Elamite combination, but failed.

This failure was a serious drawback to Sargon II, in controlling his other enemies. The ruler of Lower Egypt was ambitious to regain some of Syria-Palestine, he therefore promised to aid this region against Assyria. Hamath, Gaza, the Mucri and Egypt formed a combination to fight Assyria; Sargon II, however, attacked each of his enemies separately and was thereby able to control fully the situation. This was about 720 B. C. Seven years went by before Sargon again entered the west. In the meantime, all Egypt was united under an Ethiopian king,

who was anxious to regain Egyptian influence in Asia. A number of Asiatic cities revolted, but the rebellion was soon stamped out by Sargon II; Egypt's promise of aid again proved to be of no consequence.

Most of Sargon's campaigns were toward the north. The chief enemies here were Urartu and the Mushki. The ambition of Urartu was to expand, and, therefore, to limit the power of Assyria. The latter country did not permit this to take place. There was long, hard fighting between the two, the result of which was that Urartu was left independent in her original territory north of Lake Van but was compelled to keep her hands off Assyrian territory. The Mushki were brought under control and forced to pay tribute. Thus Assyrian authority was thoroughly established in the north.

Sargon now turned his attention toward Babylonia and after a hard contest with the Kaldean prince, mentioned above, the latter was expelled and the Assyrian ruler became the lawful king of Babylonia. So territorially the empire of Tiglathpileser III was kept intact.

During the last few years of Sargon's reign, his city and palace of Khorsabad were completed. The king lived most of his reign at Kalkhi, he had restored there the palace of Ashurnacirpal. "But his overmastering ambition suggested to him an achievement which had not entered into the minds of his predecessors. They had erected palaces. He would build a city in which his palace should stand. For this purpose, with an eye to the natural beauty of the location, he chose a plain to the north east of Nineveh, well watered and fertile, in full view of the mountains. A rectangle was marked out; its sides more than a mile in length, its corners lying on the four cardinal points. It was surrounded by walls nearly fifty feet in height, on which at regular intervals rose towers to a further height of some fifteen feet. Eight gates elaborately finished and dedicated to the gods gave entrance through these walls into the city, which was laid out with streets and parks in a thoroughly modern fashion, and was capable of housing eighty thousand people. Upon the northwest side stood

the royal palace on an artificial elevation raised to the height of the wall. This mound was in the shape of the letter T, the base projecting from the outer wall, the arms falling within and facing the city. An area of about twenty five acres thus obtained was completely covered by the palace, which consisted of a complex of rooms, courts, towers and gardens, numbering in all not less than two hundred. The main entrance was from the city front through a most splendid gateway which admitted to the central square. From its three sides opened the three main quarters of the palace to the right the store-houses, to the left the harem and directly across, the king's apartments and the court rooms. This latter portion was finished in the highest artistic fashion of the period. The halls were lined with bas-reliefs of the king's campaigns; the door-ways were flanked with winged bulls, and the archways adorned with bands of enameled tiles. In the less elaborate chambers colored stucco and frescoes are found. The artistic character of the bas-reliefs, however, is not distinctly higher than that of any previous periods. The variety of detail already noted as appearing in the bronzes of Shalmaneser II (Sect. 175) is the most striking characteristic of these sculptures. It is the mechanical skill displayed, in the finish of the tiling, in the coloring of the frescoes, in the modelling of the furniture, in the forms of the weapons and the like, that the art here exhibited is chiefly remarkable. In addition the colossal character of the whole design of the city and palace, culminating in the lofty ziggurat, with its seven stories in different colors, rising to the height of one hundred and forty feet from the court in the middle of the southwest face of the palace mound, gives a vivid impression of the wealth, resourcefulness and magnificent powers of the Assyrian empire as it lay in the hand of Sargon, who brought it to its height and gave it this unique monument" (G. p. 259 ff.).

Sargon's government of the empire was largely patterned after that of Tiglathpileser III, but he went further than that ruler in organizing provinces and deporting great masses of the population. This meant greater centralization in the government, for the deported population lost its unity and nationality.

Royal officials must administer the local government. This involved an amount of detail that must have been irksome even to one so able as Sargon II. Was this the best policy or was it better to have less provinces and more vassal kings as did Tiglath-pileser III? This may have been a weakness in Sargon. It was a weakness if he favored unduly the priesthoods and commercial class, for this would involve the peasant farmers in debt and might finally lead to serfdom and slavery. Since these small farmers supplied the army, once they were degraded, mercenaries or the soldiers of the conquered states must take their place. However great these evils may have become later none of them are apparent in Sargon's time. "Assyria was never so great in extent, never so rich in silver and gold and all precious things, never so brilliant in the achievements of art and architecture, never more devoted to the gods and their temples. Nor was Sargon unmindful of the economic welfare of his country, as his inscriptions testify. He directed his attention to the colonization of ruined sites, to the planting of fields, to making the barren hills productive, and causing the waste dry lands to bring forth grain, to rebuilding reservoirs and dams for irrigation. He sought to fill the granaries with food, to protect the needy against want, to make oil cheap, to make sesame of the same price with corn and to establish a uniform price for all commodities. When he had settled strangers from the four quarters of the earth in his new city, he sent to them Assyrians, men of knowledge and insight, learned men and scribes, to teach them the fear of God and the king. These were high conceptions of the responsibilities of empire, however imperfectly they may have been realized" (G. p. 264).

Sargon spent but a short time in his new city. It is recorded that he met a violent death; by what means is not known. He was succeeded by his son Sennacherib.

The reign of Sennacherib (705-681 B. C.) was filled with military campaigns. Though there were not so many as during Sargon's time, most of those conducted were on a large scale. A few unimportant expeditions were made toward the east, north-

west and Arabia, but generally speaking there was peace both along the northern and the eastern borders, and the provincial governors did their duty well. The really serious problems confronting Sennacherib were in connection with Babylonia and Palestine.

Babylonia at this time was divided into a number of principalities each one desirious of holding the nominal leadership of the country. In the north and east were the Aramean communities; in the west were Arabians, and in the south the Kaldeans. Assyria and Elam both wished possession of the land. The city of Babylon had no unity in itself except that found in the desire to maintain the religious and commercial supremacy. Sargon's connection with the city has been noticed. At the beginning of Sennacherib's rule his brother was the governor of Babylon, he was soon murdered, however, and a Babylonian placed in his stead. This arrangement lasted for about a month, then the throne was seized by the Kaldeans; they were supported by the Aramean communities and Elam. Sennacherib defeated this combination and carried away, among other things, much spoil and 208,000 Arameans. A young Babylonian noble who had been reared at the Assyrian court was placed on the throne of Babylon under the protection of the Assyrian king. We shall note later how this arrangement worked.

Meanwhile the deposed leader of the Kaldeans in Babylonia had stirred up disaffection against Assyria in the west. Active and open opposition was organized. It included Judah whose king was Hezekiah, Tyre and a number of other Phoenician cities, Ammon, Moab, Edom, some Bedouin tribes and Egypt. Sennacherib was not long in moving into the west; he rapidly conquered, and received the submission of all these enemies except Tyre and Judah. Tyre evidently remained independent, but Judah was overcome and forced to pay tribute (For description of campaign by Sennacherib himself, see G. p. 270 ff.; for Biblical description, see 2 Kings XVIII and XIX, Isa. XXXVI and XXXVII). Though there was a pestilence in his army, the king had been successful, so successful indeed that he did not

have to enter the west but once more and then only for the purpose of quieting some Arabian tribes; while, in the west, the Babylonian prince placed on the throne by Sennacherib had not been faithful; the Kaldeans and Elamites had allied against Assyria, all Babylonia was in commotion. The Assyrian king marched into the country put down the Kaldeans and Elamites, made his own son king of Babylon. This arrangement insured peace for about six years (700-694 B. C.).

During this interval the Assyrian king made an attack upon Elam. The latter made a counter attack and captured the ruler of Babylon, Sennacherib's son. This again opened up the Babylonian problem, which Sennacherib finally settled by blotting Babylon out of existence. A canal was turned out of its course and permitted to flow over the ruins. The country around the city was organized into an Assyrian province.

The closing years of Sennacherib were troubled ones. There was rivalry among his sons over the succession, the result of which was that the king was finally assassinated. Thus a brilliant reign ended in murder and bloodshed.

"The name of Sennacherib is intimately associated with the city of Nineveh which owes its fame as the chief capital of the Assyrian empire, to his choice of it as a favorite dwelling place. He planned its fortifications, gave it a system of waterworks, restored its temples and built its most magnificent palaces. The city, as it came from his hands, was an irregular parallelogram that lay from northwest to southwest along the eastern bank of the Tigris, its western side about two and one-half miles long, its northern over a mile, its eastern more than three miles, and its southern half a mile in length, making in all a circuit of about seven miles. Through the middle of the city flowed, from east to west, the river Khusur, an affluent of the Tigris. Sennacherib built massive walls and gates about the city, and on the eastern side toward the mountains added protecting ramparts. A quadruple defence was made on this side. A deep moat supplied with water from the Khusur, was also led along the eastern face. Diodorus estimates the height of the walls at one hundred feet.

Their general width was about fifty feet, and excavations have indicated that in the vicinity of the gates they were more than one hundred feet wide. The arrangements for furnishing the city with water are described by the king in an inscription, carved upon the cliff of Bavian, a few miles to the northeast of Nineveh among the mountains. Eighteen mountain streams were made to pour their waters into the Khusur, thus securing a constant supply of fresh water. A series of works regulated at the same time the storing and the distribution of the water, and made it possible for the city to maintain an abundant supply in time of siege. Two lofty platforms along the Tigris front of the city had served as the foundations of the palaces already erected, but both palaces and platforms had fallen into decay. The northern platform, now known as the mound of Kouyunjik, lay in the upper angle formed by the junction of the Khusur and the Tigris. Sennacherib restored and enlarged this platform, changed the bed of the Khusur so that it half encircled the mound, and built in the southwest portion of it his palace. It has been only partially excavated, yet already seventy-one rooms have been opened; in the judgment of competent investigators, the palace is the greatest built by any Assyrian monarch.

On the southern platform, now called Nebiyunus, the king built an arsenal for the storing of military supplies. His ideal for these buildings is stated by himself to be that they should excel those of his predecessors in 'adaptation, size and artistic effect.' His success in the latter respect is no less remarkable than in the two former. No series of bas-reliefs hitherto executed in Assyria, or even in the ancient world, reaches the height of artistic excellence attained by those of Sennacherib. In variety of subject-matter, strength and accuracy of portraiture, simplicity and breadth of composition, they are among the most remarkable productions of antiquity. The tendency to the development of the background and setting of the principal subject, already observed in previous works, has reached its climax. The delineation of building operations and the sense of landscape are two new features which illustrate the larger outlook characteristic of the

higher civilization and broader culture of the time. Similar characteristics appear in the literary remains of the king. Official as they are, they reveal, as compared with similar documents of earlier kings, a feeling for literary effect, an element of subjectivity, a color and breadth of composition, which are unusual. The description of the battle of Khalule, in the Taylor inscription, in spirit and vigor leaves little to be desired, while the free characterization of personages and measures, indulged in throughout the inscription, introduce a distinctly fresh note into these usually arid and stereotyped annalistic documents. The culture of the time may, perhaps, also be illustrated by the subtle and effective speech of the Assyrian royal officer to the people of Jerusalem, preserved in 2 Kings XVIII 19-35,—an argument in content and form worthy of a modern diplomatist" (G. p. 278 ff.).

With all his faults Sennacherib had preserved the integrity of the empire. Many writers have adjudged him a fearful monster. This judgment has been due largely to his boastful inscriptions and his destruction of Babylon, and is thought by other writers to be hasty and one-sided since the inscriptions and the destruction of Babylon show the man in only exceptional cases. He was daringly brave in battle, quick to act and original in his plans, in a word, he was a great soldier. Though he destroyed Babylon, he made Nineveh, the world's greatest city for that time, the capital of the strongest and most centralized state the Assyrians had ever had.

There is no contemporary account of the troubles following the assassination of Sennacherib, but the Babylonian chronicle indicates that Esarhaddon, son of Sennacherib put down his brothers, the murderers of his father and became king; the brothers escaped to Urartu.

Esarhaddon's reign extended over a period of thirteen years (681-668 B. C.). The royal inscriptions of his time are not arranged chronologically, but the important movements are described very well, even in places with considerable detail. Indeed something of the literary spirit of Sennacherib's time is evident, but there was a decline in energy and a tendency toward

mere pharase-making which reached its height in the following reign. A palace and arsenal were erected on the southern [redacted] platform at Nineveh; Sennacherib's building on the same site had become too small. A palace was also built at Kalkhi. The indications are that Esarhaddon made use of the material from the palace of Tiglathpileser III, in the construction of the latter palace. "A characteristic of both of his palaces, indicative perhaps of a new architectural impulse, is the great hall of unusual width, its roof supported by pillars and a medial hall. Another striking feature is the use of sphinxes in decoration" (G. p. 286). No bas-reliefs of any consequence have come down to us. A tunnel was dug to lead the water from the Upper Zab into the city of Kalkhi, it was a restoration of the channel made by Ashurnacirpal. The king was also a great temple builder. At least 30 temples bear marks of his work.

His greatest work as a builder was the restoration of Babylon. It will be remembered that this city had been destroyed by his father. Several reasons have been given for the restoration: (1) Esarhaddon held that his regard for the gods caused him to do it; (2) The king may have had a personal interest in the city, since he had once been governor there, or his wife or mother may have been a native Babylonian; (3) Some hold that Babylon represented one of the fundamental political divisions of the empire, i. e., Nineveh represented the army and the more secular side of life, Babylon the cultural, religious and commercial; (4) Others say that the rebuilding was caused by the natural reaction against the severe policy of Sennacherib. Whatever the cause or causes may have been the king took a very lively interest in the work.

The rebuilding was begun with solemn religious ceremonies, the former population was recalled, and the estates of the nobles in the vicinity of the city were restored. It took about three years to do the work, after which Babylon was more magnificent than ever. Babylon again regained religious and commercial supremacy, and again became a political problem in the imperial rule, even though a provincial governor was placed over the

country. With some difficulty Babylonia was protected from the Arameans, Kaldeans and Elamites.

The problem of defending his northern and eastern borders was by no means an easy one for Esarhaddon. The Medes had now formed into a loose confederacy. Urartu was still quite formidable, but had been held in check by the Mannai who were under the protection Assyria. The Kimmerians (Scythians), a migratory people, were pushing in from the Caucasus mountains. For some reason not known, the Mannai joined the others in a league against Assyria. This league, however, was broken up, as much through its own inherent weakness as through Assyrian attacks. There is no evidence that Esarhaddon extended his borders toward the north and east, indeed it was with difficulty that he held his own in these directions.

No troubles had appeared in the western provinces for more than twenty years after 701 B. C. There was no rebellion there when Esarhaddon ascended the throne, but several years after his accession there was some difficulty in connection with Sidon. This city had been treated well by Assyria, as a foil no doubt for Tyre; but finally one of Sidon's kings became ambitious and formed a league which, probably, included Cilicia, Cyprus and Egypt. This combination soon fell to pieces, Sidon was utterly destroyed and a new city built near the site.

Esarhaddon next turned toward Egypt. That country had long been considered an enemy of Assyria; she had time and again stirred up rebellion in Syria-Palestine. After hard and persistent campaigning Lower Egypt was taken, and the country as far as Thebes probably acknowledged the nominal supremacy of Assyria. In lower Egypt at least Assyrian officials had a general oversight of the government of the several city-states which were ruled in other respects by petty kings. There are evidences, however, that Esarhaddon intended to incorporate Lower Egypt into the Assyrian empire. The next year after the conquest of Egypt that country revolted. Esarhaddon promptly set out to put down the revolt, but died on the way. It was left to his son and successor to carry out his plan and again triumph over Egypt.

Probably surmising that trouble over the succession might ensue, Esarhaddon had, before leaving for Egypt the last time, designated his eldest son, Ashurbanipal as king; his youngest son was to be king of Babylon, and his other sons were to be priests of important temples. This was an honest attempt to pass on to his successors a government which he considered best for the needs of Assyria.

The judgments passed upon Esarhaddon by historians have usually been favorable. He was an excellent general, personally brave, and in most respects gained brilliant successes. But there were certain aspects of his reign that are none too favorable for progress. The king was the first of the successors of Sargon II to boast of his lineage. He traced his family back to a mythical ancestry. He compelled conquered rulers to crouch before him like beasts. These things were excesses of orientalism harmful to the state. The king's religious attitude made him almost dependent upon the priests. This so-called piety was about the same as superstition.

As a statesman Eserhaddon was in many ways the equal of his great predecessors. He followed out their general ideas of deportation and provincial rule. His dealings with vassal kings were probably more successful than those of any king before him. His general foreign policy was by no means successful. In the north he was on the defensive; his conquest of Egypt, in the end, only weakened the empire.

No king had approached him in the great treasure he spent rebuilding Babylon, but the resources used in this had been mainly laid up by Sennacherib. Politically, the reconstitution of Babylon was inexpedient. Babylon, as before, became a center of storm, not only in itself, but around which Kaldeans, Arameans Elamites could defy the mighty rulers of the Tigris—in a word, it meant decentralization, and hence was a step toward the destruction of the Assyrian state.

When Esarhaddon died the arrangements he had made for his succession were carried smoothly into effect. Ashurbanipal (668-626 B. C.) and his brother, now king of Babylon, were well

disposed toward each other; the former was to be the political head of the empire, the latter was to finish rebuilding Babylon, and develop it industrially.

Ashurbanipal first gave his attention to the Egyptian affair which, we saw, was an unsettled problem at the death of his father. He finally conquered all Egypt up to, and including, Thebes. He then appointed a native Saite prince, Psamtik, as a vassal ruler of Assyrian Egypt. Psamtik was supported by Assyrian troops. Ashurbanipal maintained well the borders of the west and northwest. It is probable that the Kimmerians were still dangerous foes in these directions. They not only attacked Assyria, but Lydia as well. Lydia was a kingdom in Asia Minor and was now for the first time rising into power under King Gyges. This king appealed to Assyria for help. Before it could be given, however, the danger was past. These things go to show the growing importance of the west.

But the greatest problem Ashurbanipal had to face was in connection with Babylonia. He and his brother got along peacefully for about fifteen years, but the natural antipathy of Babylonia toward Assyria, intensified by the amibtions of the brother, brought about a crisis. Good evidence shows that about the time Babylonia was ready to revolt, there was a number of bad harvests; this unbalanced the economic conditions and caused great discontent. The Babylonian king sent agents to stir up rebellions in the various vassal states of Assyria. The immense resources of the temples were used in purchasing the support of both the vassal states, and the Elamites, Kaldeans and Arameans. The conspiracy of his brother apparently took Ashurbanipal by surprise, but he was not unprepared for such an emergency. After a great struggle, the Assyrian king put down all these enemies; his brother to avoid capture, killed himself; the Kaldeans and Arameans were thoroughly subdued, and Elam was blotted out of existence as an independent state.

The difficulties on the northern border were, comparatively, not very great. Ashurbanipal followed the policy of arraying the tribes against each other, and avoiding direct conflict between

them and himself. "Thus all along these mountain barriers, Ashurbanipal might boast that he had maintained the integrity and the glory of the Assyrian Empire. He was not aware what momentous changes were in progress behind these distant mountains, what states were rounding into form, what new masses of migratory peoples were gathering to hurl themselves upon the plains and shatter the huge fabric of the Assyrian state" (G. p. 313 ff.).

The wars of Ashurbainpal were over by the year 640 B. C. Never before had the empire seemed so great. It impressed all surrounding peoples as being the world's greatest power. The inscriptions of the king show that "plenty abounded" and, that the king was thoroughly mindful of the economic welfare of his country. The king was a great builder. Temples in many of the cities were enriched or rebuilt. He did nearly as much for Nineveh as had his grandfather; its defenses were enlarged and repaired; a beautiful palace was constructed on the northern mound. The construction and form of this palace were similar to former buildings of the kind but its ornamentations and sculptures surpassed all previous work done by Assyria. "Sennacherib had led the way, but the sculptors of Ashurbanipal improved upon the art of the former day in the elaboration of the scenes depicted, the delicacy and refinement of details, and the freedom and vigor of the treatment. For some of these excellences, particularly the breadth and fulness of the battle scenes, it has been said that the new knowledge gained of Egyptian mural art was responsible. But in the hunting sculptures and representations of animals, the Assyrian artist of Ashurbanipal's time has attained the highest range of original and effective delineation that is offered by antiquity. The reliefs of the wounded lioness, of the two demoniac creatures about to clinch, and of a dozen other figures represented in the hunting scenes, are instinct with life and power; they belong to the permanent aesthetic treasures of mankind" (G. p. 315).

The palace also contained a great library, the greatest so far as we know, that Assyria ever possessed. There were thousands

upon thousands of clay tablets arranged in systematic order upon shelves, for easy consultation. Here was to be found not only the diplomatic literature of Assyria, but also the religious, scientific and historical literature of Babylonia. The most ancient documents of the latter country were copied and edited. The writers of the time, no doubt encouraged by ancient examples and by the king, reached the high water mark in Assyrian literature. They showed spirit, ease and freedom in representing their thought.

The king must have entered into and encouraged this advanced culture, but he was no indolent dreamer, living in luxurious ease. He enjoyed the hunt, shooting with the bow and arrow, and riding in the chariot. Every thing shows that the king was a many sided, manly personality.

In the administration of the government he combined old with new ideas. He followed the old method of provincial administration, deportation of peoples and the union of several districts under one vassal king. His armies drew recruits from conquered and subject peoples, as before. Unlike his predecessors, however, he rarely, if at all, led the armies in person. Some have thought that this reflected upon the personal bravery of the king; but may it not be that he had plenty to do at home? At any rate, the system must have worked well, for we hear of no rebellions among his generals, and again his armies were almost uniformly successful. Furthermore, Ashurbanipal not only reigned for nearly half a century, but did much to encourage culture along various lines—in a word, he proved that it was entirely possible for an Assyrian king to be more than a political leader of his people.

But the tendencies toward orientalism noticed during his father's rule were even more prominent during the rule of Ashurbanipal. The splendor and pomp of his court surpassed that of any other Assyrian monarch; these things were not only copied by later kings but became objects of tradition. The king was no weakling but he loved luxury, show and cruelty. He displayed captive kings in cages as if they were dogs, and sometimes hung their heads on trees which surrounded his banquet table. Not

withstanding all these evil tendencies "no Assyrian king was ever more devoted to the gods and dependent upon them" (G. p. 319).

After 640 B. C. we have no Assyrian records for the reign of Ashurbanipal, but Ptolemy's "Canon of Kings" shows that his extended to 626 B. C. (For explanation of "Canon of Kings," see G. p. 39). The absence of records for these years is probably due both to the years of peace and the final distress of the empire in the loss of territory. Egypt became independent under Psamtik before the death of Ashurbanipal. Movements tending toward the same end were taking place in other directions. The Median tribes were almost moulded together into a nation and their hatred of Assyria was as strong as their national movement. True enough the strong nations, Urartu and Elam had been broken down, but with the loss to Assyria of many men and much treasure. Then again instead of these countries being built up by Assyria, they had been left practically desolate. This gave an opportunity for other tribes to move in—among the most prominent of these were the Persians who took possession of deserted Elam and thereby renewed the old feud with Assyria. With the movement of these tribes a new a serious problem confronted Assyria.

Such were the condition of affairs when Ashurbanipal was succeeded in turn by his two sons. The remains of their buildings show that the empire was on the decline. During their reigns, Necho II, son and successor of Psamtik in Egypt, conquered Syria-Palestine to the Euphrates; and apparently their rule over Babylonia was only nominal.

There are many traditions about the downfall of Nineveh and the Assyrian monarchy. It is tolerably certain that the outside force, which operated in this downfall, was a combination between Nabopolassar who had set himself up as king of Babylon, and the Medes, probably under King Cyaxares. These kings were probably aided by many discontented tribes, notably the Scythians. Nineveh was captured and the Assyrian power suddenly ended about 606 B. C.

It is well to investigate further the causes of this sudden collapse. Of course there was the outside force just noticed, but there were other causes probably of more consequence. It may be that these causes will be better understood if some statement is made of the reasons why Assyria became a great state. Her natural surroundings made her first of all a warlike state. Her comparatively small population, therefore, had a common spirit which brought about great unity of action—in a word war dominated every other feature of Assyrian life. Another great force in Assyrian life was her reverence for Babylon. Babylon not only gave her a convenient military outlet and stirred her patriotism to deliver the mother country from her enemies but she also gave to Assyria language, art and the fundamental principles of religion, —in short Assyria adopted almost without change the culture of Babylon. This gave to Assyria a marked advantage at first in exercising military supremacy over the surrounding nations.

"Yet Assyria's weakness lay in the elements of her strength. The early unity of national life led to pride of race and blood which permitted no admixture and, as revealed in the Assyrian monumental portraits, resulted in far purer Semitism than was the case with the Babylonians. But purity of blood in time enfeebles a people. The Assyrian was no exception. The defects essential to a military state were equally manifest. The exhausting campaigns, the draft upon the population, the neglect of agricultural development which is the economic basis of a nation's existence and for which industry or commerce cannot compensate, least of all the spoils of aggressive warfare, the supremacy of great land-owners, and the corresponding disappearance of free peasants, the employment of mercenaries and all that follows in its train,—these things inseparable from a military regime, undermined Assyria's vitality and grew more and more dangerous as the state enlarged. These weaknesses might have been less pronounced had Assyria been able to work out original and fruitful methods of social and civil progress. But as has been just noted, her civilization because it was imitative set free more energy to devote to conquest; hence her achievements only empha-

sized her inner emptiness. No great distinctly Assyrian poetry or architecture, or ideals of life and religion came into being. The nation stood for none of these things. Living on a past not its own, it could feel no quickening of the inner life. No contribution to the higher ranges of human thought was possible

Moreover, in its administrative activity one central thing was lacking,—the ability to organize conquered peoples in a way to unite them vitally to the central government. They yielded and lay passive in the grasp of the mailed fist but no national spirit thrilled through the mass and made it alive. Assyrian pride of race among other things stood in the way of union. Thus in some measure may be understood how the Assyrian monarchy so suddenly fell at the height of its glory, and so utterly disappeared that as has often been observed, when Xenophon and his Greeks passed by the site of Nineveh some two hundred years later, they did not so much as know that any capital had ever existed there. The monarchy had stood in proud isolation, ruling its empire from its palaces on the Tigris; with its passing the great fabric which it reared was neither shattered nor shaken, since between the Assyrian monarchy and the Assyrian empire no vital connection existed. Hence, when the one disappeared, the other passed under the sway of Babylon. In view of the absolutism and tyranny of the monarchy the outburst of hate and exultation at Assyria's overthrow is not surprising. It is voiced most clearly by the prophets of that vassal state upon the Judean hills, the history of which is at the same time the wisest commentary upon the career of its haughty and tyrannical master and his severest condemnation (G. p. 327 ff.).

With all her faults Assyria contributed something to world-history. Her rulers went far beyond Egypt in working out in reality the ideal of a world-empire. This empire was to be dominated by one person. The beginnings were thus made of government on a large scale. The institutions worked out along this line were adopted and made better by later world rulers. By means of this strong government the great civilization of Babylonia was distributed far and wide. The elements of this culture

reached Asia Minor and even Greece. This is not strange when we remember that trade and commerce had ever been a leading function of the Mesopotamian kingdoms. Assyria's long and cruel wars were not without their benefits, for they broke down the petty nations of western Asia and welded them into a sort of unity, which was generally speaking, beneficial for future progress.

* * *

CHAPTER V.

The New Babylonian or Kaldean Empire (600-539 B. C.).

Everything goes to show that the Medes and the Babylonians had no trouble in dividing the spoil they had gained from Assyria. The former obtained the country north and east of the Tigris valley, finally extending her sway southward over Elam and westward to the Halys river. In the latter direction she came into conflict with Lydia. Cyaxeres, reputed to be the first great king of the Medes, maintained a strong government over a wide domain which included many nationalities of varying degrees of advance. During his lifetime peace was kept with the Babylonians, probably for the reason that his daughter had married Nebuchadrezzar, the son of Nabopolassar.

Babylonia obtained the rest of the Assyrian Empire, i. e., that part west and south of the eastern and northern mountains to the Mediterranean. There are good reasons to suppose that Nabopolassar was a Kaldean (Chaldean) and hence his empire may be called the Kaldean Empire, but the Kaldeans and Babylonians had so intermingled that it makes little difference which term is used. The chief source of information about this empire are the Greek writers, coming nearly a century later. Their accounts are not always accurate. "Happily, the contemporaneous accounts of the Hebrew writers, prophets and historians, throw much welcome light on some important details of foreign affairs" (G. p. 334). The records of the Babylonian kings are mostly building inscriptions and, therefore tell us little of the outward events.

Nabopolassar was king from 626 to 605 B. C., but it was only during his later years that he took an active part in affairs outside his capital. During the earlier years of his reign, the inscriptions show that he was engaged in rebuilding temples and opening canals. It is not likely that the alliance was made with the Medes before 610 B. C. From that time on the Babylonian king was an important factor in world-politics. At about the same time that his armies were helping to invade Nineveh, Nebuchadrezzar was fighting the invading mountain tribes in upper Mesopotamia. He cleared the country east of the Euphrates of these enemies. Nebuchadrezzar then crossed the river and engaged the Egyptians at Karkhemish. (It will be remembered that Necho II, king of Egypt, had already taken possession of Syria-Palestine). Necho was badly beaten and pursued southward. At the border of Egypt Nebuchadrezzar received word that his father had died. He at once made a treaty with Necho and hastened home to claim the vacant throne. Necho relinquished all claims to Syria-Palestine. Apparently things were quiet in Babylon, when the conqueror returned home.

Nebuchadrezzar's haste to return may have been due to a rivalry between him and a younger brother whom Nabopolassar probably intended to be king of Babylon, while Nebuchadrezzar was to be ruler and sovereign of the whole empire. Whatever may be the facts with regard to the succession, "how to be king of Babylon in all the ancient religious meaning of that term and at the same time to harmonize the demands of this position with the administration of the greater state, remained to the end the standing problem of the Mesopotamian dynasties. Nebuchadrezzar, however, by the promptness of his appearance on the scene and through the fidelity of his father's counsellors, overcame whatever opposition may have existed, and in his long reign (605-562 B. C.) maintained his supreme position with power undisturbed by revolt and splendor undimmed by rivalry" (G. p. 338).

Though the Kaldean empire was not large in comparison with the Assyrian empire, it was more compact and was free from the border problem on the north and east, since there was a firm alli-

ance between the Medes and the Kaldeans. Nebuchadrezzar was thus able to possess more fully and organize better the more compact peoples of the west and south. Little is known of how this was done except in the case of the kingdom of Judah. It was the old story of Egypt's interference in Palestine. True enough, after the defeat of Necho at Karkhemish, it was not a direct interference, but indirect and through intrigues. Again, Nebuchadrezzar did not protect sufficiently those who had been well disposed toward him at first; this was very likely the case in regard to Judah. The result was that Judah, together with many other western nations, rebelled and paid the penalty by being wiped out of existence (586 B. C.). Thus Babylonian authority was thoroughly asserted in the west and south. Egypt was also attacked by Nebuchadrezzar, but there is no evidence to show that he held control over that country.

"If the knowledge of Nebuchadrezzar's wars and the administration of his empire must be derived largely from others than himself, the case is different with respect to his activity in Babylonia. To this long inscriptions are devoted, and small tablets, stamps, and bricks from many famous sites add their testimony. He describes, particularly, his building operations in the city of Babylon, the fortifications, the palaces, and the temples reared by him. Utility and adornment were his guiding principles, but not without the deeper motives of piety and patriotism. In Babylonia at large, he labored at the restoration of the canal system, so important for agriculture, commerce and defence.

One canal which was restored by him, led from the Euphrates south of Hit directly to the gulf through the centre of Babylonia; another on the west of the Euphrates opened up to irrigation and agriculture the edge of the Arabian desert. The river, as it passed along before Babylon, was lined with bricks laid in bitumen, which at low water are visible to-day. The city-canals were similarly treated. Those connecting the two rivers and extending through the land between them were reopened. A system of basins, dykes and dams guided and guarded the waters of the rivers,—works so various and colossal as to excite the ad-

miration of the Greeks, who saw or heard of them. A system of defenses was planned by the erection of a great wall in north Babylonia, stretching from the Euphrates to the Tigris; it was flanked east and west by a series of ramparts of earth and moats filled with water, and extended southward as far as Nippur. It was called the Median wall. Restorations of temples were made in Borsippa, Sippar, Ur, Uruk, Larsam" and other less important places." More than forty temples and shrines are mentioned in the inscriptions as receiving attention.

Bricks bearing the king's name are said to have come from every site in Babylonia, from Bagdad to the south of the rivers. He may well stand as the greatest builder of all the kings of the Mesopotamian valley.

An estimate of the policy and achievements of Nebuchadrezzar, while limited by the unequal amount of information on the various phases of his activity and subject to revision in the light of new material can be undertaken with a reasonable expectation of general accuracy. Tiele has called him one of the greatest rulers of antiquity, and when his operations in Babylonia are considered, that statement has weight and significance. A century and a half of war, in which Babylonia had been the field of battle, had reduced its cities and its fields to wastelands. Its temples had been spoiled or neglected, and its gods in humiliation or wrath, had abandoned their dwelling-places. Warring factions had divided up the country between them, or vied with one another in handing it over to foreign foes. The first duty of the king, who loved his people and considered the well-being and prosperity of his government, was to restore and unite. Recovery and consolidation,—these were the watch-words of public policy for the time, and these Nebuchadrezzar set himself to realize. It is no chance, then, that his inscriptions deal so uniformly with Babylonian affairs, with matters of building and canalization and religion" (G. p. 342 ff.).

Nebuchadrezzar considered it his first and foremost duty to make the city of Babylon prominent in all respects. The only title assumed by the king on his inscriptions was "King of Baby-

lon." This only intensified the jealousies and rivalries of other Babylonian cities toward Babylon, and hence may looked upon as a doubtful policy in the extreme.

Nebuchadrezzar copied his form of the administration of the empire after that of Assyria, but he did not protect and develop the parts of his empire as had the Assyrians. All the subject communities apparently existed for the benefit of Babylon, and if they became too prominent commercially or industrially, they were destroyed.

Nebuchadrezzar was very much devoted to religion. He must have had high religious thoughts and feelings as well as lofty conceptions of his sovereign powers as emanating from his god Marduk. But with all these excellent qualities, the king was cruel, luxurious, and unprincipled in many ways, indeed in some respects, the Book of Daniel accurately describes him.

After his death the dynasty of Nebuchadrezzar was very unstable. This was probably due to the strife and intrigues such as were likely to occur any time in an Oriental state. The dynasty ended about 555 B. C.

It may be well to examine now somewhat more extensively the prominent elements of Babylonian civilization during the rule of the Kaldeans, for these peoples had contested for centuries the right of others to rule in Babylonia. They had outlived the shock of many invasions and had waxed stronger with the passing years, until they had grasped the sceptre of Babylon. One would naturally expect the Kaldeans to contribute some new and original ideas to the valley civilization. Such was not the case, however. In only a few important aspects does the civilization of this time differ from the Babylonian civilization of 2000 years before. "As in the case of the Kassites, so in that of the Kaldi the age-long Babylonian civilization has absorbed the new elements and has moulded them into its immemorial forms. The same occupations are followed; the same institutions are preserved; the same social classes exist; the same principles of legal, political and moral action prevail; the same forms of intercourse are maintained. There seems to be almost a conscious effort on the part

of the Kaldean leaders to return to ancient customs. So marked is the movement that the period can properly be characterized the Renaissance of Old Babylonia. * * * Not less manifest is the same tendency in the royal literature, in which, as has been noted, not only the literary style but even the forms of the characters are modelled after the inscriptions of the time of Hammurabi" (G. p. 352). This return to the past is also manifest in Egypt during the period of the Restoration.

No age, however, can exactly reproduce the features of another age. Trade and commerce were now of greater relative importance than agriculture. The centuries of wars had not only devastated much of the land but had killed off many of the farmers. Most of the rulers tried to remedy the conditions by restoring the land and bringing in other peoples. Yet trade and commerce were encouraged even more than agriculture. The cities were the centres of the life of the time. In the manufacture of linens, carpets and cottons, Babylon excelled any city in the world of that day. Trade expanded further than ever toward the south and southwest, and the Tigro-Euphrates valley still furnished the great highway of commerce toward the Mediterranean and adjoining lands. Canals and quays were built on a scale unheard of before. Gold and silver were both used as standards of value, the ratio between the two has been calculated as about twelve to one. Exchange of products ~~were~~ was facilitated still further by smaller coins being made. Interest varied from ten to twenty per cent.

The great industrial development had its effect both upon the social life of the time and the centers of population. It seems quite probable that social position was largely dependent upon business connections. Of course ancient distinctions were still used in the social organization, but they are not of fundamental importance. The great bulk of the population now lived in the cities, particularly in Babylon, where, it is probable, luxury, pomp and splendor reached the high water mark for the ancient world. Herodotus thus describes a Babylonian gentleman of the time: The dress of the Babylonians is a linen tunic reaching to

the feet, and above it another tunic made in wool, besides which they have a short white cloak thrown round them, and shoes of a peculiar fashion, not unlike those worn by the Boeotians. They have long hair, wear turbans on their heads, and annoint their whole body with perfumes. Every one carries a seal, and a walking stick carved at the top into the form of an apple, a rose, lily, an eagle, or something similar; for it is not their habit to use a stick without an ornament (Herodotus, I, 195; see also Ezek. XXIII 14 ff.).

The family was still the chief unit of society. The changes that can be traced in society show a higher morality. It appears that polygamy and concubinage were not so prevalent as 2000 years before. Marriage by purchase was not at all common. "The position of woman was still as free and as high as before" (G. p. 356).

As has been noticed, the government of the time was more centralized than 2000 years before. But the old prominence of Babylon, political as well as commercial and religious was still evident. That Babylonia now had an imperial government was largely due to the work of Assyria. The provincial system supported by mercenary troops was still maintained.

In the field of literature there is still evidence of an effort to go beyond the past. There was no new thought, but the mechanism of literature was probably elaborated. "Its quality and influence are best estimated by the example of the one people of genius that breathed its atmosphere. Hebrew literature, of the exile and after, is in form separated by a great gulf from that of earlier period. The peculiarities of the style of Ezekiel and of Zechariah—the artificiality of form and the grotesqueness of conconception—are Babylonian. But the mechanical correctness of these writers becomes harmony and unity of presentation in such a literary artist as the author of the second part of Isaiah. 'His discourse, serene, affluent and glowing, is an image of a Babylonian landscape. As it unrolls itself, we think of fields and gardens and stately palms and bending willows and gently flowing streams, stretching away over an ample plain; and all

standing out clear in the light of a cloudless sky' " (G. p. 357).

Full information has not as yet been gained concerning the art of the Kaldean period. One prominent feature about the palace, however, was the colored decorations on the walls. Many kinds of scenes were represented, especially of animals, in which form, color, and composition were duly balanced.

The Babylonians, during the Kaldean period were very active along religious lines, but little advance was made in this sphere. Such prayers as those of Nebuchadrezzar (For example of prayer, see G. p. 348) show a tendency toward a spiritual monotheism. Magical formulae, under the control of a watchful priesthood, were everywhere prominent. The morality of the time was of a mercantile and commercial variety, but it encouraged straight forwardness and the performance of just duties. The religion of this time influenced foreigners more than at any other time in Babylonian history. This was perhaps due to the close international relations. Greek thought was undoubtedly stimulated by, and gained many suggestions from this source.

"The finishing touches to the structure of Judaism—given on Babylonian soil—reveal the Babylonian trade-mark. Ezekiel, in many respects the most characteristic Jewish figure of the exile, is steeped in Babylonian theology and mysticism; and the profound influence of Ezekiel is recognized by modern scholarship in the religious spirit that characterizes the Jews upon the reorganization of their commonwealth" (Jastrow, Religion of Babylonia and Assyria, p. 696 ff.).

The supreme effort of the Kaldeans to revive the past was made in the rebuilding of Babylon. It is possible to locate, by the mounds, some of the buildings and the gardens ascribed to Nebuchadrezzar. The discoveryof many royal inscriptions and the descriptions of the Greek writers, permit one to get some idea of the ancient city. The main part of the city lay along the east bank of the Euphrates. It was guarded on the west by the river and on the east by (1) an inner circular wall; (2) an outer wall roughly parallel to the inner wall and some distance from it. The circumference of the outer wall, including the river front was

about eight miles. Each wall had its moat. Babylon was thus about the same size as Nineveh, but the former was much more densely populated, the houses being three or four stories high. The city was laid off in checker-board fashion; it is probable that both the space between the walls and that around the temple were occupied by private houses.

The temple was in the central part of the inner city. It was on an elevated platform and was surrounded by a wall. The temple must have been a series of structures, the most prominent one of which was the ziggurat with its seven stages of which Herodotus thus speaks: "The ascent to the top is on the outisde by a path which winds round all the towers (stages). When one is about half-way up, one finds a resting place and seats where persons are wont to sit some time on their way to the summit. On the top-most tower (stage) there is a spacious temple, and inside the temple stands a couch of unusual size richly adorned with a golden table by its side. There is no statue of any kind set up in the place." Near the tower was the shrine of Marduk. It was a great structure whose walls glistened with alabaster, precious stones and gold; its roof was made of cedar brought from Lebanon. Of another one of the sacred chambers, Nebuchadrezzar has this to say: "The shrine of the Fates, where, [redacted] on Zagmuku, the beginning of the year, on the eighth and eleventh day, the king, the god of heaven and earth, the lord of heaven, takes up his residence, where the gods of heaven and earth [redacted] reverently pay obedience and stand bowed down before him; a fate of a far distant day, as the fate of my life, they determine therein: that shrine, the shrine of royalty, the shrine of lordly power, belonging to the leader of the gods, the Prince Marduk which a former king had constructed with silver, I decorated with shining gold and brilliant ornaments." A passage way led from the door of the temple to the sacred street. It was the custom, on festal days, to bear sacred ships of the gods along this street. Near the temple was a sacred canal which brought water from the Euphrates for sacred uses.

North of the temple, between the canal and the inner wall

was built a magnificent palace; it was also a citadel of which there were many. "Most imposing of all was the system of fortifications placed by Nebuchadrezzar quite outside of the walls already described. It consisted of a combination of earth-works and water-ways. A wall was built of colossal dimensions. * * * The extremities were connected with canals or earth-works which reached to the Euphrates; it was itself protected by a fortified moat. This was the mighty work which astonished Herodotus. He gave its height as somewhat more than three hundred and seventy feet, and its width more than ninety feet. The summit was lined with battlements and guard chambers, between which on either side a space was left sufficient for a four-horse chariot to turn. The wall was pierced by one hundred brazen gates" (G. p. 363).

Improvements of many other kinds went on under the guidance of Nebuchadrezzar. The banks of the Euphrates were, in places, lined with bricks. Near his palace were the magnificent hanging gardens built as a solace to his Median queen. Borsippa was much improved, it became closely united to Babylon. This double city must have been in the mind of Heredotus when he described Babylon as a great square fourteen miles on each side.

Though the Kaldeans soon lost control of the Semitic world, the city they had made the most magnificent in the world remained for centuries after their time, a great center of religion, manufacture, and commerce.

Nabonidus (555-534 B. C.), a Babylonian noble, succeeded the last Kaldean king upon the throne. He aimed to conduct affairs after the example of the great Nebuchadrezzar, if we may take his own inscriptions to indicate his purpose. These inscriptions show that he was not only religiously inclined, a restorer of temples and a devout follower of the gods, but also a loyal defender of the imperial authority. He asserted his power in Syria-Palestine.

During the time of the changes which brought about the accession of Nabonidus to the throne, the Medes had seized a

part of Mesopotamia and thus controlled the trade route leading through that country to the northwest. For the time this was harmful to the economic welfare of Babylonia, but the occupation of upper Mesopotamia did not last many years on account of the great change in the government of the Medes. This was the time when Cyrus, afterwards known as the Great, was contending for the Median throne. The Median kings withdrew their forces from upper Mesopotamia, since they needed them at home. Hence Nabonidus welcomed the change which finally placed Cyrus at the head of Medo-Persian rule. He little thought that in two decades more Cyrus would be the ruler of Babylonia also.

During the years Babylonia was spared from Median attack, Nabonidus restored temples with the greatest of zeal. He aimed, as has been said, to emulate the mighty Nebuchadrezzar. He was partially successful in this. It is probable that he caused the enemity of the priests of Marduk by making too prominent the sun-god, Shamash. Some of the Babylonians were, apparently, not pleased with Nabonidus' action in showing his pleasure at the conquest of Cyrus; they could not forget the former friendly alliance with the Medes. These enemies of Nabonidus probably forced him to retire and his son, Belshazzar, possibly became king in his stead. This changed the attitude of Cyrus toward Babylonia. The Medo-Persian king appears to have seized one of the border districts below Arbela and was on the verge of invading the main part of Babylonia. He was deterred for the time, however, by trouble in another quarter.

In our study of Egypt it was noticed that Egypt, Lydia, Sparta and Babylonia made an alliance against Cyrus. It will also be recalled that both Lydia and Babylonia were conquered by him. "Babylon fell into the hands of the Persians without a struggle. So deeply had the feuds of the parties, ecclesiastical, and political, eaten into the body politic that the capital was betrayed by its own citizens. The so-called Cyrus cylinder has perpetuated the memory of this infamy. There in words written under the hand of Babylonian priests, it is said that Marduk, in wrath at the loss of his prerogative and the complaints of his servants, not only abandoned the city, but—

He searched through all lands; he saw him, and he sought the righteous prince, after his own heart, whom he took by the hand. Cyrus, king of Anshan, he called by name; to sovereignty over the whole world he appointed him. * * * Marduk, the great lord, guardian of his people, looked with joy on his pious works and his upright heart; he commanded him to go to his city Babylon, and he caused him to take the road to Babylon, going by his side as a friend and companion * * * without skirmish or battle he permitted him to enter Babylon. He spared his city Babylon in (its) calamity. Nabonidus, the king, who did not reverence him, he delivered into his hand. All the people of Babylon, all Shumer and Akkad, nobles and governors, prostrated themselves before him, kissed his feet, rejoiced at his sovereignty, showed happiness in their faces (Cyrus Cyl.," 11 ff. G. p. 375).

With the coming of Cyrus the Tigro-Euphrates valley lost its supremacy as a center of political, religious and commercial power. A new man of a new race, with different ideals, had made the Mesopotamian lands a part, but only a part, of an empire more vast by far than the world had as yet known.