



E12573







# THE HISTORY OF WORLD CIVILIZATION

FROM PREHISTORIC TIMES TO  
THE MIDDLE AGES

BY HERMANN SCHNEIDER

D.Phil., D.Med., PROFESSOR OF PHILOSOPHY AT THE  
UNIVERSITY OF LEIPZIG

VOLUME ONE

LONDON

GEORGE ROUTLEDGE AND SONS, LTD.

BROADWAY HOUSE: 68-74, CARTER LANE, E.C.

1931

**FIRST PUBLISHED IN 1931**

**TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN ORIGINAL OF 1927 BY  
MARGARET M. GREEN**

**PRINTED IN GREAT BRITAIN BY  
STEPHEN AUSTIN AND SONS, LTD., HERTFORD.**

# CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	ix

## BOOK ONE

### PREHISTORIC TIMES

#### STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

A. THE CIVILIZATION OF NEANDERTHAL MAN . . . . .	5
B. THE CIVILIZATION OF AUBIGNACIAN MAN . . . . .	7
C. THE CIVILIZATION OF NEOLITHIC MAN IN EUROPE . . . . .	17
TABLE I . . . . .	25
SUMMARY . . . . .	34

## BOOK TWO

### THE CIVILIZATIONS OF THE EARLIEST INVENTORS OF WRITING

A. EGYPTIAN CIVILIZATION . . . . .	39
Racial Formation and Political History . . . . .	39
Constitution and Growth of Social Classes . . . . .	44
Architecture and Sculpture in the Round . . . . .	50
Reliefs and Painting . . . . .	57
Writing . . . . .	64
Literature and Music . . . . .	70
Learning . . . . .	82
Religion . . . . .	96
Summary . . . . .	116
B. BABYLONIAN CIVILIZATION . . . . .	119
Racial Formation and Political History . . . . .	119
Constitution and Growth of Social Classes . . . . .	130
Plastic and Pictorial Art . . . . .	138
Writing . . . . .	149
Literature and Music . . . . .	151
Learning . . . . .	168
Religion . . . . .	185
Summary . . . . .	201
C. CRETAN CIVILIZATION . . . . .	203

## CONTENTS

## BOOK THREE

THE CIVILIZATIONS OF THE EARLIEST PEOPLES TO BORROW  
PERFECT WRITING

A.	JEWISH CIVILIZATION	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Racial Formation and Political History	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Constitution and Growth of Social Classes	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Religion	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Literature	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Music	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Plastic and Pictorial Art	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Learning	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Summary	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
B.	PERSIAN CIVILIZATION	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Racial Formation and Political History	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Constitution and Growth of Social Classes	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Religion	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Literature	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Learning	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Plastic and Pictorial Art	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
	Summary	.	.	.	.	.	.	.
TABLE II . . . . . End of								

# INTRODUCTION

THE individual when he comes into the world is a total stranger in it. He must learn gradually what kind of a world it is in order to live in it : he begins by learning to suck, to see, and to grasp, and ends with his individual survey of the world and conduct of his own life. Mankind as a whole shares the lot of the individual ; to the race, too, the world is the object of experience, although it is not quite so helpless as a child, for here we are concerned with adults, able to control their senses and their limbs, ape-men who know how to satisfy the instincts of hunger and sex ; but strangers none the less in an alien world in so far as they seek to become civilized beings instead of animals and creatures of instinct. Ape-man adapts himself to his world by instinct ; if he is to become civilized he must acquire accurate knowledge of the object experienced, must learn to use it more skilfully, must advance from instincts and impulses to clear knowledge and acts of volition, to science and art ; he must survey his world by theory and dominate it in practice. The individual and civilized mankind mentally assimilate the object experienced, in order that they may overlook it in every part and make full use of it. Mankind stores the product of this assimilation in the intellectual and artistic achievements of the best of its children. In these we may trace the path it has followed from the earliest dawn of civilization to the full light of day.

But it is only in the main outlines, not in every detail, that we can compare and equate the progress or " evolution " of the whole human race with that of the individual.

The individual really does evolve ; a child advances steadily and becomes an adult ; the " evolution of mankind " takes place in a number of peoples ; it depends upon the generation of a type that can rise superior to the level already reached ; it takes place in fits and starts, irregularly, with relapses and breaks. Certain groups are kept apart and so breed pure under varying conditions, and these separate breeds subsequently mix.<sup>1</sup> These are the factors which under favourable conditions have led to a forward step, a

<sup>1</sup> On this and what follows compare my *Philosophie der Geschichte* II (Hirt, Breslau, " Jedermanns Bücherei ").

bridging of gaps. A few "creative" civilized peoples, the product of cross-breeding between races of a certain disparity, are the vehicles through which mankind continues to assimilate mentally the objective world. A succession of racial mixtures may take place in the same locality. Sometimes it is the earlier race that is gifted with creative power and gives its language to its successors, so that their achievements hardly surpass its own, if at all; such, for instance, was the case in ancient Egypt and in China for three thousand years. Sometimes the greatest cultural achievements come late; in England, France, and Germany, for instance, they are quite recent, subsequent to the Celtic and Germanic civilizations and that of the Middle Ages which sprang from the mixture of races at the time of the migration of peoples. True, before an early civilization we nearly always find one still earlier, in relation to which it appears late—for instance, the Chinese civilizations before 1200 B.C. And the "greatest achievement of civilization" is a relative term; long before the Germanic and Celtic era primitive civilization reached its zenith in Western and Central Europe.

The individual acquires most of his experience (at least, as regards learning and art) mediately through parents and teachers, by means of education; the human race has been compelled, at one time or another, to acquire all its experience direct. But peoples, too, adopt the culture of others (transmission), and revive their own (renaissance), and such processes are to a people just what school is to the individual; that is, they produce material and technical pre-ripening,<sup>1</sup> save energy, and so make great achievements possible, even where there is no exceptional talent.

The individual develops from a child to an adult and grows old, and there is a corresponding process in the life of a people. After a new racial mixture destined to prove culturally fruitful, there follow five or six centuries of silent growth to maturity and the absorption of earlier cultural treasure; this era is comparable with the childhood of the individual. Then the great classic geniuses appear, mapping out the cultural world anew with rapturous eagerness, preparing and ushering in a revolution in all relations and conditions. In eighty or a hundred years this early period of youthful creative energy, comparable with the youth of man, is past. It leads on to

<sup>1</sup> "Vorreifen" is used by the author to indicate the fact that a civilization is enabled, through the influence of a preceding civilization, to achieve greater things on reaching cultural maturity than it could have done by its own unaided powers. It does not indicate that cultural maturity is reached earlier than would otherwise have been the case.—*Translator's Note.*

an era of change, a century of revolution. Finally the second flowering-time of civilization, comparable with manhood, springs from a belief in progress coupled with critical reflection on the limitations of man's all too human nature, from the spread of new ideas to wider circles, from the creative work of scholars and artists, and from civic conflicts. This era lasts for two or three centuries, and leads on to "popular culture", moulded to uniformity, adapted to the needs of the masses. As it attains civilization the nation begins to acquire the characteristics of homogeneity, uniformity, purity of breed. About a thousand years from the first racial mixture the nation becomes senile and uncreative, but it retains its unique character and grows more and more homogeneous in race and culture.

It is permissible to speak of "young" and "old" peoples, but clearly in so doing we are using a metaphor transferred from the individual to the community, though a natural community based on kinship; we must, therefore, define accurately what we mean by "young" and "old" in the case of peoples, lest we be led astray by metaphors falsely applied.

Mankind "evolves" through peoples, through their transmitted civilizations and the civilizations that they create afresh themselves; it is not like the evolution of a single individual, a co-ordinated process advancing at an even pace; it proceeds through a multitude of peoples, not continuously but with great breaks, by fits and starts. There are regular periods of relapse into total or partial barbarism (China). Many peoples fall for a time out of the general march of evolution because their level of civilization is below that attained earlier elsewhere. Nevertheless, we can observe an advance in man's cultural achievement in the period ranging from round about 1000 B.C. to the present day, and that in certain peoples who thereby become the leaders of civilization. We can pick out these peoples, range cultural achievements in successive order, and thus speak of "man's cultural evolution". In this way we can take stock of man's cultural achievements and record the history of his evolution.

Man's intellect assimilates his experience, picking out what aids him to survey all that is relevant to his aims and combining them symbolically under new heads or "notions". In so doing he may select in such a way that his notions sum up those qualities which remain unchanging in the object; on the other hand, he may select and retain that which undergoes a process of regular change in the passage of time; in the first instance he forms "notions of static Being", in the second "notions of flux".

If we want to record the history of the evolution of human civilization, we must form notions of flux dominated by the idea of evolution.

The idea of evolution in our minds is drawn from experience; a tree "evolves", that is, it grows from a seed to a seedling, then to a sapling, and finally a full-grown tree; a man "evolves" from a fertilized egg to a child, then to a youth, and finally to a mature adult. A homogeneous and undifferentiated object changes by regular degrees in continuous progression to a heterogeneous, differentiated object.

In the objects of our experience we look for qualities which we can classify and survey with the aid of these images—for the moment it is only a question of the transference of images so as to classify and survey a vast material; there is no need for the original and the corresponding image to be identical. Such a process enables us to classify the animal world in a "natural system", from the single cell to the human being, without so much as touching upon the question whether the higher animals really did evolve from single cells, though there is much to support that view, especially the development of the animal embryo. Similarly in the history of civilization we may classify a number of cultural phenomena, including intellectual and artistic works, which grow more perfect in the course of human history, more complex, more diverse, more finished; and thereby we secure the advantage of surveying and unifying a vast mass of material. In the process we can omit many peoples who do not outstrip their predecessors in cultural achievement, and we can ignore relapses, if only we can discover in the passage of time an advancing gradation by constant increase and diversification of achievement: for we are merely transposing an image for purposes of classification. There is an ancient controversy whether there is only "Being, that remains unchanged", or only "Becoming, that never stands still", whether there are eternal and unchanging animal types and man eternally the same, or evolution of species and of human civilization. That controversy is settled from our point of view; there is only one single object of experience, from which we may equally well choose out what has "remained unchanged" ("man as a notion of static Being"), or what changes (e.g. the child at the breast which becomes a school-child, or the road traversed from the civilization of Neanderthal to that of the Greeks); both the unchanging and the changing aspects are "real", both the stationary and the progressive, that is, they

exist objectively. Both are of importance to us ; we must, therefore, treat our subject in both aspects, that of Being and that of Becoming.

If anyone say : " Man has always remained the same ", he is right—as regards certain qualities ; if he say : " Man has evolved greatly," he is also right. But if he say : " Man has not evolved " he is only conditionally right ; only, that is, if he means that man has remained unchanged in certain characteristics (for instance, in the possession of an upright gait or of the intellectual faculty). If, on the other hand, he means to assert that man has not changed in anything appertaining to the idea of human evolution and capable of scientific or artistic presentation, then he is wrong ; he is trying falsely to suppress qualities and relations between qualities which unquestionably do exist objectively.

We have an equal right to present the history of man as an evolutionary process or as a subject of psychological exposition, and every such right is a duty ; we are faced with a scientific problem which must be solved scientifically. That problem was posed by Germans and must be solved by Germans. Herder was the first to sketch a " Philosophy of the History of Man " in evolutionary form, Kant made ethico-political ideas the centre of the whole problem, Fichte, standing on the shoulders of both, set himself to work out the problem in form and substance, Hegel introduced the most complete and fertile philosophic unity into the " history of the spirit ". After the great philosophers, Lamprecht was the first specialist to take up the immense task—rightly conscious that this was the sphere of the historian of civilization.

It might be supposed that to record the evolution of civilization is a task for the psychologist. But psychology, the science of the soul, presupposes the existence of living souls as objects of scientific treatment. The souls of those who created bygone civilizations and all the monuments of the past are inaccessible to psychological investigation—they are no more. All that is left for us is historical material, relics of civilization, and to these we must apply the methods of historical investigation in order to determine their date, to examine our sources with critical care, and to assign their place in history ; and that is the business of the historian of civilization alone ; it is his special subject. He classifies the material in the light of evolution ; from a number of monuments of civilization he ultimately constructs the " spirit " that produced them, but not the " soul " (that is the meaning of Hegel's contrast between " spirit " and " soul ", a distinction which marks the border-line dividing

the work of the psychologist from that of the cultural historian); his system, therefore, is one which assimilates experience in the form of notions and perceptions, that is, it is a logical, not a psychological system.

True, there are all manner of "evolutionary" psychological systems; one investigates the evolution from child to adult (for instance, it defines the nature of puberty); another finds the causes of historical processes in a timeless soul (such, for instance, is Nietzsche's explanation of the rise of sacerdotalism and Christianity as due to vindictiveness, *Ressentiment*). It is also possible to study the psychology of peoples by classifying psychological phenomena in ascending order. Finally, it is true that the spheres of the psychologist and the cultural historian do meet; it is possible to use our knowledge of the psychology of children and of nations as a key to the psychological elements in bygone civilizations. But primarily the schema adopted by the cultural historian must serve to classify living peoples ("savages") in his general survey of civilizations, and assist in the education of children (a schema of instruction; the child passes, though more rapidly, through the stages by which the race has assimilated its experience). But though the two sciences meet, they do not merge: "evolutionary psychology" will remain the psychology of evolution, of the child and the juvenile in all nations; the science that treats of the stages through which mankind and the child have passed will always be "evolutionary history", non-psychological in character, and based upon the historian's scheme already referred to.

Our task, therefore, relates solely to the history of civilization. We have to sum up man's principal feats of mental assimilation throughout the course of history and to tabulate them chronologically in steady progression (as an example of evolution). We must trace the chief civilizations (that is those of a given group which have surpassed and supplanted what went before), showing their sequence and what they achieved in the mental assimilation of experience. After a brief survey of the racial make-up and political institutions of each people, we shall treat of their constitution, the growth of social classes, poetry, music, plastic and pictorial art, learning, and religious-philosophical ideas. Where records and monuments are lacking throughout a whole region, or are very scanty, the omission will be noted. We shall compare achievements, and shall conclude with comparative tables, so as to make immediately plain how experience has been mentally assimilated and how man has progressed from one

stage to the next. Thus we shall see how in certain achievements a culminating point has been reached, followed by exhaustion and petrification ; for instance, the Old Stone implements of the Aurignacian era, pottery in Greece and China (porcelain), the heroic epic in Greece, Rome, and Italy, and musical harmony in Germany. Forms of cultural achievement, whether in great things or small, come to flower and wither, as do peoples and individuals ; what has been worked out to its consummation and turned to common use survives as the product of technical skill and craftsmanship so long as it serves a purpose and pleases.

It is the mission of our epoch to bring this general evolutionary survey of human civilization to scientific completion. Great quantities of the material upon which the history of world civilization is based have been gathered ; people are weary of collecting such material and are demanding a final survey, the " natural system " of human civilization. Hegel is once more in harmony with the spirit of the age ; what he attempted in his *Philosophy of History* with the material available in his day must now be attempted once more on the basis of our more extensive material and with a system more realistic than his three-keyed logic. The task is still a philosophical one, but it is so closely akin to the specialist's labours that it can be directly linked with them ; they can be used to test the investigator's premises, to supplement his survey of the material, and to pave the way for practical application (pedagogy).

The first volume of this work treats of the principal civilizations of antiquity. First I shall offer a brief survey of Europe's pre-historic Stone Age civilizations down to the Neolithic era ; I shall then treat of the inventors of writing within our own cultural area—the Egyptians, Babylonians, and Cretans ; then those who inherited the art of writing and perfected their cultural heritage—the Jews, Persians, Greeks, and Romans. A Supplement treats of the Indians and Chinese, whose principal achievements also belong to antiquity.

A second volume will describe modern European civilizations, the Italians, Spanish, English, French, Dutch, Germans, the Norse peoples, the Poles, and the Russians. They took up the great problems of human civilization anew at the point where the Greeks and Romans had left them, worked them out finally, and solved them.

Only after we have thus completed our general survey can we deal with the " medieval civilizations " of Europe, as also of Asia and Africa (Islam). We have here the thorny problem of a lower

type of civilization pre-ripened by the influence of a very much higher type, a different problem, therefore, from that of the straightforward upward course of cultural evolution. In this connection we shall have to consider also the "Middle Ages" in Persia, India, and China, and also Japanese civilization.

I have been at work for twenty-five years on a great survey of civilizations, and it is now my desire to conclude it. I was first led on from my studies for a history of philosophy to the history of religion, and that inevitably developed in the case of those peoples whose religion bears the stamp of eternity into a general history of their civilization. Thus in 1906 I wrote books on *The Civilization and Thought of the Ancient Egyptians*, in 1910 on *The Civilization and Thought of the Babylonians and Jews*; in succeeding years I investigated the main trend of philosophic and religious development among the Persians, Indians, Chinese, and Greeks (*Religion und Philosophie*, 1912), as well as primitive religion (*Felszeichnungen von Bohuslän*, 1915) and *The Origin and Significance of our Alphabet* (1918); in 1922 I laid the philosophical foundation of the whole structure in my *Philosophie der Geschichte*.

In this labour, extending over so many years, I have been fortunate enough not only to have free access to the material for research and the library of Leipzig University, but also to receive the kindest assistance from a number of professors, especially at the Universities of Leipzig and Berlin, who have aided me with advice and have often allowed me to attend their lectures. In addition to my own teachers, H. Rickert, of Heidelberg, and K. Lamprecht, of Leipzig, I would mention especially Professors Abert of Berlin (the music of the ancients), Bethe of Leipzig (Homer), Conrady of Leipzig (China), Diels of Berlin (Greek religion), Hahne of Halle (prehistoric times), Haloun of Prague (China), Hertel of Leipzig (the Persians), Ed. Meyer of Berlin (Crete), Heinrich Schäfer of Berlin (the Egyptians), Steindorff of Leipzig (the Egyptians), Studniczka of Leipzig (the Cretans), Wedemeyer of Leipzig (China), Windisch of Leipzig (India), and Zimmern of Leipzig (Babylon). Here I feel impelled to convey to all of them my heartfelt thanks.

HERMANN SCHNEIDER.

LEIPZIG.

April, 1927.

**BOOK I**  
**PREHISTORIC TIMES**



## BOOK I

### PREHISTORIC TIMES

#### STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

THERE have been man-like creatures of the human breed (pre-humans, ape-men) for tens of thousands of years, nay, hundreds of thousands of years, before the Ice Age. Human beings proper have existed only since the end of the Ice Age; only then did ape-man develop into man on the road to civilization, producing tools with conscious purpose and craftsmanship, having mastery over fire and using it to protect himself, for the chase, and for his own comfort. Herein man surpasses the brutes; no animal before him ever took that step: here is the dividing-line between brutes and men.

Even in the Tertiary period ape-men became more like human beings than any anthropoid ape; they walked upright upon their feet (metamorphosed hands) and learned many ways of using the arms and hands liberated by their upright gait; their jaws had no need to develop teeth for fighting purposes, for they could arm their hands with stones and sticks; the head was free and untrammelled by supporting muscles attached to the skull, and it dominated the whole figure; the great brain grew larger, and with it the brain cavity. It is possible that Tertiary men already possessed stone "tools", the so-called "eoliths", stones rudely shaped but not simply picked up in the manner of the apes. Ape-man discovered that with these sharp or pointed stones he could cut, and scrape, and perhaps even bore holes, and in this way he developed the use of stones to cast and to strike.

We do not know what he cut and scraped and pierced with these cutting and scraping stones; all that is certain is that they remained unchanged and undeveloped for an eternity. The Ice Age began (its duration is estimated at a million and a half years), the climate of Europe changed several times, with alternating ice periods and temperate intervals, animals and plants migrated. Man must have fled with them before the ice and returned as it receded, like the animals and plants upon which he lived; till far into the Ice Age he behaved exactly like an animal that obeys the call of nature and has no thought of resisting or mastering the elements.



## A. THE CIVILIZATION OF NEANDERTHAL MAN

At the end of the Ice Age, at latest during the last temperate interval, a sudden change came about and ape-man entered upon the road to civilization; he mastered the elements and was soon victoriously defying the rigours of the final ice period. In the Marne district (Chelles) and the neighbouring regions of Western and Central Europe an unique race of men sprang up (doubtless by racial mixture among ape-men and subsequent isolation), whom we may call "Neanderthal man" after the place where they were first discovered, the Neander Valley near Düsseldorf. Neanderthal man must have been very brute-like in appearance; he was short (1.55 to 1.58 metres in height), thick-set, and hairy, he could not straighten his knees or his back, his face was dominated by the massive, projecting jaw (with no chin), above which was a flat, broad nose; over his eyes was a thick brow-ridge of bone, the lower edge of a receding, narrow forehead; but his cranial capacity was some 1,400 cubic centimetres (the present-day gorilla has only 500 cubic centimetres, the Australian aborigines 1,340, the European 1,550), and he was the creator of the earliest human civilization.

Suddenly the eoliths of Northern France were improved upon, after remaining the same for many thousands of years; Neanderthal man showed purpose and craftsmanship in making an implement of general usefulness, the *coup de poing* (first found at Chelles on the Marne) from a piece of flint, chipping it to an almond shape; the broad butt was made to fit the hand, and the faces sloped evenly to a broad blade and a point on the cutting side. Man had become an artist, moulding his material with deliberate aim; he struck out in all directions; he was the ancestor of the ingenious smith of the Metal Age. To his capacity for thought and craftsmanship we may attribute the second great achievement of this primitive civilization: the conscious mastery of the animal terror of fire, the conscious subjugation of fire to man's will. Ape-man may, indeed, have warmed himself occasionally at the ashes left by a chance forest fire or lightning flash: now he learned to maintain fires, to manage and use them for protection against beasts of prey, for night hunting, and to warm himself.

Ape-man was an animal among animals. Neanderthal man must have been the first to develop the consciousness of power.

## 6 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

His self-confidence and consciousness of strength must have increased: hitherto he had been the inferior of the animals, the cave lions and bears, the mammoths and rhinoceros, the buffalo and horses, who were altogether stronger and swifter than him: now he felt himself to be their superior, raised above them as a man endowed with reason; he was the owner of fire which they, being mere animals, feared, he was master of the art of working in stone, to which they could never attain. Conscious of these things, he entered upon a struggle with the larger animals for mastery, as also with ape-man, once his equal, now to be despised like other animals.

Ape-man must originally have been a herbivorous creature, living upon seeds and fruits, but not scorning occasional animal prey; in the colder northern climate, in the rigours of the first Ice Age, he may have learnt to procure more meat in the shape of carrion or young animals that he could overpower when he found them alone or managed to isolate them and drive them away from the herd. Neanderthal man became a hunter, consciously using his mental superiority to the animals in order to kill them in their haunts or in the chase. He had no weapons with which to fight them, neither spear nor bow, but in fighting his own kind the *coup de poing* may have played a part, as well as stones and clubs.

The earliest human civilization centred in Northern France and Belgium, partly, perhaps, because flints are plentiful there. All that we know of its development is that the flint implements were improved in many directions: this is the first occasion upon which we observe differentiation in a product of civilization—improvement in quality accompanies variation—together with careful and beautiful workmanship; subsequently, we observe, the guiding idea loses force, and interest and care grow slack. As time passes the *coup de poing* becomes thinner, oval in shape, longer, more pointed; it is no longer made from a whole nodule, but from broken chips; it is no longer the principal type; side-scrapers, prickers, and borers, hitherto chance products from chips, are everywhere shaped with equal care; at last the *coup de poing* dies out altogether—people have no further use for an all-round implement, but rather require specialized, varied, small shapes, some of which must have been used with handles of wood or bark; specially noticeable are fine, sharp-edged, pointed knives (Mousterian points) and broad side-scrapers and end-scrapers with delicate edges.

## B. THE CIVILIZATION OF AURIGNACIAN MAN

We cannot tell exactly how many centuries were taken up by this stage of evolution. During its course the temperate interval passed by and a new Ice Age approached, bringing north-eastern and latterly northern animals to Europe. But this time man did not retreat. He possessed fire, he was a skilful hunter, well able to procure meat when his vegetable food failed, and he held out against the change of climate. He even made progress in civilization as a result of the cold, for he learned to clothe himself in skins and to make his dwelling in caves, and he was by now so much superior to the animals that he compelled them to yield him skins and caves (formerly he preferred to stay out in the open, for the caves were traps in which a cave bear or lion might surprise and make a prey of him).

The final Ice Age and the following period were actually the first era of a great human civilization. Man advanced beyond the first Neanderthal phase so far that those who attained the new civilization stood almost as high above Neanderthal man as he had stood above ape-man: sculpture, painting, and religion made their appearance.

This step forward is the outcome of the first racial mixture amongst men of which we have any knowledge. The Neanderthal race spread from the Marne district to Southern France, where, in the Garonne district (the Vézère Valley, Dordogne), they met another race (or several), Aurignacian man (who, indeed, may be himself the product of cross-breeding or sub-division). Aurignacian man was little taller than Neanderthal man (1.60 metres), nor was his cranial capacity larger (1,400 cubic centimetres), but his appearance was far less brutish. His forehead was higher and broader, the brow-ridge was less prominent, the strong jaw was no longer a muzzle; the limbs were longer and the trunk relatively shorter. We are not concerned to distinguish the cultural acquisitions of the two races: they devoured one another and interbred; a Neanderthal man (Mousterian) and an Aurignacian were found in the same cave buried in the same fashion. The advance in civilization was the outcome of their interbreeding. The new race which finally emerged as a pure breed was first discovered at Cro-Magnon and so is called the Cro-Magnon race; it has traits of both parent races, but is taller (in a few cases 2 metres in height), with a long, narrow skull, a fine

## 8 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

forehead, a thin nose, a more developed chin, and a cranial capacity of 1,500 cubic centimetres. Whilst this race was evolving the artists of the Old Stone Age cave paintings came upon the scene, besides the framers of the earliest religious conceptions, and some of the ancestors of civilized races of to-day in all parts of the world.

According to the Mendelian law this new, civilized breed was bound frequently to break away and revert to the older types; even in their creative phase they had not become a fixed racial type, handsome and perfected (the Cro-Magnon). They adopted a late form of Neanderthal civilization, recognizable in the remains at Le Moustier in the Vézère Valley and distinguished by its work in stone; they developed the technique in this stonecraft, discovering the possibility of splitting long wedges of flint with bars of horn or bone, and straightening the edges. At this point the manufacture of paleolithic implements reached its culmination; long knives, keel-shaped planers, square double-scrapers, and finally laurel-leaf javelin heads (Solutrean) appeared, as beautiful in form as they are careful in workmanship, adapted to their purpose and to the material of which they are made: the art, therefore, had reached perfection and began to degenerate into mass production, the more easily because horn and bone had become successful competitors of stone; in the Reindeer Period (Magdalenian) the points of spears and harpoons were commonly of horn and bone; only for knives was stone indispensable.

Apparently Neanderthal man never thought of working in horn or bone, nor could he have done so without sharp knives. The new race found out how to make tools and other objects of ivory, horn, and bone with stone knives and fire; they made javelin-heads (for light javelins and hunting spears which were invented at this period and were the first missiles except sling-stones), polishers, prickers, and needles (for making their fur garments); discs of bone, teeth, and shells were pierced and threaded in chains, figures were carved either as small, separate statues or as handles; magic staffs were covered with pictures and signs. This highly developed art in the working of stone and bone soon became a trade; specialization of labour and commerce made their appearance, and in consequence Mediterranean shells were brought to the Vézère Valley and foreign snails to Moravia.

But we must not go too far in assuming a division of labour in this primitive era. For everybody the principal work was to procure food; the women gathered plants and caught small animals

(the first representation of an ear of corn is on a magic staff); the men hunted, and in both cases the work was better organized and more productive than formerly. In the case of hunting this progress can be demonstrated by means of material remains: we now find weapons; small spears and spear-throwers (the bola) make their appearance; the hunt now becomes an affair of beating and trapping in pits, as is proved by the masses of bones found beneath precipices and in pits; we can see that these places were very skilfully chosen for the purposes of the hunt. The quarry—always with skull and marrow-bones split open—consists principally of swift gregarious animals, horses, buffaloes, and reindeer (at a later date), but small animals too were frequently killed, such as hares, birds (with slings), and fish (with spears).

Art in its higher forms likewise served the interests of the chase, and together with it man's first religious conceptions. Men thought whilst they hunted and, being unusually stimulated by the desire for quarry and for distinction, they invented aids to the chase. Hunting was the highest achievement of body and mind in those days, and yet its results were still very unsatisfactory; beats often failed (if large animals turned upon the beaters there was nothing for the hunters to do but to make a hurried escape, seeing how feeble their spears were); spear-throwers, slings, and javelins often failed to accomplish their purpose, and in cold districts the game often withdrew to remote spots. Was there no means of safety, of securing the constant presence of enough game and the certainty of killing it?

Perhaps reason, which had already accomplished so much and had raised the hunter so far above the brutes, could help in this difficulty too. One day it occurred to somebody to influence the animals by portraying them, encouraging them to breed, to remain in winter, or to return in summer, and so affect the fortunes of the chase. At first these pictures were mere play, but they were a powerful stimulus to imagination, desire, and memory, for there is a mysterious link between the visible presence of an image and of its original. Attempts at portrayal had now acquired an object and meaning; pictorial art had acquired a value, and it became increasingly necessary to strive after the utmost truth to nature, for the best likeness would exercise the greatest power. So, too, speculation on the problems of the universe came to have a value and therefore developed, for failures did not lead men to abandon the new hypothesis, but to elaborate it. The charm of this new theoretical reflection (the creation of myths in the service of practical

## 10 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

needs) was too great, its efficacy too palpable, for a reversion to paltry sober reason to be possible : magic arose and men " explained " the failure of their first efforts to influence the natural world by means of fresh attempts and fresh hypotheses. At the same time these new ideas extended from hunting to other fields. And along both roads man was inevitably led to a philosophy of the universe.

Palaeolithic art portrays animals almost exclusively ; they are painted on the walls and roofs of caves, partly or wholly in relief (originally, no doubt, they were always coloured), on bone handles and magic wands, and sometimes as independent objects (also painted). There is no dividing line between painting, relief, and plastic art—they merge into one another. It is often a boss or line or mark in the material with some resemblance to an animal that determines the position and execution of a picture. We often find older pictures of animals painted over with more recent pictures—certain places had proved suitable, or the species of animals had changed. In accordance with its object, this art was naturalistic, for what assured the attainment of the desired end was the accurate and natural representation of animals (or of certain essential parts, such as the indications of sex). It turned out that this practical need of complete resemblance and a close acquaintance with the animals from childhood, assisted by frequent hunting, resulted in the ability of specially gifted individuals to represent the animal world with far greater truth to nature than was required for the purpose of a general theoretical survey of the world. The outlines and also the movements of many of the principal beasts of the chase (buffaloes, two species of horse, mammoths, aurochs, stags, ibexes, and antelopes), as they are known to the hunter and desired by him (running, resting, grazing, mating) are reproduced in many pictures with astonishing truth to nature. In some cases they are in relief, as, for instance, the cattle of Tuc d'Audoubert. But wherever the stimulus of sympathetic magic was absent, we see that this portrayal of individual figures had not yet been grasped as a general theoretical problem ; for the rare human figures on the cave walls, including carved figures, present only the mask of the animal-charmer, or the signs and beauties of sex ; all the rest is symbolic, simplified to the mere indication of a concept (the formation of concepts was inseparable from art). Tents and hands (except in so far as they were wholly individual silhouettes), the pictures of snakes, fish, ears of corn, and eyes upon magic staffs, and much similar ornamentation, all were plainly mere symbols of a concept.

The aim of these pictures is frequently clear enough : there are herds of animals or animals mating—their aim was to produce herds and young animals outside ; there are men disguised as animals, a phallic stag-man (the Three Brothers' Cave), three little chamois-men on a magic staff—they are working charms to multiply or kill the game that they are imitating ; finally, hands are painted on the animals, quite definite hands of definite individuals (silhouettes)—these individuals are to obtain these animals. And some particular hunter, desiring to capture particular animals, would carry their solid images in the shape of a dagger-hilt or pendant.

The path leads direct from charms worked upon animals to charms worked upon other men. For though man felt himself to be the superior of the beasts, he made no theoretical distinction between man and beast. In many respects the beasts were superior to him—in size and strength and swiftness ; he admired them with his awakening artistic sense even while he hunted them. It may be, therefore, that the small solid figures of women (rarely of men) with the indications of sex and beauty strongly marked (steatopygous figures) once served the purpose of procuring beautiful wives for their possessors, either here or in the grave, and offspring.

The numerous amulets made of animals' bones, animals' teeth, and shells (and there must certainly have been far more than have been preserved, made of less durable material) belong to the same class ; so also may the custom of painting the human body, which became more general as more colours were used for pictorial art (ochre—yellow and brown—red chalk, manganese, and on rare occasions chalk marl). Even cannibalism may have had a magic significance.

People who think ahead to such an extent in the matter of the chase do the same in their other business. The representatives of Aurignacian civilization (together with the Neanderthal people of the Mousterian period with whom they allied themselves and inter-married) were the first to bury their dead. They had attained a certain degree of comfort and security in life and did not wish to lose it in death ; they were acquainted with cave-dwellings (the first pit-dwellings belong to this period and tents are portrayed in the caves). So, too, the dead were buried in caves ; they were given their weapons, their emblems, and their charms, paints, and amulets for the hunt, and some meat, together with the picture of a wife or servant ; they were laid on one side in a sleeping posture (generally on the right side), and one leg was drawn up close to the body, afterwards both ; they were covered with earth, and the head,

## 12 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

perhaps, was protected from falling stones ; their friends ate and drank beside the grave by way of leave-taking. Care was thus taken that neither animals nor enemies should find and destroy them (the outward, visible man was preserved, and with it the essential being), and that they could go out and provide for their needs. Every honour was paid to them, so that they might not be angry with the living ; they lived on in the same world as the living. As in the case of hunting charms, quite simple conclusions were immediately drawn from the assumption that the visible exterior of a creature is of prime importance, and that upon its portrayal or preservation depends the possibility of satisfying a particular wish. When men realized that the matter was really not so simple, they were driven to proceed further.

The reason why the pictures were placed in caves may be primarily that in winter people withdrew into caves and there found leisure to brood over their desire for success in the chase. But soon this chance connection of cave charms and pictorial charms led to further developments : if the charm failed, people searched for all manner of reasons and soon accounted for it by supposing that it ought to have been more elaborately and secretly performed. They therefore placed the pictures far in the interior of the caves (in La Mouthe they begin 93 metres from the entrance, in Combarelles 118 metres) ; they concealed them in niches and in terminal chambers (at Tuc d'Audoubert). In profound darkness, barely illuminated by the earliest type of lamp made of hollowed stones, the people produced these magic pictures ; they were led by magicians clothed as animals, and were no doubt disguised themselves ; or they performed the efficacious rites in the presence of the pictures or on them, covering them with hands or making them prolific. A heel-dance performed before the oxen of Tuc d'Audoubert has left its marks in the clay floor of the sanctuary ; similar dances, perhaps with bone pipes, and certainly accompanied by song (Aurignacian man spoke much more and much better than Neanderthal man, as is indicated by the formation of his mouth) must have been performed in front of some pictures, whilst others, placed in niches and corners, could only be approached crawling or kneeling. In this manner cave temples and cults arose only known and accessible to the initiated, terrible and hard of approach even to them ; to the uninitiated they were closed and he approached them at the risk of his life, thanks to the character of the caves and the worshippers. The caves were either dwellings or uninhabited sanctuaries. The

pictures acquired a sacred, divine character. When we find that by the sea the picture of a fish was enchanted, that is worshipped, and inland mammoths, horses, and buffaloes, this indicates in the first instance, that different animals were hunted ; but the creature thus worshipped readily becomes a local deity when once the idea of a deity penetrates from any source into the mental world of these people. Then the deity may assume the shape of an animal, his priests serve him in the same animal garb, and the faithful devour his animal at the sacrificial feast.

It seems that in this period men advanced from magic ceremonies in caves to the worship of a god, and the object of worship appears to have been the sun. That is obvious enough for a gifted nature-people in the Ice Age and the period immediately following, for the sun brings warmth and light and life ; when it gains strength the spring arrives and with it an abundance of animal and vegetable food ; everything bursts into flower and multiplies ; when the sun grows feeble, the cold approaches and Nature becomes more niggardly than usual. Men must have greeted the sun with lively emotion on its victorious path in springtime ; they cannot have failed to realize that it was the sun which gave not merely comfort but fertility and plenty.

As soon as it occurred to people that it was the sun which fulfilled their desire for large herds of game and prolific breeding among the animals, their ideas of magic necessarily became associated with its image ; now in winter the sun entered a mountain or cave ; there he lived surrounded by his herds (the majority of animals most frequently portrayed later became sacred to the sun at one place or another ; such are the bull and the stag, the elephant and the horse) and waited till he recovered strength enough to overthrow the wicked lord of the wintry night ; here he might be sought for, not without a shudder, for he was vanquished, ferocious, and weak ; here his favour might be secured for the coming year.

There are not many remains demonstrating the existence of sun worship in the open (in summer), but there are a few. In Southern France and Spain there are a few female figures, one actually with a horn in her hand (to pour forth plenty), also a few animal figures that would be in harmony with such worship of the fertilizing sun. There are caves at a high altitude where the sun occasionally penetrates, such as Wildkirchli (1,477 metres) and the Drachenloch near Vättis (2,400 metres) without pictures and impossible as dwellings, but conceivable as places where the sun was worshipped. Most of the ceremonial of this daily worship was transitory and has

## 14 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

left no traces, for painted pictures and clay models of animals above ground are no more durable than New Year and summer dances or hunting customs in the presence of the sun.

On the other hand, it seems to me that some traces of the sun cult in caves have been preserved, though rather far south (in Spain : the caves of Mas d'Azil, Gogul, and Alpera) and of a late date (the Azilian period). We have no exact knowledge of the physiological basis upon which Aurignacian civilization rested—whether it was the creation of a single race or of cross-breedings (perhaps after the intermixture of Neanderthal and Aurignacian man a second at the Solutrean period and a third at the Magdalenian period) that completed its development at a level not greatly superior to its earliest achievements. Certain considerations render the latter hypothesis probable. But now, at the end of the Magdalenian period, the centre of civilization was shifted from the Vézère Valley to Spain, and here it reached its climax plainly as the result of a further racial mixture.

This period is named after the cave of Mas d'Azil, where quantities of symbols were found painted in red upon flat pebbles ; these are known to us in Cretan sun worship and are preserved in the alphabet : bull's-heads variously simplified, discs, crosses, lines like snakes and eyes and ladders, and figures resembling the letters *L*, *E*, *F*, *J*, and *M*. In the caves of Gogul and Alpera there are not only pictures of animals but human figures and whole scenes that are comprehensible only in the light of sun mythology ; two bulls are attacking one another ; a giant crowned with feathers but otherwise naked, with powerful calves and phallus, is striding along whilst a little man sports Tom Thumb-like at his feet ; a naked man leaps over a bull ; women with skirts round their hips dance about a little man with a large pendant phallus : the giant and the leaping man might represent the victorious sun-god, the little man the sun-child, who is growing to sexual maturity well guarded in the cave. We know the giant and the cattle from the northern rock-drawings, the man leaping over the bull and the myth of the sun-child in Crete. Menes of Egypt had himself portrayed as a hunter in the feather garb of the giant, armed with a bow, and we meet the women's skirts round the hips again in Crete. Finally, the cave of Pasiega, a labyrinth of passages and chasms, very difficult of access and never inhabited, is the most marvellous mountain palace for the sun-god that a poet's imagination could conceive. It contains a hall with a throne or altar, and the walls are covered to the remotest corner with pictures of elephants, bulls, stags, horses, ibexes, and chamois—all creatures

sacred to the sun. But there is something quite new at one entrance inside the cave : several signs that can only be interpreted as picture-writing, perhaps also solar symbols—half a ship, two footprints, and a pair of horns. Ideas associated with the sun seem to have found a place, too, in funeral customs at this period. The graves discovered at Ofnet near Nördlingen belong to the Azilian period ; here the bodies of the dead have been disposed of and only the skulls (the part that resembles the sun) have been preserved and buried in red ochre, facing westwards.

This last offshoot of Aurignacian civilization in Spain seems, therefore, to have risen, or very nearly risen, to the conception of a myth of the solar year. The religious advance is not surprising, for there is evidence that these people made cultural progress in other directions, and outstripped their predecessors. For instance, they made the hammer-axe by grinding any lump of stone (not a flint) upon sandstone, a new and simplified process in stone-work ; they invented the bow (the first reliable long-distance weapon used by man), and weaving (for women's skirts) or plaiting, besides the beginnings of picture-writing. We are at the threshold of the New Stone Age, which was destined to give birth to the first comprehensive scientific conception of the universe, the first consummation of material civilization, and the first world civilization.

Up to this point, man's civilization has little to offer us to-day that is still a living force in our lives. Any sympathetic understanding of these primitive hunters with their cave sanctuaries involves a reversion to the romanticism of magic flutes and Red Indians. The new achievements of Neanderthal and Aurignacian civilization are so primitive and fundamental, that we cannot throw off the habit of taking them for granted. Primitive life is something alien to our minds, however much we try to enter into it. True, it was then that the use of fire was discovered and the construction of tools, spears and knives, tents and burial, habitations and sanctuaries ; it was then that art and religion made their appearance. But we use fire for cooking, which was not done in those days ; we no longer use inadequate spears and stone implements. Only the invention of lamps casts a glimmer of our idea of a "dwelling" into the vast caves ; and the realization that the sun was worshipped then brings this hunters' magic and religion a little nearer to our imagination. The history of evolution tells us that we stand upon the foundation of these primitive civilizations—in actual fact, they are dead to us. Neolithic civilization is the first of which considerable portions still survive in our own day.



### C. THE CIVILIZATION OF NEOLITHIC MAN IN EUROPE

As we pass from the Old to the New Stone Age we lose sight of cave civilization; for a long time the old caves were no longer inhabited, nor were new ones occupied and painted. We do not know exactly what happened; the former inhabitants did not disappear or migrate elsewhere, for no essential element of their civilization was lost where they had settled; it merely became obsolete. People no longer lived in caves but in pit-dwellings. The dead, however, were buried in caves. Naturalistic pictures were no longer painted on cave walls, but the people were skilled in the use of simpler geometrical symbols, which they carried about with them and which served the same purpose. Paleolithic implements became small and were shaped geometrically, whilst Neolithic craftsmanship produced more important stone implements suited to the new conditions; in addition, men worked in bone and wood. The cave-dwellers had spread over Europe (to Spain, for instance), carrying their civilization with them. As they came in contact with alien, less civilized neighbours, "provincial civilizations" arose, which preserved a certain amount of technical skill, but nothing else; also new mixed races sprang up, afterwards the pre-Indo-Germans and Indo-Germans. In the centre of the old civilization its influence spread to the masses and it became a matter of technique and ornamentation. Finally came the "barbarian" invasion, and "provincial civilization" (using archaic types of tool) conquered the ancient homeland. The centre of gravity of cultural development moved from the Vézère Valley to Central Europe, where new civilized races arose in the vast forests between the North Sea, the Baltic, and the Alps, and probably further east.

These new civilized races adopted the old civilization, all in its most recent, mechanical, simplified form: philosophy and art as simple symbolism, methods of hunting and the working of stone and bone, but especially many cultural acquisitions that till then had occurred only locally and in isolated instances: the hammer-axe and the bow, the pit-dwelling and burial in a crouching posture, cereals, and more besides. Man's creative activity set to work on these, and more were added until at last something emerged quite different from the old hunting civilization; it was a civilization of settled cattle-breeders and husbandmen, who began to clear the forests and send their

## 18 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

surplus population long distances over land and sea. It was the first world civilization.

We do not yet know just where the centres of this Neolithic culture lay, for the study of prehistoric times, especially in the East and South East, is in its infancy. One such centre was the peninsula of Jutland together with the neighbouring islands and shores of the North Sea and the Baltic. Here we find six thousand years before Christ a new, tall, long-skulled race; they may have had predominantly fair skins and hair and blue eyes at that early date (being ancestors of the later Indo-Germans). They lived settled lives in pit-dwellings and depended for their livelihood on the sea (shell-fish, fish, and birds) and the forests (deer and acorns). They also tilled the soil to some extent (they grew barley) and possessed one domestic animal, the dog, though he was kept only for amusement and protection, and occasionally for food. The men of this shell-heap civilization had learned to use large stone implements, perforated and with sharpened blade, such as the hammer-axe and mace-head of rock; their potters made bowls and also cylindrical vessels for storage. Their weapons included the bow and fishing-spear, besides the axe and club; they also possessed the monoxylon (a boat hollowed out of a tree-trunk) and net. Their dead were buried in a crouching posture, wrapped in skins and surrounded by flat stones. A civilization of the same level was reached in the southern German-speaking area (Switzerland) some two thousand years later, when the lake-dwellings reached their highest development. At this later date the existence of large wooden houses (standing on piles) can be demonstrated, besides numerous domestic animals—cattle, goats, and pigs; in addition to barley there was millet and flax; the people were acquainted with stone mills and looms, spinning-wheels and plaited materials (of rushes); their potters fashioned vessels with handles, necks, and edges, idols in the shape of bulls, and toys.

The creators of this new civilization were likewise a new race; they had smaller short heads, and later, when the breed was pure, their hair was dark and their eyes brown; they were the Alpine people. Besides these two races there must have been at least one other, tall and dark, with long heads. They may have sprung up in the neighbourhood of the Danube, or further east. They were called pre-Indo-Germans because four thousand years before Christ they began to migrate in waves along the roads subsequently taken by the Indo-Germans: to Babylon across Persia and Asia Minor, to Crete and Egypt across the Balkan Peninsula and Greece. These

migrant waves were the Sumerians, the Proto-Semites, Proto-Egyptians, and Proto-Cretans. It was not till after the year 2000 B.C. that the first Indo-Germans made their appearance here. Possibly the Band-potters in the Danube region (Southern Germany, Hungary, and beyond) were akin to this race; they were husbandmen living in settled colonies on well-tilled land, and their cattle-breeding, weaving, and pottery were well developed. They were tall, with long skulls, and their civilization was akin to that of the earliest Troy, possibly also to Crete (before 2000 B.C.).

Probably the new inventions that distinguish the New Stone Age were made at various places. Of some we know that they date from the Old Stone Age (pit-dwellings and the hammer-axe), others can have arisen only where the plants and animals that they concern were found in a wild state. Once an invention was made anywhere, it was bound to become common property throughout the civilized world, for we are concerned entirely with things obviously useful to their owners, and they spread as metal and metal-work did at a later date. But in certain places the new civilization must have been re-moulded and perfected, emerging new and complete, the creative achievement of young and rising peoples. This seems to have taken place about 4000 B.C., as regards the conception of the universe perhaps in the Megalithic civilization of Northern Central Europe, as regards agriculture and cattle-breeding perhaps further to the south-east. In any case, before 3500 B.C. there was a uniform Neolithic civilization all over Central Europe and in parts of Eastern Europe, and it spread in all directions through migration, and became a world civilization.

The New Stone Age received its name from its stone implements, which were manufactured differently from those of the Old Stone Age. People had learned to grind and polish them. When scholars made their first survey of the periods of civilization, it was sufficiently convenient to designate them by the material most frequently and perfectly preserved. To-day we know that the New Stone Age created all the foundations of our material and spiritual civilization—agriculture, cattle-breeding, the building of houses and boats, plaiting, weaving, pottery, solar astronomy, and religion. Its designation by stone implements is, therefore, very inadequate, and yet stone implements retain their significance as an indication of the progress and essential character of the new civilization in comparison with the old. The principal implement now became the hammer-axe, a heavy hammer ground into shape from hard compound rock (preferably

## 20 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

nephrite, jadeite, or primary rock); people first learned to sharpen the blade, and then to perforate and polish the weapon. Technically that is a great advance; the blades are smooth and do not split so readily, handles can be easily and securely affixed, and the tool gains in weight and, when fully polished, is beautiful. The stone axe turned at this juncture into an ornamental object, the sceptre. But in addition to the technical improvement, the tool was capable of a new use, and precisely the one required by the age. The heavy stone axe soon grew to be the principal tool used in clearing forest land, and also the principal weapon in hand-to-hand fights in the wars that now became frequent in order to secure the more fertile land, and necessary to secure more land and so provide for more numerous offspring. Once more there was a universal tool, as in primitive days, but it was now the weapon and clearing axe of warrior peasants, and soon became the symbol of their strength and dignity. Flint implements, too, were adapted to the new conditions, and a flint "core-celt" developed, its edge being ground, not merely retouched.

Besides the axe, other new inventions made of hard rock were the rock mace-head (a pierced globe attached to a shaft) the hoe (shoe-last celt), and the earliest plough (a large blunt axe, pierced at the top); made of flint there was the sickle-blade or saw—a long serrated knife hewn into shape. Both were essential for felling trees and hewing beams. Men continued to use the older flint knives, scrapers, and borers, as well as instruments for shaving and tattooing (France is now digging them up and selling them commercially), and bone harpoons, fishing hooks, daggers, awls, and needles. Stone arrowheads were equipped with spikes and barbs.

A new and large domestic implement was the mill, a millstone with a grindstone upon it. Pit-dwellings with earth roofs developed in time into huts—lake-dwellings in the south and the megaron or chief's castle in the north. I see no reason to suppose that lake-dwellings first appeared in some other place than Europe, where they were first found (in the tropics, for instance). Ramparts and earthworks were also laid out as fortresses, protected by palisades; they were set upon hills as sanctuaries or refuges and as fortified "cities" (the Band-potters).

Monoxyllons were made from great tree-trunks and used for fishing on the sea and lakes, being hollowed out to the required shape; the rudder, steps, and ladder were invented; men learned to use pulleys and levers (the *Hunnebedden* or giants' graves); wheels,

too, have been preserved in bone models, in the form of disc-wheels and wheels with spokes : we may conclude, therefore, that the people had carts.

Looms and spinning-wheels were used for flax ; linen garments were introduced besides the earlier fur garments, and fishing-nets besides the harpoon and hook. Reeds and straw were plaited. Plates and pots were carved in wood, as well as twirling-sticks and toys.

Pottery was an entirely new art ; at first no wheel was used, the material was coarse clay dried in the sun and then imperfectly fired ; later men learned to wash the clay and to improve the firing process by mixing it with a proportion of quartz or charcoal, and also to fire more thoroughly. The several shapes suited to everyday uses were modified by an artistic sense, and grew more varied and beautiful. Bowls and pots for storing (for now men gathered and stored) were of many different shapes, pots developed handles, necks, and rims. The origin of pottery had been the use of clay to calk wicker-work and twisted cord, and the marks so made were remembered and used solely for ornamentation. Various kinds of decoration grew from various origins, till we come to white inlaid figures on a dark ground, painted with free meander and spiral lines that had a profound religious meaning. Thus art entered upon a new field, in which it was to reach its fullest perfection at a later date in Crete and Greece. People also moulded bulls' heads and horned idols in clay.

They hunted bears, aurochs, elks, stags, and hares in the forests, killed birds and caught fish on the water ; they gathered food, such as acorns, mushrooms, roots, perhaps wild apples and pears, and honey in the forests, besides shell-fish (oysters) and crabs by the water ; and these remained their chief sources of sustenance. But they had learnt also to force Nature to yield them regular supplies, and were independent, up to a point, of her tricks and contingencies. They kept domestic animals—cattle, goats, and pigs—which provided them with meat and fats to eat at sacrificial feasts, but not, probably, as a regular thing. They cultivated barley and millet and ate the grain, roasted or in flat cakes, with salt or honey or poppy-seed. They had learnt, also, to boil and roast meat.

Human civilization, therefore, changed altogether in the New Stone Age, first and foremost in its material and technical aspect : here we find the same world in which we palpably live to-day. We still use all the same implements and appliances, from axes and pots

## 22 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

to looms and mills ; they have merely changed their form, are made of metal or porcelain, and have developed into machines. We still live in houses, though they are built of stone. Agriculture and cattle-breeding are still the basis of our existence. And though our States are now for the most part democratic republics, they are fundamentally akin to the Neolithic States with their princes and clans—policy is still dominated, as it was then, by the struggle for the more valuable land, the apportionment of the earth's surface, and the distribution of surplus population over it.

Moreover, the Neolithic outlook on life had many features that are still familiar and dear to us to-day. As was the case with so much of Neolithic progress, its essential characteristic dates from the Old Stone Age : man's observation, that is, of the connection between the sun's course and the fertility of animals and plants. This the early hunters had observed, and had profited by it to win the favour of the sun for the coming year in their caves in winter, just as they saluted the summer sun in the heavens and rendered him thanks and adoration. In the Azilian period solar mythology must already have acquired certain individual traits : the sun was represented as a warrior giant in the sky with a great stride and a powerful phallus, and as a male child guarded by women in the cave and growing to sexual maturity and full strength. It seems, also, that people already made images of a fight between two oxen or several archers, as a symbol of the contrast between the two halves of the year. The chaotic confusion of similar cave paintings in the Pyrenees and in Spain (men had not yet learnt to distinguish actions and typify them unmistakably) points to the likelihood that other images were acquiring a symbolic meaning (e.g. a man climbing to the heavens), but that no one group succeeded in dominating the rest.

It was hardly possible that the later solar religion should develop fully in the southern latitudes of the south of France and Spain, nor in a civilization based upon hunting. True, its essential characteristics could originate here in an ice period and the era immediately following, in which the sun's vital importance to the herds of wild game and to man's comfort would be keenly felt. Pictures were produced to match this conception : pictures of the sun-god taking refuge from the cold with his beasts in a mountain-side, and of the struggle in the world of Nature that drives him to the cave in winter, and frees him again in summer. The web of fancy might be spun further in the heights of the Pyrenees as men

contemplated the contrast between the icy winter and the hot summer, between the dread night of the caves and the bright daylight and warmth outside ; perhaps the god died in winter and lay dead in the cave, perhaps a sun-child rose up as his heir. But here the process of development necessarily stopped. The Ice Age had faded away in the distant past, the southern climate became warmer, the sun did not " die " even in winter ; and hunters were no longer as dependent on the sun's course as they had been formerly ; in the southern forests the game remained in winter, even though it did not multiply.

It was at this point that the seed was handed on to the peoples of the New Stone Age, who fostered its growth. The further north they lived the more certain and obvious must it have seemed to them that the sun shrank and grew feeble and died every winter, only to recover his stature and strength again in summer and to rise from the dead. Every child could see and feel directly that these things happened. So, too, the contest between the two seasons is palpable in northern Central Europe. These images in the inherited symbolism became prominent, therefore, and all others disappeared. The year's course is a fight between two bulls or two heroic giants. (The bull or aurochs of the forests became the chief solar animal, and second to him the stag.) In summer the radiant giant was victorious and brought light, warmth, and life ; in winter he suffered defeat and " entered the mountain-side ". There he himself recovered strength and vitality, or his son grew up so that he might come forth and prevail in summer, risen from the dead, or as his predecessor's youthful offspring. Thus the doctrine was made quite simple and immediately palpable to all ; and yet it is profound enough for simple souls who are just learning to separate image from reality in the images representing processes so little concrete and spectacular as the year's course : the sun really does die and yet he lives, he is a different being this year and last, and yet he is visibly the same, himself and also his own son. And here man's own longing for a resurrection must have entered in.

But the solar doctrine was not only made simpler, more tangible and actual, and more profound in the north and among the Neolithic peoples ; it gained in significance and importance in men's lives ; indeed it dominated and ruled their lives. For Neolithic man was no longer exclusively a hunter, he was also a tiller of the soil and a breeder of cattle. But tillers of the soil must have accurate knowledge of the sun's course if they are to sow at the right time,

## 24 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

especially in the north. And the breeder of cattle is more aware of the coming of spring in his byres than the hunter in the forest, for when his cattle breed prolifically their offspring belong to his household. Solar religion first developed its full potentialities as an agricultural religion, and it was in northern lands that it first palpably found its true place. The sun-god now became the originator of agriculture and cattle-breeding, the guardian of the country and of civilization. He fought against barbarism (represented by mere gangs of hunters) and disorder, and not only against the sombre power of the winter. As a bull-god he stood for something more than the force and fertility of Nature: the ox was the most important of the animals bred for meat, and at a later date he became the farmer's draught-animal. At the same time men realized more and more profoundly that the sun's course is eternally the same and immovably fixed. For the first time their minds seized in tangible form upon the conception of law, for here there was nothing further to be attained by magic. This stimulated their hopes of rising from the dead, for by imagining the reign of law they themselves might have a part in it.

Finally, the new conditions of Neolithic civilization influenced the development of mythology: the sun-heroes became princes and warriors; in battle they had a friend and companion beside them. They entered into definite family relationships, as brothers (two equal parts in the same year), or as wooers of the same woman; she was snatched away by one from the other, or she betrayed one, or remained faithful to him beyond death, saving the defenceless child and bringing it up to avenge its father. Myths were permeated by the influence of political conditions in the new, settled life, and of the closer family ties in the common house (pit-dwelling), and thus acquired a deeper ethical meaning. Ideals of law and loyalty or of the reverse (brothers estranged, treacherous lovers) educated men, or moved them, or filled them with horror. Solar mythology progressed side by side with the advancing organization of the State and the family. Lawful marriage took the place of irregular amours, and the hard, worldly tyrant who feared the avenger supplanted the savage pursuer who sought to devour the defenceless child. Further, the symbolism of the myth was enlarged in a modern sense: the combatant brothers were armed with axes instead of bows or spear-throwers, they drove in chariots or sailed in boats, and so two axes, the wheel, and the boat became the symbols of the sun, as well as the two bulls (two bulls' heads) or heroes, as also the bull and the snake.

I. Prehistoric Era (Before 1000 a.c. to 8000 a.c.)		MATERIAL CIVILIZATION		CULTURE		SUMMING-UP
1. NEANDERTHAL MAN (Before 10000 a.c.) { Palaeolithic Man	Fire for warmth and the chase.	Flint instrument for general use ( <i>coup de poing</i> ).		Too little known.		Ape man becomes man on the road to civilization.
	Fire for warmth and the chase.	Fur clothing.  Cave dwellings and tents made of skins.		Realistic painting and plastic art as charms for the purposes of the chase. Beasts of the chase in outline—prepared for practical reasons.		CULMINATION OF PURELY HUNTING CIVILIZATION. Visual imagery in magic spells. Later first beginnings of a homogeneous view of the universe.
2. AURIGNACIAN MAN (about 10000 a.c.?)	Fire for cooking.	Pit dwellings, houses.  Spinning, weaving (nets). Pottery (vessels for storing and general use, clay idols).		Constitution: Solar things, free peasants.  Art: Solar symbolism in line drawings, wood, and clay.  Poetry: (The solar myth, Solar games) Blank.  Learning: Solar calendar; earliest rationalism. Various empirical sciences (medicine).  Worship: Fetal circle. Sanctuaries in stone megaliths. Burial mounds. Latterly cremation of the dead.		FIRST AGRICULTURAL CIVILIZATION. First homogeneous view of the universe, an uniform, concrete nucleus for all subsequent intellectual assimilation of the objective world.  CULMINATION, in that the masses always revert to this solar culture in their view of the universe. (The best attainable by the masses.)
3. NEOLITHIC MAN (about 4000 a.c.)						

1 and 2 are dominated throughout by the mere struggle for existence against the forces of Nature and the animal world. The great invention of the New Stone Age, fire, initiates the first theory of the universe, and conquers the world (the first world civilization), and to this day they form the groundwork of all advanced civilization. We can now devote less of our attention to material civilization, but in the succeeding era of the inventors of writing it advances decisively in two directions: the art of working in metal is perfected (bronze and iron), so that weapons and tools (and finally machines) are brought to a final pitch of excellence; and writing is invented and permitted in order to preserve and hand on all that has been achieved, to carry the process of intellectual assimilation even further and deeper. Intellectual culture (theory) assumes a dominant position; material civilization, in the form of technical knowledge, is further differentiated as applied theory.

Note.—The descriptive tables show the succession of peoples in the vertical columns, and the rise of civilization in all fields in which the objective world is intellectually assimilated. Horizontally the several provinces of civilization are placed side by side. In the case of prehistoric times I have divided them into "material civilization" and "culture", in the case of later epochs into constitution, art, literature, learning, philosophy, and religion. Achievements in any one province that have reached their culmination are designated by capitals.

## 26 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

The snake appeared in solar mythology as the representative of the earth or the cave in which, like the dead sun-god, it dwelt. Woman, too, stood for the earth, the beloved and sister whom the radiant brother frees and takes for his mate, and the dark brother violates (for she, too, was an established fact like the two halves of the year; she became a mother and gave birth to the sun). So the myth was deliberately given a cosmological meaning.

The sacred legend in the form in which it must have culminated between 4,000 and 3,000 B.C. in the Neolithic lands north of the Balkans and the Alps divided up the year's course (and this was the form in which it migrated southwards with the Sumerians and the Proto-Egyptians, and was then metamorphosed and adapted to other natural surroundings). The year began at Easter with the New Year festival which celebrated the victory of the sun-hero over his dark brother, his accession to power, and his marriage or mating; at Whitsuntide his benefits were palpable on all sides; after Midsummer (St. John's Day) the year declined towards harvest and the festival of the dead; the hero had been struck down by the malicious traitor, he was dead and had descended into the mountain, into his grave; his faithful mate had fled; she was pregnant and in the cave or mountain she secretly gave birth to his heir and avenger (Christmas); pursued but successfully guarded whilst he was still weak, the child now grew up to be the victor of the New Year.

Every human relation was mirrored in this mythology. The hero's experiences are those that may come to man as such, and they also represent the course of external Nature. He is a glorious youth, strong and victorious; he is a man who wins a wife and begets a child; he is miserably betrayed and dying; he dies and rises from the dead; he is the helpless child in the wilderness, despised and deserted and pursued until he saves himself. The woman, too, experiences the whole fate of her sex, the joy of love, the agony of losing the beloved, the terrors of persecution, the joy and suffering of concealed motherhood. Every human relation known to the age is symbolized here and given lasting expression with all its joy and pain.

But not only did the sacred legend mark the course of the year by making it a cycle of festivals; it also established new sanctuaries, the worship of the gods, and the veneration of the dead. The sanctuaries of this Nature-worship were groves, spared when the forest was cleared, perhaps marked off in the forest, but always so situated and laid out that the sun could be seen and observed on

Easter Day, at the New Year. Where there were mountains the principal sanctuaries must have been set up on particular mountains (sometimes surrounded by circular ramparts and used also as places of refuge). Where there were none, there would be an artificial hillock erected in the sanctuary, a burial mound for the god. Such parts of these sanctuaries as were made of stone have been preserved here and there ; primarily these are arrangements of stones, circles, and patterns made up of circles, or single pillars of stone (menhirs) and blocks of stone covered with so-called cup-markings. Without doubt these stone monuments served astronomical purposes ; many of them are open to the east, and stone signposts direct the eyes of an observer standing at the centre to that point where, at the date when they were built, the sun appeared on the horizon at the spring equinox. It has been thought that in some the number of stones forming the several circles constitute a new and eternal calendar of the months, designed to reconcile solar and lunar calculations. At any rate they represent the first instruments with which the sun was scientifically observed in order to determine the exact date of spring and so of the New Year festival.

Natural science, in the form of solar astronomy, had come into being. The priests were no longer magicians, but wise men who turned their eyes skywards. They observed the more keenly because their aims were strictly practical and subordinated to the purposes of agriculture. The fact that their observatories were also festive places where the whole community awaited the moment when the New Year began, and greeted it jubilantly, nowise detracts from their scientific merits. The science of the calendar is the earliest true science amongst men. The single stone pillars may have served for purposes of observation, possibly to watch the shadows and calculate the longest and shortest days. But primarily they were symbols of the unique character, the surpassing greatness and fertility (the phallus), of the sun-god. Finally, the cup-marked stones were doubtless altars ; from the little round holes upon them (images of the sun !) the sun sucked up libations of honey, oil, and blood.

The god was worshipped in the open air. In the open the assembled people saluted the victorious sun-god on New Year's Day, and celebrated his victories with processions and games. In honour of the duel he fought, the men also fought with axes and bows, spear-throwers and nets, on horseback, in chariots, in boats ; they fought one another and they fought the bull. In memory of his victorious career men and women ran races, the whole community

## 28 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

marched along stone-paved meander and spiral paths ("Troja-burgen"), dancing and leaping out of the sun-trap. The girls played ball and the men threw quoits, imitating the sun's flight over the earth. Almost all our games have their origin in man's imaginings in this connection, from the drama to the game where a ball, representing the sun, has to make its way out of a hole in a board. The marriage of the god gave occasion for ceremonies of initiation and sexual orgies, his death for lamentation and mourning. At the harvest festival his share of the crop was brought as an offering. Only one festival in the year was not held in the open air, and that was the winter festival in honour of the newly born divine child. For that men turned from the groves to the caves, and especially to the new and more mysterious caves that were houses. It was celebrated with lights and mummary, representing the little god (the baby hare, or the prince disguised as a bear) tricking his fierce, gigantic pursuer and escaping death unarmed. For these festivals and processions the first need was a place near the sanctuary, perhaps a number of places, where the sacred legend could be played locally. Perhaps a cave was needed for the birth and burial of the god and a place for sacrifice. Further, symbols were required to carry in procession and a house where they could be kept. The place for sacrifice was under the open sky, and included an altar upon which men and animals were sacrificed to the god, and sometimes burned in the early days, perhaps. The assembled people devoured the flesh of the sacrificial animals, primarily oxen. The men drank their blood, probably mixed in the early days with intoxicating liquor and later supplanted by it; drinking, they celebrated secret orgies and imbibed the life and strength of the god. There were a multiplicity of symbols: among them were bulls' heads and pairs of horns in clay (sometimes with the horns attached to bull's heads), and also certain decorative axes; but the people also paid homage to the chariot and the boat in which the god rode across the heavens, and to parts of the chariot, such as the wheels, whether as discs or with spokes. The spoked wheel was the subject of a special simplified symbolism connected with the sacred legend: with four spokes and unbroken, it symbolized the unwounded sun; without the rim, as a cross made of spokes, it stood for the dead sun; as the swastika with the rim growing afresh, it was the sun about to triumph. Nor must we forget the plough with which the first furrow was made at the spring festival. These symbols and many more, and even scenes of love and war from the sacred legend, were painted at the

festivals or portrayed in such perishable material as straw or dough.<sup>1</sup>

This solar religion had no need of actual images of the gods. In its sacred legend it was not fundamentally monotheistic, but the three chief gods (the radiant and dark brothers and the sister-mother) were one and akin, so that it had a certain kinship with monotheism, and its innate lack of images allowed of many. Every symbol was sacred and there was no limit to the sacred symbols and objects that could be associated with it. The ancient animal charms of the earliest days that had long ago become totem-like marks distinguishing particular communities, fetishes of every kind, charms in war and at work, in the hunt, in the home and in love—all these found a place in the forms assumed by the solar religion at different times and places.

The sacred legend of the solar religion is at one and the same time the natural history of the year's course and the history of all that is human; it permeated and influenced and imbued with ideals every human relation known at that period. Naturally, therefore, it influenced care for the dead, which now developed into a cult of the dead and of ancestors, a belief in resurrection from the grave. "The sun enters the mountain-side, and according to immutable law he emerges again; when man likewise enters the mountain-side, an obviously parallel case, he too will emerge from it again." So men argued and built a great mountain of stones for the dead chief and his kindred, and covered it with earth (dolmens, giants' graves). Into this hillock the body was borne, and sometimes, in order to complete the resemblance, they caused it to "vanish in flames" like the sun, lighting a little fire round it before closing the door of the tomb. The dead man was given weapons, tools, amulets, and food, and at a later date his kindred even followed him; thus he could live on in his eternal tomb, and if he wished to quit it he could live out in the light of the sun, or in the home of the sun.

<sup>1</sup> The rock drawings at Bohusland are pictures of this type made for the New Year festival; they were scratched in stone at the beginning of the metal era, but in this durable form they are demonstrably mere copies of older paintings. From their symbolism I have managed to make out the sacred legend in its earliest historical form: it is in perfect harmony with what Jacob Grimm postulated as the kernel of myths and fairy-tales and popular customs; but now that kernel has been proved to have existed as an historical religion, two thousand years before Christ in the north and between 4000 and 3000 B.C. in the original home of the Sumerians. Compare *Die Felszeichnungen von Bohuslän* Publications of the Museum für Vorgeschichte in Halle, 1918, Kabitzsh, Berlin-Wurzburg; and *Die Sonnenreligion im ältesten Babylonien. Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1922, Hinrichs, Leipzig.

## 30 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

For the survivors he became a god, the actual sun-hero or the equivalent of the hero; losing his individuality, he became one with the hero in the memory of his mighty deeds and in sharing the universal fate of man. He was an ancestor to be worshipped just as the sun-hero was an ancestor, so that the great burial-mound of a chief could without sacrilege become the centre of a solar sanctuary; it could become the tomb of the sun himself. So, too, the sacred legend is the finest piece of poetry of which we can infer the existence in the New Stone Age; it must have formed the nucleus of festal and funeral songs and heroic epics that have been lost to us. Graphic art must have portrayed its characters as well as its symbols—in abstract and sometimes greatly simplified form. Music must have lent its inspiration to the New Year festival and others; there would be kettle-drums, and perhaps curved harps at this period, and certainly pipers. Hitherto we have not been able to prove that the symbols were used as hieroglyphs, but it is very probable (festal images).

The solar religion of the New Stone Age was a great cultural achievement; it was man's first consistent philosophy of life, the first world religion, permeating the whole life of civilized man, giving him ideals of civilization, humanity, and morals, and security in life and death. It gave rise to the first great religious movements. Its adherents dedicated themselves to the god by having round pieces of bone cut from their living skulls in his honour (trepanation); it was a most dangerous operation, and so greatly admired that after the death of the holy man the survivors cut disc-shaped amulets from the scar in the trepanned skull that had healed successfully. A later religious movement went to such extremes that the faithful, unshakably convinced that they would live on with the sun-god, quite overcame their terror of the destruction of the visible ego and submitted to be burned; they sought, that is, to merge themselves directly in the solar element.

Just as our life to-day is based in its material aspect on the creative achievements of the New Stone Age, so our spiritual and intellectual life falls within the domain of their solar religion and science. All the languages derived from the New Stone Age bear traces of the solar sacred legend in their words formed from the roots "man, men, min, mon, mun", and "har, her, hir, hor, hur".<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Since Neolithic man had not invented the art of writing he could not leave any record of the names of his chief gods; but we may learn from his descendants that "Man" or "Min" was the original name of the solar bull, and "Har", "Her", or "Hor" that of the young sun-hero. The unity of the

All great poetry, both epic and dramatic, has evolved its subjects from that legend. All the principal religions of the world are offshoots of this first world religion. It survives in us and with us in Christianity and its cycle of festivals, in fairy-tales and popular customs. And the science of the calendar, as established in this earliest era of man's religious liberation and fulfilment, the practical solar astronomy of the age, is the oldest valid knowledge of the natural world that we possess, the oldest stone in the edifice of modern science.

The most important monuments were left by the Baltic civilization before 3000 B.C. Here we find the first burial-mounds in the plain, the predecessors of the Egyptian pyramids, the dolmens; here the most beautiful ornamental axes were found; here, therefore, a civilization of an unusually high level and exceptional vigour must have existed between 3000 and 4000 B.C. Dolmen civilization grew out of shell-heap civilization; it must have been the people of the shell-heap period who intermarried with another race, with fruitful results. This new culture quickly spread; it took the path of the later Anglo-Saxons and Danes across the North Sea, and its offshoots appeared in Brittany and England, destined to outstrip the parent civilization in the magnitude of their monuments. The solar sanctuaries belonging to the early Bronze Age at Salisbury (Stonehenge erected about 1700 B.C.) and Avebury in England, at Kerkeslan and Carnac-Ménec in Brittany, are the mightiest of their kind; their festal roads and race-courses, and, indeed, some of their many circles of stones, embrace whole villages. That they were dedicated to the service of the solar worship of the bull is proved not only by their astronomical position, by the number of stones in the principal system of circles (at Stonehenge 1, 12, 15 ( $3 \times 5$ ), 12, 30), by menhir and tomb, but also by the pattern in which the stones are placed at Avebury; from a bird's-eye view they form an immense bull's head. Moreover, Greek records mention one of the English groups of stones as a solar sanctuary.

The total transformation of the whole state of civilization in the New Stone Age, the progress made in all fields of culture, the opening up of so many sources of better and surer food-supply (in

two finds expression in Har-Min (Egyptian), "Irmin," "Her-man," and "Menhir". It is comprehensible that "Herr" (lord), "Herz" (heart), "Haar" (hair), and "harren" (to await) should have the same root. The youthful sun-hero, "Her" or "Har" was the first lord; his strength lay in his heart and in his sunny hair; he was the liberator awaited with longing by his mother and by all mankind.

## 32 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

hunting, agriculture, and cattle-breeding), the acquisition of settled homes, must have imbued the representatives of the new civilization with a certain sense of repose, an immense youthful pride in their culture. There would follow an increase in population, hitherto impossible, in the various centres of civilization. Civilization spread over Europe by sea and land at the expense of the "savages" (a conception which arose at this juncture and applied to the hunters of the earlier phase). Mechanical and material progress is quick to migrate, intellectual progress follows in its wake. Between 4000 and 3000 B.C. Europe north of the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Balkan peninsula must have been the seat of a uniform civilization, inhabited by the "children of the sun". Many and various in race and speech, they were one in culture and material civilization, which differed only in degree according to men's abilities and the nature of the soil. For centuries tribes wandered southwards from this cultural centre, all alike in their solar religion and methods of agriculture and cattle-breeding. It seems, indeed, that even the dress of these migrants, similar to that of the Red Indians, remained unchanged for a long period.

An agricultural civilization gives rise to rapid multiplication, and so inevitably to excess of population. It follows that *vera sacra* are sent forth, first to neighbouring places, then further afield. Land rises in value, some districts are richer than others, and so men fight for the rich territories with the best soil, or at least with better soil. Far as the New Stone Age progressed in agriculture and cattle-breeding, the advance was not great enough to enable the people to break up heavy land, to provide fodder for large herds, and to clear the forest. Thus even in prosperous times the limit of over-population was relatively quickly reached in the new territories of civilized Europe, and far more quickly, of course, when conditions were unpropitious, when harvests failed and drought appeared.

Between 4000 and 3000 B.C. the homeland of Neolithic civilization came to resemble a basin seething with peoples, bubbling up every spring and overflowing at last. Quite apart from the expeditions of warriors, eager for spoil and booty—and these cannot be distinguished from other migrations—the regular movement of the surplus population led to the colonization of all cultivable lands at home, to the shifting to and fro of frontiers, and to the expulsion of communities out into the steppes, where a nomad shepherd population arose. Finally, it led to regular migrations of peoples

to distant lands. They always followed the same roads, south-eastwards at first, where Europe was linked with cultivable lands in Asia, and where the passage of the migrants was not blocked by mountains, steppes, deserts, and seas. These migrations of the children of the sun gave birth to a civilization embracing Europe, Hither Asia, and Egypt. At a later date the migrants went further : they wandered as far as India, China, America, and the South Seas : this earliest of man's world movements finally lost itself in the solar civilizations of the Inca and Maya peoples, in the Red Indian worship of Manitu, and in the Mana of the South Sea Islanders.

The migrations of its representatives made solar civilization the first world civilization, solar religion the first world religion. It was the first civilization of a relatively high level, and it carried the arts of agriculture and cattle-breeding to all parts of the world. It reached its zenith in northern Central Europe and in the neighbouring districts to the west and east between 4000 and 3000 B.C. and in the period immediately following. Thence it moved south-eastwards, eastwards, and southwards. It sent offshoots of pre-Indo-Germanic tribes between 4000 and 3000 B.C. to Mesopotamia and the Nile Valley ; there in the south the earliest arable land was tilled and fertilized by their labours, for they drained the marshes, settled the country, and garrisoned it with towns. In these new centres of civilization man made his next great cultural advance : he learned to work in metal and invented the art of writing. Great States arose with settled laws, standing armies, intensive cultivation of the soil, commerce, and industry.

And now the relative cultural level of the southern and eastern countries and those of the north was reversed : the more advanced civilization spread from south-east to north-west. First and foremost, bronze, but other things besides—wheat and pulse, the more skilful use of dogs with cattle and for the chase, and woollen materials—all were carried to the ancient solar lands and there transformed civilization. At the same time the wealthy lands exercised a growing attraction upon the impoverished peoples of the North, who set forth in hordes to conquer them. Compared with the Egyptians and Babylonians just before 2000 B.C., the Neolithic peasant warrior was a savage, just as the Palæolithic hunter had been previously in comparison with the Neolithic tiller of the soil and breeder of cattle. The Sumerian word for the sun or the sun-god is "bar-bar" (in a language, that is to say, which sprang from the Neolithic solar civilization); and it may be that

## 34 STONE AGE CIVILIZATIONS IN EUROPE

somewhere or other the representatives of this earliest European civilization once proudly called themselves "barbarians", "children to the sun". But now the word lost the proud meaning which stressed their more advanced civilization. To the Greeks "barbarians" were savages, people untouched by a high type of civilization. It was two peoples in the south-east, the Egyptians and Babylonians, who took the next forward steps in the evolution of civilization, advancing simultaneously but independently. Both were the offspring of mixed races, and among the parent stocks one at least had migrated from the home of solar civilization; probably there were two such stocks, for at one time or another the Semites must come across Asia Minor to Mesopotamia and Syria from the solar lands, sending offshoots thence to Arabia which bred pure and persisted. The cross-breeding must have begun at the same time; at any rate the new literary civilization arose simultaneously soon after 3000 B.C. in the valleys of the Nile and the Euphrates. But Egyptian civilization remained somewhat more primitive than Babylonian, more closely akin to the common ancestral culture. In a book that deals with history as an evolutionary process it must, therefore, be treated first. Both civilizations bring us within the range of history that can be chronologically measured, because it is recorded in writing.

### SUMMARY

In the Stone Ages man acquired in Europe the material basis of an assured existence, and achieved the partial mastery of Nature. First he learnt to manufacture tools with conscious purpose and to use fire, then to hunt by trapping in pits and driving over precipices, to chip javelin-heads and needles, to make his dwelling in caves, to paint and model; at last he learned to cultivate the soil and breed animals, he made huts and byres, carts and bread, mills and looms, pottery and wicker-work, the material foundations of our life even to the present day. Side by side with material civilization the life of the spirit evolved, the magic and image-making of Palæolithic cave sanctuaries emerged as a homogeneous solar religion, a view of Nature and society which inspired and permeated every department of men's lives—the State and the family, art and science. It was a central conception whence they could proceed to comprehend the world concretely in all its detail and all its extent. And that basis, too, is still ours to this day.

## **BOOK II**

### **THE CIVILIZATIONS OF THE EARLIEST INVENTORS OF WRITING**



## BOOK II

### THE CIVILIZATIONS OF THE EARLIEST INVENTORS OF WRITING

THE two most obvious advances made by man in the civilizations of Egypt and Babylon were the arts of working in metal and of writing.

The fact that metal as well as stone could be used for weapons and tools must have been discovered in some place where copper or tin was found, either pure or in a form in which it might be accidentally smelted out. There is no such place in Babylon or Egypt, but the Sumerians came into Mesopotamia from Persia, and the Semites probably from Asia Minor. Copper and tin when hammered cold were kinds of stone, approved because they glittered like the sun, but still inferior to the hardest stone because they were soft; nevertheless, like amber, they were undoubtedly associated with the solar religion and therefore acquired a commercial value. In this way both metals may have reached the countries of the Sumerians and Egyptians, where new creative forces were coming to birth. In one or other (more probably Babylon) the art of casting bronze must have been invented, or at least so far perfected and applied as to improve the quality of weapons of war and methods of agriculture. The possession of bronze meant durable weapons for cutting and stabbing, more terrible than the stone hammer and spear; it meant implements that would plough and trench deeper and more quickly than stone and wood. The Egyptians and Babylonians were the first to conquer and found great empires soon after 3000 B.C.; their systematic labour turned immense tracts of marsh into arable land dotted with towns, land which must have yielded far more than had been produced hitherto. The advance from stone to metal was not so immensely pregnant with results as the step from hunting to agriculture and cattle-breeding; perhaps we may compare it with the invention of the steam-engine and the harnessing of electrical power. Great empires arose with wealthy sovereigns who learned to rule and administer. The smith became a necessity, the knight a possibility, though there were no horses till after 2000 B.C. Luxury and leisure came into being, technical methods and the arts made progress.

The origin of writing was the realization that images and symbols, which had long existed and always conveyed some meaning, could

be used for any communications and records desired. Man thus found himself faced with the problem of presenting everything in images. In order to achieve that he had to realize also that he could use the images to signify sounds and reproduce words ; thence arose the problem of writing all words. The cultural advance which thus became possible was immense ; men now began to attempt to force the whole world within the compass of a complete system and survey to represent and express all the many-sidedness of reality. So theory came into being. Reality must be reconciled with reality, the original with the copy, image with sound (the search for the essential), and so pictorial magic re-emerged, together with verbal magic, and in addition man was schooled anew in logical and artistic thought and expression. Literature came into being, practical in character at first : written administrative documents, then precepts of wisdom and science (compilations and surveys), and lastly poetry as an art. The people were divided into literate and illiterate. A class of scribes arose and rapidly became more important than the smiths. Knowledge came to mean the knowledge of letters, the centre of gravity in education shifted to the field of instruction, and schools became necessary. Hitherto everybody had been able to learn everything, now the mere preliminary step of learning to read and write took years and involved special training. But in return it matured the mind ; people learned to think and calculate and review their experience. Theory as a creative art and differentiation made their appearance, as also theory in the form of empty scholastic guesswork and pseudo-science : "scholasticism" appeared as the use and abuse of learning. There is no doubt that writing was invented in Egypt and Babylon more or less at the same time (about 2800 B.C.) and independently. Much later the Cretans and Hittites, the Chinese and the Maya peoples made the same advance, also independently.

I shall first give an account of Egyptian and Babylonian civilization. They were followed by Cretan civilization, which arose later than the other two ; its flowering-time was about 2000 B.C. But it was much earlier than the next great civilizations of the Jews and Greeks. The Cretans invented an alphabet and created a civilization which remained independent and did not, like that of the Hittites, fall under subjection to others. They developed their system of writing, abbreviated, simplified, and systematized it until the alphabet was complete in the form upon which all civilizations of our group base their own. All later forms, therefore, assume its existence at once as basis and transitional form.

## A. EGYPTIAN CIVILIZATION<sup>1</sup>

### RACIAL FORMATION AND POLITICAL HISTORY

Not one racial fusion was the basis of Egyptian civilization but, as in the case of China and India, several in succession, each supplanting its predecessor. Its seeming homogeneity is due to the fact that the achievements which followed upon the later crossing of races did not greatly surpass those of the oldest stock, the creators of the Ancient Empire; both represented the same level of human development. On this level the earliest race gave birth to Egyptian civilization (as did the infusion of Chou blood in China and of Aryan in India). Later races rose to a somewhat higher level in Egypt's greatest moments; their work was more individual and they perfected technical methods (as happened in China after the infusion of T'ang or Sung blood). Finally they fell below the early level (like the Mongols and Manchus in China) until the ancient land underwent a process of modernization by the more advanced civilization of the Greeks and Romans (as the Europeans modernized China in the nineteenth century) and was incorporated in the wider unity of world civilization.

The oldest Egyptians sprang from the fusion of several older races in Upper Egypt. One parent-race was non-Semitic, founded an Empire with its capital at Coptos (Kebti), and gave the coming race the essential basis of its language; it joined with Semitic and African elements. This must have happened about 3300 B.C., for the new mixed race came to maturity about 2800 B.C., and the interval between the original fusion and the first prime of a people is 500 years.<sup>2</sup> The dominant stock in the coming Egyptian race came from the home of Neolithic solar religion and agricultural civilization, by what road we do not know. It is difficult to attribute a name to this people, for the graves at Naga-ed-Der seem to date from beyond 2000 B.C.; I have suggested "Tehenu Egyptians". The national god of this pre-Egyptian Empire of Coptos was called "Min"; he was a sun-god in the shape of a bull, represented with the phallus, and he carried the double-axe (sheathed, in fact, like

<sup>1</sup> My *Kultur und Denken der alten Ägypter* (Kröner, Leipzig) and my essay on *Die jungsteinzeitliche Sonnenreligion in alten Babylonien und Ägypten* (Hinrichs, Leipzig) constitute preliminary studies for this section.

<sup>2</sup> See my *Philosophie der Geschichte*, vol. ii, chap. 4 (Hirt, Breslau).

Min of Crete at a later date) as a sceptre and weapon ; his consort, cow to bull, was called "Hathor"—"the house of Hor", that is of the youthful sun-god whom she concealed and gave birth to. Min, the old man, therefore ascended the throne afresh in the new year in the person of his own son, Horus, having lost it by death. His murderer, the dark brother, must have been called Set, for it was him that Horus deprived of sovereignty. The consciousness that Min and Hor were one and the same long persisted in Egypt ; in hymns Min continues to be "the bull that mates with his mother", and round about 2000 B.C. there was still Min-Hor religious speculation based upon their original unity, though meantime the father of Horus had received the name Osiris and had become the god of the dead. For us, looking back, this worship of Min is important because it gives us the names of gods of the Neolithic solar religion of the period between 4000 and 3000 B.C. in one of the regions to which it had migrated ; if we look forward, it is important because in it we have the germ from which the higher religion of Egypt evolved. We can trace the influence of the material civilization brought by emigrants from the lands peopled by sun worshippers, who came to Upper Egypt at the time of the Min dynasty, in the construction of canals, and the division of the country for purposes of settlement and government into city nomes. The principal implements were still made of stone until Egypt's first civilization approached its prime. Nor did funeral customs change materially ; the kings of the Min dynasty must have been buried in mounds ; even the Naga-ed-Der warriors were buried in a crouching posture.

Egyptian history begins with the northward march of "Horus of Edfu", and its earliest memory is of "the followers of Horus". They were a princely clan whose home was at Edfu, far to the south, and whose totem and coat-of-arms was the falcon. In the senile Min Empire this clan represented the new "Egyptian civilization" when the new racial mixture reached cultural maturity. They overthrew the Min dynasty. The god Min lost the emblems of sovereignty, the shape of a bull and the axe as sceptre (though this continued to be his hieroglyph, but without its handle). He retained divine honours, however, as the god of a provincial town and of the roads to the east ; his emblems became a crown of feathers, the phallus, and the whip ; His consort became the independent sovereign of Denderah ; she remained a cow and the mother of Hor. But Hor ceased to be a young bull and took the shape of a falcon, making Edfu his home. His avenging campaign against Set (who likewise ceased

to be a bull and became a horned monstrosity) came to represent the earthly victorious march of the Followers of Horus down the Nile. Set was established first in Ombos, close to Edfu, then in Oxyrynchus in Central Egypt, later at Tanis in the Delta, and last of all in the deserts beyond the confines of Egypt. Thus Horus became the lord of civilization ; Set remained his enemy, the king of all non-Egyptians, all uncivilized peoples, all "rebels". The dark brother had become a national enemy. The Horus campaign was completed by Menes, who seems to have borne the royal title "Nar-Mer". He pushed forward into the Delta, subdued it, and founded the citadel of the future city Hiku-ptah (Memphis), which is said to have given Egypt its name in the days of the Greeks. He was the first to wear the two crowns of Upper and Lower Egypt. He established new cities in the Delta, which continued long after his day to be chiefly pasture with unsettled boundaries, and was only gradually transformed into arable land. In the monuments of his victories we find the new Egyptian writing and art in their finished form. Under him the use of writing for administrative purposes must have begun, and written calendrical calculations. He must, therefore, have lived about 2800 B.C. for the first Sothic year (a cycle of  $4 \times 365 = 1,460$  years) began in 2786 B.C.

Egyptian history begins with Menes ; he founded the Ancient Empire, which flourished from about 2800 B.C. to 2300 B.C. Under his immediate successors the Delta was firmly attached to the empire, and civilization was assimilated by a small upper class. A revolutionary period followed ; the kings were forced to fly to Upper Egypt, and Set names appear side by side with Horus names. The great pyramid builders, in particular Cheops (Khufu), were the first to rule the whole country from Memphis once more (the fourth dynasty, about 2600-2500 B.C.). Under their rule Egypt experienced the second prime of her earliest culture. It was more widely shared and great works were produced : in addition to the first great edifices, many important monuments of plastic art were created, the earliest literature developed, and religious speculation on a grand scale had its beginning. With this culture the Ra kings of the fifth Dynasty came into power ; their rule lasted for 125 years, during which period the first Egyptian nation stood at the zenith of its culture. Under succeeding rulers the citadel of Menes became one with the shifting royal camp ; the new capital received the name of Memphis. Then the empire was broken up as a result of internal disorders and attacks from without (2300 B.C.).

This penetration of the Delta by the new race from Upper Egypt, their construction of canals and their settlements, from about 2800 B.C. onwards, naturally led to a second fusion of races in the Delta. And so, just as the Ancient Empire collapsed, the second Egyptian race that sprang from this fusion came to maturity. Consequently the period of disorder between 2300 and 2100 B.C. was the beginning of a new flowering-time which found expression, not, indeed, in political influence and in great architectural and artistic works, but in a great literature. Two kings of Herakleopolis, who ruled the Delta and fought against Upper Egyptian kings at Thebes, wrote Precepts. The profoundest work of Egyptian literature, *The Dialogue between a Man Weary of Life and his Soul*, belongs to this period, and paved the way for a new morality and a deeper piety. Thereafter all Egypt was united once more from Thebes, which remained the capital. Usertsen III (Sesostris), the most important sovereign of the Twelfth Dynasty (the Middle Empire), which ruled about 2000-1800 B.C., conquered Nubia and established an agricultural colony there; his successor brought Fayyum under cultivation. The kings' faces as portrayed by art now became more individual, and at the same time tales of adventure were written in which the heroes were not kings, and a magical romance telling how the pious sons of the priest of Ra of Sakebu overthrew the tyrants of the Fourth Dynasty. Mathematics and medicine flourished also. About 1700 B.C. this second Egyptian culture had likewise run its course. It collapsed beneath the attack of a wave of peoples invading the Delta, the Hyksos, partly of Semitic descent. For about a century Egypt was under foreign rule.

After a prolonged struggle liberation came from Upper Egypt, supported by the young peasant colonies of the Twelfth Dynasty in Nubia, and the country was united once more. Aahmes took the capital of the Hyksos in the Delta about 1580 B.C., and pushed on, in the first instance towards Palestine, thus founding the New Empire (1600-1100 B.C.). His heirs were the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, under which Egypt conquered and held Syria. Thothmes III (1480-1450 B.C.) pushed his frontiers as far as the Euphrates. Assyria, Babylon, and Crete sent him presents. The kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty are the Hohenstaufen of Egypt, more individual than any previous rulers, the leading men of the age. At their court we observe a gentler humanity, friendship, and the love of women. Under Amenhetep III (1415-1380 B.C.) this third phase of Egyptian culture reached its zenith, based as it must have been upon a fusion of races

beginning about 2300-2200 B.C. In architecture and plastic art, the most finished of the smaller and the mightiest of the great works were brought to perfection. In literature we have chivalrous romances and love-songs as well as social satire. Historical literature flourished and merged in poetry. Even religious speculation assumed the form of narrative poetry. Amenhetep IV aspired higher still, and succeeded as far as he personally was concerned; he founded a new, natural religion, worshipping the beneficent sun in a new capital, and a new art which derived its ideal of beauty from his own person. Reaction followed. Religious influence was brought to bear against the royal heresy and gained a wider hold on the people. The priests of Amen in Thebes became leaders of the masses and legitimized the new Nineteenth Dynasty, which endeavoured to maintain Egypt's collapsing power in Syria and Palestine from 1350 to 1200 B.C. The Hittites, then a tribe of Israel in Palestine, and finally the Philistines, Achaeans, and Etruscans, appeared upon Egypt's horizon as enemies. Mercenary armies were required to push them back, for the peasants had lost their vigour and martial qualities.

When Egypt extended her boundaries to Syria she came into close touch for the first time with a more advanced civilization, that of Babylon. The Egyptians had learned to use Babylonian script, which was the universal medium of communication in the diplomacy and commerce of Hither Asia. At the same time they themselves approached more nearly to the level of Babylonian civilization; a bourgeois, priestly class began to play a part and Amenhetep IV's heresy raised them to power. The Egyptians did not want to borrow from the Babylonians; where they did borrow anything, such as the story of the Flood or of Gilgamesh, they distorted and caricatured it; it was certainly not only inability to do better which caused them to transform the Flood into a flood of beer, and the glorious hero Gilgamesh into a dwarf and a god of the toilet. But the sacerdotal spirit of Babylon might give support unobserved to the claims of the Egyptian priests, and the increased Semitic element in the race, which made itself felt about 1200 B.C. as a result of the Hyksos invasion of 1700, was bound to bring the Egyptians nearer to the Babylonian mixed racial type. Rameses II (1300-1230 B.C.) the most famous king of the Nineteenth Dynasty, made his residence in the east of the Delta, where the empire had to be defended. He was more religious in the Babylonian sense than the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty. The energetic Rameses III

(1200-1169 B.C.) managed once more to defend the frontiers of the empire, or at least the Delta, from the barbarians, but after him the kings of the Twentieth Dynasty became mere puppets of the priests of Amen at Thebes.

This was the end of the third phase of Egyptian civilization. Further racial fusions, down to Hellenic times, resulted in no new creative power to outstrip past achievements. Libyan and Ethiopian princes ruled the land, which finally experienced a last flowering-time under the princes of Saïs in the Delta (663-525 B.C.); the power of Psamthek I was founded by Assyrians, Greek mercenaries secured the rule of his dynasty, and Persians made an end of it. This last phase of culture, perhaps the outcome of a Libyan-Egyptian fusion in the Delta after the death of Rameses III (about 1170 B.C.), looked to the Ancient Empire for all its ideals, copying its style with facile insipidity but technical skill.

#### CONSTITUTION AND GROWTH OF SOCIAL CLASSES

From the outset Egypt was a kingdom and so she remained to the end, but the character of the kingship changed in the course of time from the original tribal monarchy (more or less corresponding to that of the Merovingians) to something resembling the conditions prevailing in the late Middle Ages in Germany (the Hohenstaufen). Finally we find the priests exercising authority under "tyrants", generally of foreign birth.

The immigrant race who afterwards came to power brought the monarchy with them in prehistoric times (3300 B.C.). The Min Dynasty of Coptos reigned in place of their god Min; doubtless their rule was absolute in principle like that of a god, but in fact archaic royal power of this religious and national type is always restricted by religious obligations and popular customs, and also by the liberty of warriors who, when they settle, naturally wish to be masters in their freely acquired possessions. In the primeval State of the Min period the ruling race must have undergone a transformation, as always happens, when they settled and intermarried with others. In the end the lords of cities and provinces with their retinues confronted the kings as an independent landed aristocracy, and the Min Dynasty, senile and stripped of all its possessions, was doomed to perish.

It was supplanted by the provincial princes of Edfu, the falcon kings of Horus, who, partly no doubt by means of treaties with

other provincial princes, seized power and set out on the Horus campaign to unite Egypt. This campaign led them far north, and here they colonized, built towns, and turned pasture into arable land. After a prolonged period of retrogression (the Set names of the kings of the second Dynasty) the monarchy of the Ancient Empire established itself firmly in the Fourth Dynasty, and in the Fourth, Fifth, and Sixth Dynasties ruled the whole country from Memphis.

These kings of the Ancient Empire ruled Upper Egypt, the southern region, through hereditary provincial princes, who were high priests and governors and supreme judges in their own nomes, with their own administrative service. At court they formed a group of "Great Ones of the Southern Tens", whereas the court officials of Lower Egypt, the northern region, did not constitute a group of "Great Ones of the North"; they held various offices in various nomes, but never all the offices in one nome. This proves that in the south (which always takes precedence in titles) the king was *primus inter pares* (the period of retrogression under the second Dynasty must have served the interests of the counts of the nomes who supported the king); in the north, on the contrary, he was sovereign; the conquered land must have been allotted for the most part to the king. The royal residence at the entrance to the Delta was not only near the frontiers of the Delta, which were constantly threatened, especially from the east; it was also situated near the royal domains. For though the king had everywhere the right to receive taxes, to command labour, to check expenditure, and levy troops, yet the chief source of his power lay in his immense landed estates in the Delta; added to these were the royal mining and trading prerogatives. Throughout the period of the Ancient Empire the administrative bodies of the south and the north remained absolutely separate, and the kings persisted in their endeavour to reduce the governors of the nomes in the south to a dependent position by placing them on an equality with those of the north. These efforts failed; in fact, the governors of the northern nomes appear rather to have become independent, hereditary princes in the end, like their fellows in the south.

Whilst the material foundation of the monarchy in the Ancient Empire was its great territorial possessions in the Delta (and these continued to the end of the dynasty to augment in value, being turned from pastures to arable land), its intellectual foundation lay in the newly constituted class of scribes. In pre-historic Egypt the people were divided into two sections, besides the king: the great

landed nobility and the peasants. During the period of the Ancient Empire a third section, which soon became a separate class, pushed its way between the two. These were the scribes, and they rose to paramount importance in virtue of the division of labour which now set in. The craftsmen (smiths and workers in wood and stone), and the potters did not attain to such a position of importance as the scribes. They, too, had their own gods and the patron saints of their craft (Thoth for the scribes, Ptah of Memphis for the craftsmen, Khnemu, the "inventor" of the potter's wheel, for the potters). True, the craftsmen emerged from the peasant masses and rose to civic dignity in the towns. But the scribes entered the ruling class to whom the future belonged.

For the Egyptians learning to write was and remained to the end a wearisome business, demanding special talent and great patience and industry; but in return an able scribe would rise to a position of power. A man who could write could govern; the king and the counts of the nomes needed his services in the administration. A man who could write was educated; his master taught him, together with writing and the art of government, that courtly demeanour which was held to be one with good morals; he was taught, too, whatever there was in the way of theoretical science, a general knowledge of the world (expressed in hieroglyphs) and arithmetic. In this way a class was raised above the mass of the people by the selection of gifted scribes and men of ability, trained by the best teachers. Of such men the king in particular had need to administer his immense estates and keep the hereditary nobility in check. The vizier Ptah-hetep, at the time of the Fifth Dynasty, described in his *Precepts* the ideal of the scribes: "humanity elevated by the command of writing, by knowledge and manners." At an even earlier date the monuments represent these scribe-officials as great men at court, well fitted for all the higher administrative posts, and sometimes as generals (like the bishops at the time of the Ottos in Germany). By the end of the Ancient Empire the upper ranks of this rising aristocracy had merged in the class of hereditary counts of the nomes (especially in the north). The ancient nobility had learnt to write and their sons attended the court school.

Then the Ancient Empire collapsed under the burden of internal disorder and attacks from without. In two nomes, Herakleopolis and Thebes, a process of transformation began and the Middle Empire slowly merged and was united at last under Thebes (about 2000 B.C.). In the Middle Empire the king was still at least "an

earthly god", Horus himself, as he had been since the days of Menes. But the *Instructions to Merikere*, a book of wisdom for kings, demands that he should be educated as a writer and orator, that he should be humble in the presence of the gods, just, merciful, temperate, and wise in the choice of helpers, selecting them for their ability and not their birth. And the *Instructions of Amenemhat* recall memories of conspiracies and dangers in the royal house. The modern, humaner kings were confronted with an hereditary provincial nobility in the south and the north, and depended upon their personal ability and the support of their own house. The power of the royal house was slight, and the kings sought eagerly to increase it in Nubia and Fayyum. Their principal revenues came from quarrying, mining, and commercial enterprises, besides the taxes which they received from the counts of the nomes. At the court the Chief Treasurer secured dominant power, and the military element became more prominent in expeditions. On occasions towns were separated from their nomes, possibly in order to play off the citizens against the nome counts. The scribes now constituted a large class, but somewhat fallen from their high estate; the *Teachings of Dwauf* still exhorted students to work hard and diligently because the profession of scribe freed a man from servile labour, provided him with a livelihood, and raised him to the ruling class; but we hear no more of elevated humanity and of the king's court, only of administrative posts. On the other hand, the priests came to the fore, together with the military. Piety, it seems, raised the kings of the Fifth Dynasty, the sons of Ra, to the throne, and in the *Precepts of Ptah-hetep* and *Merikere* the doctrine is stressed that the Deity orders all things according to his will. This must have raised the authority of the priests; they too had meantime become educated men, scribes. And now the time approached when they were to develop the new learning to its religious consummation and take it under their direction. That was something new in Egypt. In the Ancient Empire every king, every nome count or governor, perhaps every father of a family, and likewise every queen, princess, and mother, was also a priest or priestess after some fashion. The professional priest, the magician, had a definite position and definite, specialized knowledge, but no peculiar sanctity, a state of affairs which may have dated back to the solar civilizations of the Stone Age, when everyone could master the whole field of knowledge and could become a sun-god in death, or at least the sun-god's vassal. In the intervening time the art of writing had divided the people,

and he who had mastered the technique of priesthood necessarily became a priest in a higher sense.

In the New Empire the kings really were lords of the land, and far beyond its frontiers, by the will of the gods, primarily Amen of Thebes, and in virtue of their armed power that had ejected the Hyksos and subdued the rebels in the Nile Valley. There were now no longer any hereditary nome counts besides themselves; their officials held absolute sway throughout the land. An "Overseer of the Granaries" at the court announced the taxes annually according to a calculation of the height of the Nile waters, and collected them. An "Overseer of the Silver Storehouse" controlled all the treasure gathered in in the form of precious metal and objects of value, and provided for court expenditure on decorations, works of art, and travel. Possibly tribute and commercial profits also came under his management. Besides the civil officials there was an army consisting at first of peasants and later of mercenaries, and led by officers or "scribe-commanders". These official services came to be classified in definite ranks with regular promotion, a system which must have stood the test of experience. Nothing was systematically worked out, neither pay nor the conception of military obedience nor even of honour, but all was there in the germ.

But not only was the king lord of the land, he was lord by divine right; he was "the earthly god" in a new sense, the chosen favourite of the gods. In his capital of Thebes he stood before Amen in the temple as his son, who owed his world sovereignty to his father, though he had won it and held it himself. He stood high above all the priests. For the first time pure blood counted, legitimate birth. Two of the ablest kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty, Thothmes I and III, made way for more legitimate relatives, the latter for his totally unworthy wife. This divine right strengthened the crown, as it strengthened the Popes in Europe in the twelfth century. King Amenhetep III took advantage of his divine freedom to develop along very human and artistic lines, and his son, Amenhetep IV, went even further: he desired to be nothing but the beloved of the Deity, but it must be the true Deity, the sun's Disk with its thousand hands scattering blessings, the creator and animator of all things, who loved his son, the king, above all else and guided his footsteps. He therefore challenged Amen of Thebes, his father's god in human and even animal form, the conqueror of the Hyksos; he abandoned the capital and built a new one, Khut-Aten, in the middle of the Nile Valley, which he determined never to leave.

The divine right of the Eighteenth Dynasty might have developed into a seventeenth century modern monarchy, but the logical intermediate steps were lacking, full monotheism and the beginnings of monism. A hieratic Papal monarchy with a major-domo might have grown out of it. The major-domo, Harmhab, existed already, but what actually developed was the sovereignty of the priests of Amen: the priesthood was heir to the monarchy.

They were required to solve the greatest problem of the age, to unite all the gathered knowledge of the scribes in a homogeneous religious system and to bring it home to the people. They solved it by making a class of wide and holy men, beloved of the gods, themselves in fact, the mediators between god and man; in this way they allied themselves with every element of society that showed itself capable of wielding authority.

In the first instance that meant the kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty, who restored the collapsing empire. They became the sons of Amen, like the former rulers, but they laid more stress on the doctrine that Amen did everything for them and through them alone; and they were consecrated as priests. This last powerful monarchy in Egypt was still a divine monarchy: the dividing line between god and man was never drawn, as it was in Babylon even for kings. The king remained the earthly god, represented as being no less great than his divine forefathers. He assumed the priestly character because he saw the implication; he submitted to the teaching and guidance of the priests from religious motives and because he was the weaker party. He was just, and merciful to the people as a man of piety, but he had no sense of sin and he bound himself by no laws, as did the Babylonian kings. There were no penitential psalms in Egypt and no laws, like those of Khammurabi, though latterly there may have been records of the accepted principles of equity on the Babylonian model, kept and expounded by the priests. The kings of the Twentieth Dynasty after Rameses III were puppets, not in the hands of a major-domo but of the priests of Amen. Then one of the priests of Amen, Her-Heru, tried to make himself a divine king, and fell. All subsequent kings were "tyrants", men of violence, who ruled in virtue of their mercenaries or other troops; they were tolerated by the gods and had, therefore, to be endured, but the priests hated and despised them. The best among them were the foreigners, whether believers like the Ethiopians or unbelievers like the Assyrians and Persians; they were paid to maintain peace. But even the Shashanqs and Psemtheks, who professed to be Egyptians, were outsiders at

bottom: they were a police-force in the service of the theocratic State.

That State refused to recognize any kind of warrior class except as a necessary evil. In the New Empire a knightly class had begun to arise. The Hyksos had adopted a new means of fighting with chariots drawn by horses, and this had proved its value in the war of liberation. During the wars, too, an officer class came into being and soon acquired education; the "scribe-commanders", inconvenient rivals for the civilian officials, men who set a value on the new humanities at court, on friendship and the love of women, and who wrote love-songs and romances, might have united with these officers and created a knightly culture; it was through similar elements that our own chivalrous era came to flower at the time of the Hohenstaufen. In Egypt the development was checked half way and the priests held the field. Their philosophy of life had no place for men of violence, which was unnecessary and an abomination to the gods.

The priests did, however, ally themselves with the citizen class, who learned to write in the New Empire and silently grew to be an important element in the towns through their piety and respectability. *The Maxims of Ani*, dating from the Nineteenth Dynasty, contain the doctrine prevailing in such circles and represent their ideals. The royal commercial prerogatives, when lost by the kings, passed to this citizen class and to the priests. They never attained to the importance of the Babylonian citizen class, which had been concluding treaties and carrying on trade in that flourishing constitutional State since before 2000 B.C. It was not till after 1000 B.C., when Egypt's greatness had faded, that the citizen class allied itself closely with the priests and secured a dominant position in the Egyptian towns. Priests and citizens made the Egyptians the most religious people in the world and realized the ideal of a theocratic State on a petty scale, a State ruled and protected by tyrants, proving its piety by the zeal with which the faithful in the nomes, even including the popular masses, wielded the cudgel in the cause of religion.

Egypt's constitutional and social development, therefore, followed Babylon's, but did not go quite so far.

#### ARCHITECTURE AND SCULPTURE IN THE ROUND

We can only infer the beginnings of Egypt's great architecture from the royal tombs, which go back little further than the time of

**Menes.** They were built with air-dried brick and wood, and all that remains, therefore, is what was intended to last for ever. The tomb-dwelling of Menes has wooden pillars, and a columned roof is erected above the enthroned king in the picture ; we may conclude, therefore, that the royal hall was built upon pillars, though possibly not in the form of the megaron. The picture of a hut with wicker-work walls, and two posts by way of decoration, may perhaps represent a temple. But the archaic statues of the god Min, certainly prehistoric (the period of the Min kings), can only have stood in a building of considerable size. At first the royal tombs were chambers in burial-mounds ; in the case of Menes the brickwork mound is embellished with pillared gates and contains several chambers ; under his successors the burial-chambers in the mound faced eastwards and were roofed with beams ; they were provided with niches and in exceptional cases were partly of stone. The first stone burial-chamber made its appearance at the end of the Second Dynasty. Then the mastaba was perfected, a cubic brickwork mound with an open chapel and a closed, protected inner chamber ; it appeared first as a royal tomb and afterwards for the graves of private persons.

During the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties the great pyramids appeared with their tomb temples, and also temples of the sun, both the outcome of the revived solar religion, which now developed into the worship of Ra, distinct from the religion of Osiris. The great pyramids, regarded as world miracles not by antiquity alone, developed from the Neolithic dolmens ; they had grown to vast dimensions, and were geometrically shaped and built with all the skill of the artist. The dead king entered the mountain-side ; he was no longer to re-emerge, however, like the sun, but to dwell there by night as the Ra statue and to come out by day into the sunlight whenever he wished ; in fact, he dwelt in the solar bark. The visual comparison with the year's course had led the Neolithic peoples to a conclusion which promised resurrection to their princes, but this train of reasoning had lost its cogency, for the sun does not die in Egypt but "lives in his own blood". Nevertheless, the Neolithic burial-mound reached its consummation in Egypt as a vast, eternal, indestructible monument. Just as the pyramids are derived from dolmens, so are the solar sanctuaries (Abu Gurab) from the stone circles of the north ; the obelisks are menhir stones. But once again speculative thought had changed the meaning of the sanctuaries. Astronomical solar observations and the calculation of the new year had become minor concerns, and the rising of the Nile governed the year's labours ;

the Nile, too, was the "bull", the fertilizer of the land, together with the sun who had become a falcon. The obelisk, therefore, was not so much the phallus as an index of the sun's course, an upward pointing emblem of love; on its bright surface, often plated with metal, the sun rejoiced to reflect his rays. But the idea of the sun as the bringer of the seasons, the joy-giver and fecundator of animals and man, remained and found expression in reliefs: thus it came that the sanctuary of Ra was a court facing eastward crowned by an obelisk (60 metres in height at Abu Gurab) and surrounded by buildings; the great altar of the sun stood in the middle, upon which burnt offerings and libations were placed. And at Abu Gurab it can be proved that there was an immense solar bark walled in on one side of the sanctuary.

Thus Egyptian speculative thought at once consummated and destroyed the solar sanctuary of the Stone Age. But from its ruins something new arose: the stone temple. And here the Egyptians created something wholly original and of enduring grandeur. The sun is in the sky; he needed no house in Neolithic days nor did he need any in Egypt, but only a place where he might be freely worshipped in the open air. But other gods had grown to importance in Egypt beside the sun-god. The totem animals of the Stone Age had become the gods of nomes and cities, and they had need of dwellings. Even Min of Coptos, though he was still a sun-god, had images in the capital of the rising empire (a phallic man with a double-axe and a bull's head), and of course he had a house too. The gods of other nomes were distinguished from him and formed a pantheon comprising figures, half human, half animal, and the gods of particular classes; and these, too, were given images and houses. But first and foremost Osiris must have acquired a sanctuary with his family, where he might dwell on earth and re-live the sacred legend; in the process of differentiation of the solar worship by speculative thought he had become the true man-god, as also a god of vegetation and of the dead.

Almost all the houses of gods dating from the Ancient and Middle Empire have been lost. Some of those from the New Empire have been preserved. Under the control of sovereigns who had all the resources and workers they desired and beautiful stone at their command, the concrete logic and technical skill of the Egyptians have here created the earliest perfect pillared temples of stone; there are small, finished masterpieces and vast surrounding structures with almost too many parts; all are richly coloured and all dominated by

upward aspiring lines from the horizontal (the cube). Amenhetep III left a little temple which stands upon a high substructure with steps in front ; it is surrounded on three sides by pillars and rounded columns, and is the forerunner of the Greek *peripteros*. He, too, built the mightiest parts of the temple of Amen at Thebes, approached by a road with images of rams and sphinxes on either side. The road leads through a gigantic stone gate (pylon) into the outer court of the sanctuary, surrounded by pillars, with royal statues and pictures on the walls showing the deeds of kings and the service of the gods ; thence into the pillared hall with its starry roof and its loftier central nave, anticipating the basilicas of Hellenistic and Roman architecture ; the road ends at the Holy of Holies, the dark chamber concealing the sacred picture of a boat. Egyptian builders were the first to design the principal types of pillared temple, that is the outer temple surrounded by pillars, and the columned hall with light from above which constituted the inner temple ; naturally, therefore, they first perfected its chief ornament, the column. This appeared in the Ancient Empire as a square pillar and as the Proto-Doric column, which is simply fluted, rises from a round pedestal, and is capped with a square abacus ; in wood it had probably even then developed into the lotus, papyrus, and palm column, which then became the prevalent forms in stone. Pillars carved like plants sometimes appeared single, sometimes as clustered flower stalks or single palm stems ; it was held that they must be clustered (several stems or palm branches) if they were to bear the weight required and stand together beneath the abacus. Thanks to accurate observation of nature, the play of forces under a weight was directly perceived by the Egyptian builders without any abstract calculation. Finally, such a hall embellished with plant-like columns recalls the sacred grove of the Neolithic sanctuary, with the stars moving in their courses overhead. The palaces and villas of the Egyptians, too, were new creations, with their entrance and reception halls, their facilities for dining and bathing, their outer gardens and inner gardens artistically laid out round lakes. Here we find the magnificent, the comfortable, and the convenient dwelling-house developed for the first time, and developed quite independent of outside influence. No fortresses have been preserved, but we know of one gigantic structure, the oldest defensive wall protecting a whole country, which shut out the nomads on the east from the Delta. The Egyptians built great dykes and canals in the Nile Delta and then began to construct a canal joining the Mediterranean and the Red Sea. The

royal tombs of the New Empire were no longer pyramids, but labyrinths, hardly less marvellous, in the rocky western slope of the desert near Thebes. They, too, were fortified excavations in the hillside, but artificially constructed and embellished with long rows of pictures, some illustrating beliefs about the Underworld.

To this day Egyptian architecture is the most striking evidence of Egypt's contribution to the development of civilization: regular stone buildings and the use of columns, especially in temples, were invented by the builders of Egypt. The Greeks were their pupils, and received from them the idea in embryo for their own temples and columned edifices, the works of a more abstract and theoretical art, but artistically purer and lovelier and richer in their harmonious unity. Egypt's gigantic tombs remained the last and highest achievement of a dying, archaic world of thought.

About the time of Menes, Egyptian plastic art made a great advance, like all other branches of culture. Before this period there were statues of the god Min of Coptos, long, rectangular blocks of stone, the arms not separated from the main block, the legs and dress barely indicated. Afterwards we find single figures and groups, still stiff and showing only the front view, but with the limbs distinctly shaped; most of them are in one of two positions, either seated or standing upright. Their faces are expressionless, their collar-bones are not always correctly placed; where the limbs join the body the supports are left, and the muscles are indicated by hard surfaces; but the sculptors had learned to distinguish male and female figures. These were sculptures of large proportions. Miniature plastic art in clay and ivory had already achieved greater freedom in portraying the human figure (an ancient king from Abydos) and animals at the time of Menes (the Followers of Horus at Naga ed-Der).

The habit of visual imagery had a clarifying, simplifying, and systematizing influence which provided a basis for great plastic art and an Egyptian style. It developed the burial-mound into the sharply outlined geometric form of the pyramid, and it created in architecture the simple and natural little temple, the several forms of the column, and the great temples divided into pylon, court, hall, and holy of holies. In plastic art it produced types of the human figure standing and sitting (which were improved in time by small variations and new detail); their proportions were tested with the utmost care for every height and then systematized, remaining unchanged on the whole till quite a late era. The bright-coloured Egyptian statues are always front face and form one block with the

seat and the ground; the relative sizes indicate man, woman, and children; they were never distinct from reliefs. Nevertheless, they did go through a process of development.

As early as the Fourth and Fifth Dynasties the figures of noblemen had become quite life-like, though still severe and dignified in demeanour as of old. This applies particularly to the faces, which are plainly successful likenesses, true to life—apparently real portraits. But if we look more closely we see that they are nevertheless types; the characteristic marks of temperament, age, and calling are stressed (King Khaf-Ra in youth and age, the full-fledged village Sheikh, the lean and learned scribe-official); so, too, in the figure the sculptors had seized upon the marks of temperament and age, but with less detail and sometimes quite clumsily (the feet). Progress in the portrayal of individuality was due to pressure from without; the best figures are Ka-statues, laid in the grave with the dead in order to assure the soul of a similar body even in case of the dissolution or loss of his own, and, moreover, a free body, not confined to the coffin; for this reason the figures had to be the best possible likenesses. The capacity to hit a likeness was always better developed than the theoretical understanding of the problems of art. We observed the same in the magic pictures of the Palæolithic caves, and it applies equally in the present case: the Egyptian lacked free personality, and the representation of personality was not, therefore, a problem that concerned him. That phase was not reached till the fourth century B.C. in Greece. But the Egyptian sculptor's purpose required an exact likeness, and so he attained something resembling individuality. Necessity, however, trained him in technical skill, and so before long others besides Ka-statues were made to be good likenesses.

In the Middle Empire royal portraits made their appearance, with a certain similarity to the oldest German portrait, that of Rudolf of Hapsburg. In other monuments, too, the sovereigns portrayed are more individual than earlier kings; the royal families set the pace in individualization (the marriage of brothers and sisters); we find a more idealized type for younger heads, together with a more realistic one for older people; occasionally there is an attempt to portray a smile, the first step towards facial movement. At this period artists felt themselves equal to the most difficult technical exercises, working in the hardest kinds of stone and carving gigantic figures.

In the New Empire this process culminated under Amenhotep IV. The king's likeness is quite true to life, both in face and figure; equally lifelike are his mother, his wife, and especially one little

daughter. Here a very gifted artist (Thothmes) has accomplished a remarkable piece of work—with the aid of plaster masks and goaded by the royal command. How limited this power of individualization was is shown by the fact that the king's body became, so to speak, a basic and authoritative type for this reformed art; the really individual portrait was produced as an external exercise, not as the result of an inward urge; it was a practical, not a theoretical, problem. It vanished, therefore, along with the reforms; the portraits of Rameses II are like those of Khaf-Ra; though they smile more graciously, they are no more individualized than the female figures of Naumburg Cathedral.

The plastic art of the New Empire was equally capable of approaching the great problems of architecture, with its colossal statues of gods and kings (the "colossi of Memnon", Amenhetep III), its avenues of lions and rams and sphinxes, and supplying the minor needs of luxury trades, for which exorbitantly costly and over-ornamented figurines were in demand, like the miniatures of the Hohenstaufen period; plastic art was equal to all—within the limits of the period.

Beside the major arts, that of pottery was not very prominent in Egypt, but at least it advanced far beyond the Neolithic stage. At the time of the Followers of Horus (graves at Naga ed-Der) ceramic art had developed more varied forms than European spiral pottery: red and black vases with white painted figures and clay-coloured ones with red painted figures are found side by side, and also magnificent alabaster vessels. Later the concrete, visual imagination of the Egyptians perfected, clarified, and purified the forms of these vessels, and their advancing technical knowledge enabled them to make vases of hard stone, faience, and bronze. In the New Empire we find vessels with herbal ornamentation, and appropriately shaped; the neck was starred with flowers and a frill of leaves and blossoms fell over the shoulder.

The stone implements of the Egyptian Horus era (knives and points from the graves at Naga ed-Der) are the most beautiful and artistic of any that have been found. Stone was soon set aside in favour of metal, and during the period of the Ancient Empire metal entirely supplanted it. And therewith the Stone Age vanishes from our sight.

## RELIEFS AND PAINTINGS

The Egyptians were the first of all peoples to attempt a theoretical survey of the whole world, in all its parts and with all its mysteries. To this end they applied their enhanced powers of portrayal and, further, their enhanced though still slight power of abstraction. The result was a world survey embodied in visual imagery, in image-types. The intellectual element endowed their art with order and style from the outset, but hampered it later; it developed their writing beyond the merely pictorial and enabled it to represent sounds and general notions. The visual element preserved the vitality of their art, but later hampered their writing.

Egyptian reliefs appear in their finished form as early as the monuments of Nar-Mer (Menes), especially in the great memorial of his advance into the Delta: we find visual imagery with the addition of naturalist traits, supplemented by written characters. The division of the whole subject into scenes, representing moments of vital importance, is determined by concrete logic: every scene, every part of the scene, is "analysed", moreover, so that every essential point may be visualized and grasped. The space to be filled is divided for these reliefs into fields of varying size; all the pictures of action are in strips, persons and animals standing side by side in each strip or moving one behind the other; there is no depth. The rank and relative power of the actors are visually expressed in their relative size: this plan was perhaps devised in Egypt by the nameless sculptor of the Nar-Mer palette; it gives a remarkably clear and emphatic picture of the relation of events, and is a really great achievement, logically and artistically. Just as the whole action and each separate scene is simply analysed and ordered, so is every part, every figure, every object: everything in them that is essential, everything that denotes character and determines the true self, is to be visible and clear. The goddess Hathor, the mother of Horus Nar-Mer, looks in four directions upon the feats of the king. On the face of the stone she is no larger than the sovereign, and she is characterized by a human face frontwise, with the horns and ears of a cow. Nar-Mer, the man-god, and his chief officials are shown partly in profile; his kingly eye and broad breast are front-face, his face and forward striding legs are seen from the side; there is no arm covering a part of the body, no visible distortion, nothing obscure, for the apron conceals the twist in the lower part of the body; further, the king is indicated by his height, his royal robes, and his name, which was added; so, also, were his followers. The enemies are

indicated by distinguishing marks of race (hair and beard), by the fact that they are lying down or fleeing, and also by names. Animals and lifeless objects, as well as the human figures, are clearly outlined, and in the case of animals characteristic movements are sometimes indicated. On the palette of Nar-Mer a bull and falcon are depicted, on other contemporary palettes herds of oxen, asses, rams, antelopes, ibexes, and ostriches, besides lions and other beasts of prey. And the whole—god, man, beast, and object—is and remains a type, both in art and the hieroglyphs. The separate concrete types are united in groups, types of a higher order with a definite meaning: Nar-Mer is brandishing his club over the enemy who lies at his feet and whom he holds by the hair; that was the visual image for "the king's victory" right down to the New Empire, when warfare was transformed by the introduction of the chariot. Nar-Mer as a bull knocks down the walls of a town of which the ground-plan is drawn; other palettes depict the king with a plough, engaged in colonization; and the ornamentation of sceptres shows the sovereign enthroned at a great festival.

All this was crystallizing at the time of Menes. Plainly different methods were possible, but what was desired was to establish durable types, unmistakable indications of essential character, clear systems, style, and a script. For in that direction lay intellectual and artistic progress towards knowledge of the universe as a whole, towards the possibility of beautiful, skilled and æsthetically satisfying portrayal, towards dignity and sublimity. We possess a palette upon which a lion-hunt by seventeen warriors is "naturally" depicted, all stir and movement and with no arrangement in line order or according to size. Plainly this confused scene gave no satisfaction. There is a certain realism in the hunting pictures, especially in the representation of animals, and these pictures prove that man had gained in capacity since the cave period; now, however, he no longer painted for magic purposes, but freely and with matured theoretical knowledge. This capacity, however, was quite consciously used in order to create types from the surrounding world. The Nar-Mer palette still shows some traces of spatial depth (the beheaded figures), and of profiles (the populace) more freely drawn (complete profiles with the arm across the body). These methods were not forgotten but ceased to be customary, just as only certain typical acts of the kings became accepted and established.

The Nar-Mer palette celebrates a great victory, perhaps the decisive victory at the beginning of Egyptian history. It is a

historical monument of the first importance. But the manner of presentation strips these events of all historical features ; there remain only timeless types, incidents in every victory : the destruction of the enemy, the capture of his cities, the contemplation of beheaded "rebels" ; and these are composites of particular types : god, man, king, officials, enemies. It is only the inscription that adds names, the true historical element. And yet all this represents a great advance on the Stone Age, in which all the deeds of kings were wholly merged in the deed of the sun-hero. Nar-Mer, too, was "Horus, Hathor's son", the bull, the sun-hero, judge of the rebels ; but he has an individual monument, his achievement embraces earthly incidents (though they are types) and names.

Egyptian art developed Nar-Mer's heritage and added something to it. In the Ancient Empire it was customary to place long friezes in chapels to the dead ; all are coloured, and show the dead alone or with their wives, sitting at the door of the tomb before the altar, more than life-size ; or they are standing at the chapel door awaiting visitors, or inside inspecting their herds and possessions and receiving offerings. The surface is divided up by the large figures of nobles ; small pictures represent journeys down the Nile, shooting birds or hunting wild animals, games and dances, and the favourite occupations of the dead. Others show us all the happenings of daily life on the large estates, agricultural labours from seed-time to harvest, the gathering, threshing, and grinding of the corn, cattle-breeding, driving to pasture, and the selection of animals for slaughter, domestic labours such as slaughtering and baking, the potter's craft and boat-building, the chase of geese and gazelles. All this is justified as assuring to the dead the possession of these things ; in theory man gained control of the objects of his experience by fixing them visually in static types. In the Middle Empire we have in addition types of magnates carrying out their official duties ; they had themselves portrayed on official journeys, on the occasion of levies and marches, receiving Semite envoys when on frontier service ; in the New Empire they were also depicted at court introducing ambassadors, reading the report on the harvest, and receiving honours before Pharaoh. Moreover, the individual types increased in number : a multitude of racial types (foreign envoys with their gifts) and foreign animals and plants (Thothmes III) made their appearance. The interior and exterior of houses, gardens with ponds, chests and vessels with their contents—all provided opportunity for extraordinary combinations of plan and elevation, profile and cross-section. Natural dyes—

the Ancient Empire had seven and the New Empire fifteen—were likewise used for purposes of typification: men were brown and women yellow, water was blue and desert sand red. Within the principal types, especially those of gods and men, a recognized system developed of the most popular—that is, the most satisfying—proportions; these were not based upon theoretical considerations (the search for “harmony” consisting of simplicity and beauty of proportion), nor upon numerous measurements of finely built persons, but simply upon the artists’ desire to facilitate their work by means of routine forms once these were accepted as successful. On the other hand, typical figures and images tended to adopt new and realistic detail: in course of time certain portraits even of great men with the arms crossed over the breast were tolerated; this was no longer felt to detract from the decorum and proud repose of the figures. Among the common people there were not only wrestlers typified in various attitudes during the match, such as had existed in the Middle Empire, but dancing-girls in full whirl. Animals grew more and more natural. The artists ventured to depict marching troops and added more properties. They painted a scene of welcome in a house, and fishing in a garden pond. The portrayal of actual achievements, whether in battle or in spreading the blessings of peace, was reserved for the kings who represented Horus and, under the guidance of Ra or Amen, governed the world. True, the nobility were permitted after the Ancient Empire to recount their individual feats in the service of the State, but not to represent them pictorially. At rock bottom the Egyptians recognized one war only, that of Horus against Set, and only one beneficent state of peace, that of the victorious Horus. For this reason the representations of kings holding their enemies by the hair, or seated on thrones, of the Nar-Mer period, were placed only in the chapels of royal tombs, and in the pictures on the temple walls it was only the king who held direct communication with the gods. In the New Empire the kings became at once more divine and more human. Queen Hatshepsut (the consort of Thothmes III) was the first to have her birth and upbringing portrayed, with much assistance from the gods. She had her great expedition to the land of incense painted, too, in full detail, from her consultation of Amen concerning its advisability and her arrival in Punt to her return and the presentation of her report; and the inhabitants of Punt had been observed with scientific accuracy. Thothmes IV was the first to be depicted fighting in a chariot and driving over his enemies, who are represented as

a great multitude of small, unarmed men, one above the other. Amenhetep III included his wife in the ceremonial pictures. Without doubt there is a tendency here to enlarge the bounds of ancient custom, at least to depict the king in new and natural relations, more individually, if only because he was a god, and more freely ; a tendency, also, to replace the old representation of victory without depth by a real, new-fangled picture of a battle with modern weapons, the confusion of the fight, and the hosts of warriors. If we look closer, we see that new types had been created : the birth-scenes of Hatshepset and Amenhetep III are not family pictures but new ceremonial scenes, a variation of the birth of the child Horus. The picture of the war-chariot is a modern form of the symbolic picture of the victorious king, and Hatshepset's expedition to Punt is not the queen's personal act, but an expedition like those of a thousand earlier kings.

At this point Amenhetep IV stepped in as a reformer, also in the artistic sphere. He had himself portrayed with his mother and wife and children in the intimacy of family life, without elaborate robes (though the solar disc was still above his head), walking with his mother like a good son, holding tryst with his wife in the garden as a loving husband, at meals with his family, and about to kiss his little daughter. He, the champion of truth in religion, demanded truth in art likewise, a faithful presentation of nature. He and his wife were painted as they really were, with a truth to life which emphasized his narrow chest and protuberant stomach. Movements, too, were to be natural. The exaggerated portrayal of movement is evidence of the trouble taken by the artist to observe correctly because the king wished it. The aim is to break through the trammels of the unchanging type in which the movements are typical : the king is leaning on a staff, his body curiously twisted ; his arm is lifting up the child for a kiss and cuts across the picture ; his guards are running, as in a film. And a new formula has been devised for the perspective of the royal couple.

We have here the greatest movement for the liberation of Egyptian art and, much as it commands our admiration, it is itself the fullest proof of the limitations of that art. Amenhetep was depicted in such a human guise only because he felt himself to be altogether divine, beautiful, and exemplary in every act. And so it came about that his chance figure, with all its peculiarities, became the new type of beauty, to which others were made to approximate. The private life depicted was no longer bound by the old ceremonial, it was natural and free ; but for the Egyptians it remained a static

concept, a piece of everyday life transmuted into a divine form : the love of Horus for his mother and wife and children was portrayed, with the warm feelings of the divine son and the family man, but there was nothing personal in the sense of particular, unique experience and action. Moreover, these artists produced something new because the king required it ; they applied their old ability to reproduce outline and movement realistically, under newer and freer conditions. They were still far from regarding the natural portrayal of figures and the study of movement as a theoretical problem, otherwise the whole would not have been once more immediately fixed in types. The best work of Crete illustrates a different stage of progress.<sup>1</sup>

Nevertheless, Egyptian art attained under Amenhetep IV the highest of which it was capable. It became un-Egyptian, excelling Egypt in its unattained aim, and finally lagging behind Egypt in its achievement, having sacrificed the advantages of a conventional style for the sake of truth to nature and lacking a new equipoise. To succeeding generations the heretic's art must have appeared unlovely and confused, as it does to us when we compare it with the pure style of the best works of the New Empire. These successors of Amenhetep, protagonists of the counter-reformation, learned something from his artists as they did from his religious outlook, and embodied it in the older style which they restored and which assumed here and there a gentler, more graceful and natural touch. Side by side with the general reversion to former restrictions, some progress may be observed in the large war-chariot picture. More features of a real battle were inserted in its typical form, which allowed plenty of space ; whole armies with chariots were represented opposed to one another ; the landscape was indicated by rocks, strips of water, and towers ; and besides additions of a general nature, applicable to any campaign, such as pictures of encampments, new incidents were included peculiar to a particular campaign, as for instance, in Rameses II's campaign against the Hittites, the torture of spies before the battle of Kadesh, and the surprise attack of the Hittites near that city. Rameses III added to the new series the fierce battles against the peoples of the north in the Delta, causing himself to be depicted as advancing in front of his troops on foot after alighting from his chariot ; he is, of course, represented as more than life-size. To him, too, Egyptian art owes its one representation of a naval battle. In the long run, therefore, the typical

<sup>1</sup> Possibly, moreover, it exercised a direct influence.

battle picture became more individual and historical than might have been expected through the inclusion of particular events, but in the main it remained the immutable type of a royal victory.

Rameses II also had himself portrayed hunting bulls in his war-chariot, at festivals, and in the harem, but without enlarging the bounds of the traditional forms. After him there was no more great art; paralysis set in in every sphere in the cramping atmosphere of sacerdotalism. No great monuments were produced under the Dynasties of Bubastis and Ethiopia, nor of Saïs.

Reliefs and paintings, therefore, did not deviate greatly from the art of the Nar-Mer tablet, but created impersonal types of varying subject and range. Their prime business was to present man to the eye in some general aspect, as a victorious king-god seated upon his throne, as a great lord managing his estates and performing the duties of office, as a serf tilling the soil, practising crafts, herding the cattle, or dancing and juggling. Individual personality, whether of a hero or an ego stamped with a particular character, lay beyond their range of vision.

The gods, too, were portrayed only as concrete types, some in shapes half-human, half-animal, a few pillars representing men, and complete human figures. They differed from human beings in size and garb, and from one another in their various shapes (animals) and symbolism. The same applies to gods of the Under-world and to demons, which are portrayed in a copious illustrated literature. One of these scenes is of importance on account of its human and ethical import: the judgment of the dead with its hopes and terrors. Here, too, the manner of presentation is clear, distinct, and impersonal. We possess no mythological pictures. If anything of the sort had been preserved, possibly from the Osiris cycle which alone contained a myth, it would certainly have been disappointingly impersonal in spite of the moving human subject; for we have the combat of Horus, showing him seizing his enemy by the hair, and the birth of Horus in Hatshepsut's birth picture. Only Isis the mother with her child might have had something of the charm of certain pictures produced in the New Empire.

The pictures from the animal world with a satirical meaning form a group by themselves. They, too, are types, with a witty twist, caricatures of serious works of art such as the sacrificial and battle pictures of kings; there are also some giving free rein to the imagination, transposing other human states to the animal world with all manner of mockery and distortion. We delight in the

topsy-turvy world produced by this juggling with familiar types, but we may easily over-estimate its import, seeking in it too much intellectual freedom, too critical an attitude towards religion and society. True, when we say that the Egyptians were "pictorially mature" we mean also "ripe for pictorial mockery"; and to be "unfanatically naïve", as the Egyptians were and remained right into the priestly era is "to take serious things lightly". The Babylonians were more solemn from the first.

We are justified in treating Egyptian reliefs, wall-paintings, and illustrations together. All three in Egypt shared a common style, found suitable in the time of Menes when men were striving for articulate clarity. It had no theoretical basis, but was known and practised as a system. No further differentiation occurred, nor was writing separated from pictorial representation. Whether a series of pictures was to be executed in relief or painted stucco, whether on the walls of a tomb or a scroll of papyrus, were not questions of art but of expense, and perhaps of the object in view (people liked to have their copy of the *Book of the Dead* beside them in the coffin).

### WRITING

Egypt's survey of the universe in visual images should have found completion in her writing. Here it might have attained to that scientific finish that was denied to it in art; a system of writing as a world system in pictures would have been a possibility. And in fact we find Egyptian writing moving in that direction at the time of Menes (undistinguished from pictorial art, with all kinds of intermediate steps on the Nar-Mer palette). And if we examine the perfected script properly, we shall see that it had become picture-writing pure and simple, for the majority of words are written by means of a single sign, a little picture; phonetic signs were only added to indicate the pronunciation more or less adequately. Word signs are the essential component of this writing and that is why the number of signs was without end; there were some 500 in common use. To stress the kinship between Egyptian writing and our own alphabet is a source of error. Its closest kinship is not with systems based on syllables and letters, but with the genuine picture-writing of the Cretans and Hittites, and Chinese ideographic script.

The last-named script illustrates what Egyptian writing might have become if those who used it had been logical enough to build up a uniform system of writing as a world survey in picture signs. It might have become universal and enabled all peoples to communicate with one another; each people could have pronounced the picture-signs in their own way, but could at the same time have communicated with all others in a script understood by all. That is what Chinese script does for the Far East.

The Egyptians were not ripe for such a development at the time of Menes, nor were they at a later date. They made their world survey in pictures, in word-signs, and proceeded in this direction for a certain length; then they turned into other paths which also might have led them to the more exalted goal of an alphabetical script or one based on syllables. But here, too, they lacked energy to go the whole way.

Visual imagination in the service of a world survey is the true achievement of the Egyptians. It never developed into Chinese ideographic, nor Babylonian syllabic, nor Cretan alphabetical writing, but remained helplessly arrested between them all. The germs of all the higher methods of writing were discovered, but the Egyptians lacked the power of analysis and abstraction necessary to develop them.

Nevertheless the pictorial world survey created in the Egyptian hieroglyphs is a new and immense scientific achievement in the formulation of concepts. It represented pictorially the human creature, man, woman, and child, with all their parts, and all human states and activities; further animals, mammals and birds with their parts, amphibia, fish, and certain insects, as well as plants; likewise the great subdivisions of the universe, heaven and earth, day and night, stars, lightning and rain, water and land, and the small subdivisions too, city, lake, and road, house, palace, and temple, fortress and tomb, boats, domestic appliances, and temple furniture, clothes, weapons, tools, wicker-work, vessels, implements for writing and musical instruments, ornaments and games; all these were fixed once and for all in typical figures and so made communicable. In the case of creatures and objects this was relatively easy, though it meant finding a simple outline for each noun, representing the essential features briefly and distinctly. It was harder in the case of states and activities and of verbs; here a man sowing seed meant "to sow", a woman in childbirth "to give birth", a man with drooping arms "to rest", and one with muffled arms "to conceal".

The Egyptians expressed "human beings" by a man and woman, "old" by a man leaning on a staff, "anything that requires strength" by a man brandishing a stick with both hands or, more simply, by a mailed arm. A bull's head with feed-pipe meant "to swallow", a hide "animal", a flamingo "red", a duck "bird or insect", a small bird "small, insignificant, bad", a flowering shrub "year", a fenced-in field "land, period", the sun's disc "time", a missile "foreign", and a roll of papyrus "written", that is, "only of the mind, abstract". Obviously this went far beyond pictorial representation: with these visual images the Egyptians could in fact describe, communicate, and survey everything that they needed. We find quite a number of abstract things expressed in concrete, visual form. In every case quite simple images embrace within the type a number of single objects of the same species, constituting notions of species, of activity, or of quality. We will conclude the series with one or two specially successful images from the religious and mathematical fields: the falcon Horus means "God", the goddess Maat "truth", hands raised in supplication "ka, the soul-figure", the night-bird with a human head "ba, the dream soul quitting the body". A lotus leaf means 1,000, for there are thousands of such leaves, a tadpole "100,000, a seething crowd", and a man clapping his hands above his head "1,000,000".

And now this world of pictures, this clear and simple picture-writing, in process of continuous development, was thrown into confusion by the realization that pictures can be used for purely phonetic purposes without regard for their meaning to the eye. People were bound to make this discovery when, for example, "sa" was pronounced alike whether it meant "goose" or "son". And once it was made, it was bound to influence the development of writing. In many places verbal similarity (in which, of course, common derivation played no part) helped to express abstract concepts more easily; for instance, "beetle" now assumed the meaning "to become", the swallow "great", the finger "10,000". There were also words of one syllable which could be used as letters (after the vowel had been omitted) or as syllabic signs. And so the Egyptians were enabled to write everything purely phonetically, without regard to imagery.

But at that point they reached the limits of their power of abstraction; they could not quite break loose from the pictorial significance of their signs; for their mission was to analyse and survey the world visually. They used word equivalents, therefore,

to write many things that were difficult of expression and to juggle with enigmas and convey their hidden meaning (the rebus). They likewise made a point of adding to every hieroglyph one or two purely phonetic sounds, usually final letters ; in the incipient confusion of synonymous words such a practice was sometimes helpful, and it was always a sign of learning. But the Egyptians wrote very little quite phonetically, and when they did they were promptly frightened at their own boldness, and feared lest they might be misunderstood. They therefore added a final sign (determinative) of purely pictorial significance, which declared what the meaning was ; if, for instance, the word was " herd ", it would be the animals of which the herd consisted, or if it were a proper name, it would be " human being ", " town ", or " foreign country ". Thus the circle was completed and led back to pictorial meaning. Thenceforward there were two final signs—" phonetic determinatives ", letters used with word-pictures, and " pictorial determinatives " for words written phonetically. At bottom Egyptian letters were phonetic determinatives, seldom more.

The use of " letter-syllables " as final, explanatory letters was of value in producing a series of twenty-four consonants (accidentally, and yet in a sense inevitably, for each consonant appears once at the end), and with these all the consonant sounds in words (foreign names, for instance) could be written. Perhaps it was due to the appearance of this " series of letters " made of final signs that vowels came to be neglected altogether. This was no special feat of abstraction, but implies a signal failure to analyse.

At this point Egyptian writing stopped short. It had passed through all manner of transformations in the hands of the scribes ; at one time it was more phonetic, at another more pictorial ; now men aimed at mystery in expression, now at clarity, now they juggled with the signs. A few rules were developed in practical use, especially calligraphic (rectangular arrangement of letters and pictures) and moral (signs indicating " god " and " king " are placed first). A literary script developed side by side with the monumental script ; in the former pictorial qualities were to some extent sacrificed for the sake of convenience and brevity in brush-writing upon papyrus (hieratic script). The Egyptians never dispensed with visual images, never discarded pictures in favour of letters and syllables, nor did they make any progress in that direction. At a late period hieratic writing was further abbreviated into demotic ; all the word-pictures were compressed by a purely external, mechanical,

and visual method, whilst the clarity and analytic power were sacrificed which had once brought a world survey in pictures within the range of possibility. Side by side with the development of this demotic script went the degeneration of monumental writing (hieroglyphs) into a kind of game. Egyptian writing had now become the concern of scholars, the secret knowledge of the priesthood. The simple Greek writing supplanted it.

But not only did the concrete logic of the Egyptians achieve a survey of the world in notions pictorially presented, it also created generic notions ("animal", "plant"), and it began to classify and sum up the whole content of experience by grouping objects in pairs. The origin of this is to be found, too, in the world outlook of Neolithic man, to whom the bright and dark brother of the year's cycle were a contrasted pair. This single example underwent a process of differentiation in Egypt. Horus and Set remained the fundamental symbol of all bipartition. But Horus, the young sun-hero, ceased to be so much the bright and good in contrast with the dark and wicked hero, for Ra was the god of day, Osiris the good god, dead and suffering, and Hor his father's avenger. Relations assumed a worldly, politico-geographical character. Hor was the legitimate ruler of cultivated lands, Set of the desert and alien lands; so the globe was divided into two parts. Other pairs were added: the two parts of Egypt were the south, Upper Egypt (the rush), and the north, the Delta (papyrus); this was based originally upon the Horus-Set formula, for Set had once been lord of the Delta, but later upon the recollection that the Delta had to be conquered and had long consisted of pasture land, full of papyrus thickets, whilst in Upper Egypt rushes grew besides a regular system of canals.

The attitude of mind which created types and regarded things in their static aspect necessarily held that, since there had been two kingdoms, with two crowns and coats-of-arms, since the time of Menes, there had always been two; the formula, therefore, justified the right of Horus-Menes to acquisition by conquest, and his special position in newly colonized possessions. Bipartition celebrated orgies in the administration of the Ancient Empire. Thence it spread to other fields. For instance, the temples, facing east and west, were divided by a central line into northern and southern halves; in each the king offered separate sacrifices from the north and south to the gods of the north and south. In other respects men liked to double: Nar-Mer (Menes) had two falcon standards behind him; the sun-god Ra had two barks, one to travel by day

and one by night; corresponding to the Nile in Egypt, which fertilized the land, there was a heavenly Nile, the rain which brought verdure to the desert; the Egyptians regarded the Euphrates as a Nile flowing in the wrong direction. But from all this the Egyptians did not evolve a more detailed system of parallels between heaven and earth, which must have led to a science of prognostication by omens. They only held fast to the one parallel, dating from Neolithic times, between the life of the year and of man, and from this they developed a science of prophecy. The lucky or unlucky significance of the days, according to the sacred legend, determined the choice of days, especially by the middle classes in the later periods under Babylonian influence.

Classification in pairs is a visual, concrete form of division.<sup>1</sup> To the Egyptians it meant an act of association and comparison by emphasizing resemblance and difference. They therefore made use of it like other visual imagery, just as they associated the pictorial and phonetic meanings of written signs. They delighted in their keenness of intellect and their ability to form notions and to classify and survey the world in images, to detect the complex alphabetical system in its pictorial form, and to apply it brilliantly yet darkly in propounding enigmas. But the Egyptians proceeded no further. In the visual and concrete world there is "as well as" but no "either—or"; all things have the right to exist in juxtaposition. It was the Babylonians who first applied logical antithesis in order to form sharp contrasts with all their consequences. This process began to appear in their coats-of-arms immediately after 3000 B.C.; Egyptian coats-of-arms were simple, like those of the German Hohenstaufen period, not symmetrically doubled. It was the Babylonians who first set to work seriously to form general notions of the more abstract kind. The Egyptians only made tentative efforts, which yet showed that in course of time they began to feel the antitheses in the twofold classification more strongly. Set grew morally worse (the judgment of the dead) and increasingly severe conditions were attached to the hope of resurrection. But Set remained a god, and man continued to be capable of rising from the dead. The Egyptians' concrete, ocular logic secured them many benefits; they always remained in close touch with life so

<sup>1</sup> There were in addition other numerical classifications; the "nine arches" represent the Egyptian people of the Horus period, the "2 × nine gods" all the great gods, the "nine peoples" all the peoples of the earth. Subsequently the numbers grew larger, but there was no regular, systematic knowledge classified according to categories.

long as they continued to produce and create ; their fertile and child-like nature had more attraction for the Greeks than the Babylonian character. On the other hand, they never emerged from the maze of their many-coloured images and phonetic tricks, and reduced their world to ordered clarity within the bounds of a uniform survey.

#### LITERATURE AND MUSIC

Egyptian writing took shape as early as the Menes period (like all their cultural innovations of essential importance), but not much was written till the period ranging from the Fourth to the Sixth Dynasties. So long was the time needed to breed a large class of " scribes " who could write and read fluently and readily perform the various tasks demanded of clerical administrators (protocols, reports, censuses, decrees, and so on). Literature of a higher type did not arise till the Fourth Dynasty, and it emerges more particularly under the Fifth Dynasty, in addition to official deeds and letters. Even it was designed at first to fulfil practical and useful purposes. Annals, hymns, and charms were written down ; some, perhaps, were only produced at this period. The first books of Precepts were written, and here the religious movement which had raised the Ra kings (the Fifth Dynasty) to the throne seems to have acted as a considerable stimulus. The seed sown in the Menes period was beginning to bear fruit in speculation concerning Ra and Osiris and general directions for right conduct.

During the period of transition to the Middle Empire and whilst it ran its course (the whole period from 2200-1700 B.C. is that of the second phase of Egyptian culture), this new literature reached its first prime. It was a literary age, and men were proud of their poetry and scholarship and their power of beautiful, skilful, and brilliant expression in every field. Spelling and calligraphy, also, attained exemplary excellence. Wisdom literature in its various forms now reached its high watermark, religious poetry treated the loftiest subjects, and in her first narrative poems Egypt already produced compositions on a grand scale. Further, the earliest important works on mathematics and medicine appeared.

Only one new book of Precepts was written under the New Empire, and that of citizen origin, and one great religious poem, Amenhetep IV's *Hymn to the Sun*. On the other hand, chivalrous love lyrics blossomed forth (and enriched religious hymnology : Isis). Narrative

poetry extended its sphere to include the romance of love, chivalrous and witty, and the sacerdotal romance, showing speculative tendencies. Historical poems in the form of chronicles were attempted; the ghost story and the fable came to birth. But the mass of the literature that has been preserved is scholastic: exhortations to scholars, model letters, and the polemics of the scribes. Scientific knowledge, especially of medicine, was now epitomized in large works.

Finally, there arose a copious light literature, romances full of marvellous evidences supporting the priestly philosophy. At the same time "sacred knowledge" was fenced off and declared holy and taught in scholastic form.

There are no author's names known to Egyptian literature. It was as impersonal as Egyptian art, in which the great masters did, indeed, portray themselves occasionally like any other craftsmen, but never signed their works. There is a single exception and that confirms the rule: the writers of Precepts invariably give their names, for their rank, their age, their fortune, and family circumstances are intended to prove that their wisdom has stood the test of practice in their own lives.

#### BELLES LETTRES

Where man has plenty of practical experience but little of it is theoretical, finished, and freely applicable, poetry, like art and science, is limited to a few brief phrases and formulæ, produced again and again always in the same manner. Lyric poetry will constantly repeat certain simple observations, desires, and exclamations, as in songs of labour; these correspond to the simplified images and symbols in art, and the source from which they spring and multiply is practical everyday experience. Just as the painter can be natural and strike extraordinary likenesses, so the singer (the minstrel) may in a special case add new exclamations and phrases to the old, established ones; some would arise from the particular circumstances, but others would be of universal import and would be partly forgotten but partly retained, and would in turn become established forms. Epic side by side with lyric poetry would grow out of songs of praise and lament (and on occasion out of exclamatory verse) with universal and especial features, but would assume a descriptive character and seek a foothold in the prototype of the

heroic life ; all heroes would become sun-heroes, all enemies his enemies, all wives his wife.

In Egypt this process can still be clearly traced. Perhaps we may infer that Neolithic culture, from which Egyptian culture obviously sprang, had no poetry but that which survives in fragmentary form in Egypt : exclamations, single phrases, pronounced by a minstrel and repeated by the rest of the people instead of hymns ; songs of praise and laments for heroes who were compared with the sun-hero, instead of narrative poems.

In Egypt the herdsmen sang as he drove his herd across the flooded fields ("ploughing") : "The shepherd is in the water with the fish" ; and the fishermen as they drew in their nets : "It is coming to us laden with a fine catch". And doubtless there were corresponding verses in Neolithic days. In the ancient Egyptian morning hymns the refrain : "Awake in peace !" greets the sun-god or the royal snake, and in Neolithic days this phrase was probably the whole, or nearly the whole, of the hymn of salutation. In Egypt, too, the king, in life and death, was still Horus, the sun-god.

The lyrical exclamations and single phrases of the Neolithic period developed in Ancient Egypt into a literary hymnology. It doubtless existed in embryo at the time of Menes, but it was not till the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties that it assumed literary form ; by that time men wrote more dexterously and were capable of something more than the mere writing of deeds, so that they could garner the harvest ripening on a new evolutionary plane. The poetical form of the new hymns does not seem to have crystallized definitely, so far as we can ascertain, but Egyptian literature is altogether without vowels, so that the verses cannot be read as verses. A refrain at the beginning of the verses is common, and occasionally we come upon a transitional form leading up to a stricter parallelism of the parts. Not only was the refrain in the more literary poetry the germ from which new versification evolved (a relic of what was once the whole, and was now expanded, still in repetitive form), it was also an influence in moulding the form : the actual poem was pendant to it—the succession of declarations, wishes, and names that made up the substance of the hymn. In the case of hymns to the gods, with which we are concerned here, the declarations had their source in a mythology that must once have sprung fresh from concrete perception (at the time of Menes ? of the Fifth Dynasty ?) In the hymns these had grown dim, intellectualized, scholastic. When Ra, the sun-god, is called "the One", "the

Eternal", "he who marches to the uttermost parts of the heavens", "he who unseals cavities", "he who lives in his own blood", we no longer find any trace of the sacred fervour which inspired men when, for example, they discovered that the sun does not die in the red glow of evening. And yet these arid hymns represent a great advance; we have here the earliest hymnology of man, his first recorded poetic literature. It is curt and arid because people were glad to be able to express anything at all in writing; its repetitions, with constantly varying names, declarations, and desires, exercised the capacity to survey, to bring out new aspects, and to devise new modes of expression. A battle-song of the Sixth Dynasty also consisted of a refrain with added lines; "this army was fortunate on its campaign" is the recurring phrase, and associated with it is a realistic description of the devastation of the enemy's country (not of the battle, that was reserved for the king); this description however, is spontaneously intellectualized, distinguishing and enumerating the acts of devastation.

The Middle Empire gathered the fruits of these exercises in surveying the world and in literary expression. *The Dirge of Maneros* (*The Song of the Harper*, found in the tomb-chapel of King Intef) was written at this period; it is a drinking-song which calls upon men to be merry and enjoy life, since all earthly things are transitory. The hymns of the learned expanded into lengthy literary works, and several refrains were carried through one cycle of hymns. We have such a cycle addressed to Usertsen III, the great conqueror of Nubia; here the power of the king is depicted, how all the world rejoices in him, his surpassing greatness, his vivifying presence; and some of the imagery is vivid enough. Vivid descriptions grew more frequent, side by side with scholarly allusions, in hymns to other gods, too (for the king was a god), especially in hymns to Ra and Osiris. Further, the religious movement at the beginning of the Middle Empire exercised an influence outlasting its own time; from it sprang the *Dialogue between a Man Weary of Life and his Soul*, than which Egypt has produced no poem more perfect in artistic form, more fervent in emotion, of profounder intellectual content and more vigorous imagery. Its form is that of a cycle of hymns dressed up as dialogues, so that it has a faint touch of the dramatic; its substance is the repudiation of a rationalism which praises life, teaching that life passes rapidly away and must be enjoyed quickly if it is not to be missed; the poet rejects this view and laments rather, with deep sorrow, the misery that selfishness and

love of pleasure have brought upon mankind, lifting up his heart to Ra, the pure and virtuous, wise and living Saviour-god. This is great poetry, clear and vivid, concentrated and perfectly moulded in every phrase, springing from the profoundest depths of emotion and therefore exercising an immense power over men's minds.

In the New Empire religious hymnology culminated in Amenhetep IV's *Hymn to the Sun*. Here, too, is deep and genuine feeling, but the yearning for salvation gives place to the rapturous surrender of one loved by the god to the divine splendour, the urge towards truth, a strong love of Nature, the urge towards beauty and oneness grandly surveying the world and losing itself in the divine Being. What found partial expression in early hymns to the sun was now united in a single image and applied to a single person, the king, who is both prophet and man; all learned trumpery vanished. We are deeply moved, too, by this kingly adoration which displays the sun-god, the Disc, as the creator and life-giver of the whole world, in Egypt and beyond its bounds, unresting by day and by night; but what we have here is more theoretical, more aristocratic than the *Dialogue*; men had learned to create a picture from a number of realistic images—an image of the sun's glory—but in the process much of the profundity is lost. The great *Hymn to Amen* (earlier than Amenhetep IV, belonging to the reign of Amenhetep III) is more learned in comparison, an admirable combination of all the material that was poetically or scholastically appropriate; the love of Nature and of beauty is conventionally expressed, but the hymn contains passages which make the god a saviour of all mankind, not of the king alone. Both hymns, alike the one to Amen-Ra and the one addressed to the Solar Disc, have outgrown the old form of the refrain; in the *Hymn to Amen* it is replaced by a stricter parallelism of the parts, in the *Hymn to Aten*, by fervent, unbridled ecstasy.

Amenhetep IV's hymn is at once a solar and a royal hymn. It has a remarkable forerunner in the hymn on the victory of Thothmes III, put into the mouth of Amen himself; the god acts through the king, all is his work and all honour is his; he relates what he is doing and has done for the sovereign. Thothmes' victories are illustrated by a list of all the conquered peoples of the earth in skilfully framed verses, each with two initial refrains; this is the kernel of a poem otherwise free in form, which is without parallel as an expression of a world conqueror's proud piety.

Love songs constituted a new lyrical type in the New Empire. These, too, we can see developing out of exclamations and phrases

embodying perceptions and desires : " When I kiss you if your lips are open I am joyful even though I lack beer," " Ah, were I but her negress who attends upon her, I should see the hue of all her limbs ! " But even here there was more art (parallelism of the parts) than in the old one-line verses, and all these love-songs consciously belong to the literary type of courtly poetry, even where they are disguised as the utterance of simple country swains and maidens. Osiris and Isis are the prototype of the lovers, hence the beloved is spoken of as " sister " and the lover as " brother ". Doubtless these love-songs were preceded by religious love poetry, laments of Isis for her murdered lover, and one such poem has been preserved to us. But in their ultimate form there is no trace left of religion or learned mythology in these courtly love-songs ; it is all firsthand experience and sentiment expressed in simple images ; the world of love is visualized, like that of Nature's wide expanse or civic life. The poets were natural men ; but, like the Germans of the Hohenstaufen period, they wrote some poems in the person of a woman. The man utters his eager desires and raptures in brief phrases, in a chain of images he depicts the charms of his beloved and the strength of his feeling ; the woman bewails more gently the yearning that fills her whole soul and the day that drives away her beloved ; she is jealous and contemplates love philtres ; the man describes his experiences of love, whether in dreams or in reality ; how he feigned illness in order to lure his beloved to come to him, how he is resolved to swim across the Nile in defiance of the crocodile, or how his beloved caught a dainty goldfish whilst they were bathing together. As the type evolves the songs grow longer and, to us, more wearisome. There are vegetation songs in which the characteristics of plants are made into symbols of love and associated with sentiment, and garden songs in which the trees speak as lovers' advocates or witnesses of love scenes. Learned art and symbolism replace the early simplicity of form in which the polite amours of the court were portrayed by straightforward descriptions, and wishes, images and laments. The love lyrics of the Egyptians are part and parcel of this visual imagery, but they are its culmination, and their sentiment (though presented in universal human form) is more personal, more social and natural. The songs are genuine, vivid, and fresh, but they are short, and are sweet and dainty rather than ardent and individual—the mere germ of the *Song of Songs*, just as the *Dialogue* and the *Hymn to Aten* are but the germ of the Psalms.

It is impossible to separate music from lyric poetry. The

Egyptians had all kinds of songs which were sung to an instrumental accompaniment. The numerous pictures of instruments prove that in this sphere, too, they greatly enlarged their heritage; there are harps and zithers, lutes and mandolines (which do not re-appear until music developed in the Middle Ages), flutes and double-flutes, and doubtless drums and trumpets. But the music played on these instruments and sung by choirs and soloists is absolutely lost. There was no musical notation, and the Egyptian musical theory of which the Greeks tell is Pythagorean—that is, Hellenic.

We have no narrative poems earlier than the Middle Empire. At that stage they appear in a highly developed form. The *Romance of Sa-Nehat* is autobiographical, interpolated with hymns and other verses as well as with authentic documents, whilst the *Khufu Romance* and the *Story of a Shipwrecked Sailor* consist of several poems interlaced and skilfully dovetailed, something in the nature of a narrative framework with smaller pieces set in it. These and other Egyptian narratives are generally called fairy tales or stories, but to the Egyptians themselves they counted as considerable works, substitutes for the novel and epic. Their subject matter is short and simple, because at that stage men had not the power to assimilate and give poetic form to anything more extensive; they treat of marvels because marvels exercise a fascination and because the interventions of gods and magicians were part and parcel of reality. In their fixity of form their dependence on established institutions of the past, on the solar hymns and the life of the court, is plainly discernible. The main plot of the *Khufu Romance* is merely a historical adaptation of the myth of the sun-child persecuted by the tyrant; Sa-Nehat's duel contains echoes of the fight of the two bulls and the primeval victory of Horus with his bow; and in the *Story of a Shipwrecked Sailor* the wonderland of the East is an Island of the Gods, and the divine serpent is a god in the home of the sun. And just as this poet clings to mythological subjects, so the poet of the *Romance of Sa-Nehat* adheres to courtly ceremonial; men's growing inventive powers needed supports when they took their first great strides.

The *Romance of Sa-Nehat* is a romance of adventure which describes the hero's experiences in sober, but carefully chosen language; when a new king ascends the throne, Sa-Nehat flees from Egypt for unknown reasons; he nearly dies of thirst in the desert, is saved by Bedouins, reaches Palestine, and renders great services to a barbarian prince there as counsellor and general. His greatest feat

is his victory over a gigantic barbarian in single combat. He lives amongst aliens in this way, as his master's son-in-law, until in his old age Pharaoh pardons him and recalls him to the court. Gladly quitting his barbarian life, and even his wife and children, he is received and welcomed at court and lives in honour to the end of his days. He relates his own adventures, so that the tale is autobiographical. The chief reason for choosing this personal form was that Egyptian audiences might be the better assured of the truth of the story. We see how little Sa-Nchat and the whole of society in the Middle Empire were individualized from his readiness to abandon his family for the sake of the court (he quits "the filth of the desert and the coarse clothing of the sand-wanderers"), and even more from the manner of his reception at court. Where all imagery is visual, even the expression of emotion must assume visual, typical form; fear and anger, surprise and joy at court, therefore, are demonstrated by fainting and loud cries. The correspondence about the hero's pardon is given in full, as a guarantee of truth and to redound to the courtly hero's honour, but also as a model of courtly conduct; for the object of this work was not merely to depict a hero for the benefit of other heroes, to entertain and to inspire great deeds (the Egyptians held all foreigners in such contempt that it could hardly act as an alluring example); like Homer, it aimed at teaching courtly manners.

The *Story of a Shipwrecked Sailor* is also an autobiographical romance of adventure; since the whole was invented, the autobiographical form seemed particularly necessary as a guarantee of truth. Construction and language are those of an artist; the book attempts a kind of Odyssey, but lacking the support of actual experience or courtly annals, the inventive power displayed is very meagre. The voyage, the storm, the shipwreck and rescue, and then the return on a passing ship are quite vividly described, though everything is typical; the marvels on the island amount to no more than the appearance of a gigantic serpent of gold and lapis lazuli who carries the shipwrecked voyager home in her mouth, soothes his fears, gives him presents, and dismisses him. In order to comfort him, she relates in three sentences how her whole family of seventy-five serpents was burnt by fire from heaven, and how nevertheless she has subdued her heart. The inventive powers of the age were not sufficient to develop this germ.

So, too, the stories of magic in the *Khufu Romance* are quite short fragments: a magician causes his wife's lover, taken in adultery,

to be swallowed by a waxen crocodile ; another causes the water of a pond to divide in order to fetch out a jewel that has fallen in ; a third restores a beheaded goose to life. The descriptions do not become detailed until we come to the secret birth of the king's children (with the aid of the gods, as with Hatshepsut), and then the action proceeds in a mythical, ceremonial atmosphere ; the model is the birth of the child Horus. The whole ceremony of naming is repeated in full for each child. The passage was once successful and so became a type ; its repetition did not weary the audience, but pleased them.

In *Sa-Nehat* the contrast between a civilized country and barbarism, between courtly elegance and a dirty life in close touch with Nature, is brought vividly home, not without arrogance. In the *Story of the Eloquent Peasant* (older than *Sa-Nehat's* adventures) the king continues for nine whole days to enjoy the misery and the fine speeches of a serf whose ass has been taken by a minor official ; only then does he impose justice. There is no satire on the barbarians in the first case, nor on official administration in the second. In the New Empire, however, the Egyptians did engage in satire, pictorially in their presentation of an animal world out of joint (Reynard, the Fox), in literature through the medium of a polemic ridiculing the labours and disappointments of an officer in Syria from the standpoint of a civilian official ; we have here the mockery of one class of scribes by the other, the offshoot of a copious literature on the superiority of the scribes to all other classes.

Nor did the narrative literature of the New Empire consist of fairy tales, but of what were intended for great works, though they were still short and embryonic in form. There was *The Story of the Doomed Prince*, whose death was predicted at his birth ; he was to be killed by a crocodile, a snake, or a dog. This poem is, in fact, the first love story of a the human race, and also a philosophic romance. For the prince goes in disguise to the wonderland of Naharin and there by his strength wins the king's daughter ; he does not make himself known, but she manages to protect him from her father's wrath and keep him as her husband, mutual love at first sight risks life and limb and triumphs over rivals and class prejudice. His wife's faithfulness and cleverness saves him when a snake threatens him in sleep, but his little dog is the cause of his death ; destiny is fulfilled even for the hero who has won the princess and subdued the monster (a crocodile). It is a poetical adaptation of the saga of the glorious hero who nevertheless must die, a derivative of the Osiris legend ; but its treatment is chivalrous and human in

the spirit of the love-songs and the worldly attitude of the court of Amenhetep III or thereabouts. There are incipient signs of imaginative power—the prince and princess win one another by a love stronger than death, his life is marvellously saved from the snake and the crocodile, and he meets his death in a still stranger manner through a little greyhound; but though these germs are no more developed than earlier ones, the incidents are vividly described and are linked with such purity and delicacy by the idea of destiny, and presented with such heartfelt fervour as to produce a perfectly harmonious little masterpiece.

Deeper in meaning but less satisfying to us is the story of Anpu and Batau (*Tale of the Two Brothers*). This tale is proved by its very name to be a derivative of the Osiris legend, a meditation on the idea of resurrection, the romance of a chaste and priestly youth, the beloved of the gods. Here, too, love is the driving force, but it assumes the form of sin and a curse. The woman alienates the pious Batau from his brother Anpu by accusing him libellously of assault; the divinity prevents fratricide by a miracle, but Batau proceeds to castrate himself to prove his chastity and goes to the Valley of the Acacia, whilst his brother kills the slanderous woman. Subsequently the nine gods give Batau a wife in the Valley of the Acacia, a child of the gods, a lock of whose "ambrosial" hair is carried by a wave to Egypt. Pharaoh causes her to be stolen from Batau by a ruse. Stricken with fear, she pursues her first husband and kills him three times, once by having the acacia tree cut down upon which his heart is placed, then by persuading her husband to sacrifice the ox and cut down the persea trees into which Batau has changed himself. But finally Batau enters her mouth as a splinter of wood and causes her to give birth to him as the crown prince. When he becomes king he has the woman put to death and reigns for thirty years. The good man who is chaste and pure and beloved of the gods lives and becomes a king, even though woman's sinful lust and the folly of the mighty kill him three times. The gods guide him heavenwards through the whole living world, as man and animal and plant—he is himself a god. Here we find traces of Amenhetep IV's assured consciousness of his closeness to Nature and to God, but it has received a twist in the priestly spirit of antagonism to sex, and is also antagonistic to the kings. The romantic Doomed Prince is impersonal, though humanly lovable and polished; even more impersonal is Batau, who is obliged to castrate himself to prove his chastity (visual expression!), who is animal and plant and king's

son, and likewise full of priestly self-righteousness, so that he fails to stir our pity in the midst of his sufferings.

Besides these great philosophic poems there were fables in the New Empire, historical narratives, and "ghost stories". The only fable that has been preserved is prolix and lacks a clearly defined central theme. But it contained a germ which the Egyptians had the capacity to develop; whether the body or the head is the more precious, that was a controversy that they could conduct in concrete, visual form, and indeed as a dialogue; the model for the imaginative treatment of this subject was legibly written in the everyday experience and philosophic outlook of the rationalist scribes, the "headpieces" of Egypt. Historical narrative led on to the contemporaneous histories, and in some cases formed part of them (the *Hyksos War* of King Kames). The stratagem by which Thuthiy, a general of Thothmes III, captured Joppa, may have been historical. But there is a story of the arrogant Hyksos King Apophis which certainly belongs to the realm of imagination and introduced the custom of mingling priestly tales of miracles and romance with historical matter. In this story Apophis (like Amenhetep IV) refused to serve more than one god and chose Set as the object of his worship; he made unjust demands on the pious king of Egypt, who was in despair till he was saved by the Deity. The ghost stories belong to the same group; they are not really ghost stories at all, but fragments of medicinal magic: for instance, the healing of a high priest by pacifying the spirit of a dead man who wants his grave to be restored.

In the later periods the priestly outlook dominated narrative literature. The works of this period are extensive enough to be called "novels", but their substance is no more considerable. The Egyptians did not advance beyond the earlier phase.

If we survey the whole narrative literature of Egypt, we find that it contains all the material for the epic; in externals, the form, the long line (in the hymns), the imagery (this, indeed, is very concise), even the "Homeric reiteration" (as, for instance, in the story of Khufu) and the design of entertaining with tales of adventure and teaching courtly manners; in subject matter we have the myth of the dying god carried on in the concrete, human world (love, fate, and appointed death in the *Doomed Prince*; the good man, with his destruction and ultimate victory, in Batau), the wanderings of heroes and adventurous journeys (Se-Nehat and the Sailor), and echoes of early history (Khufu, the Hyksos). But no great epic arose; that would have meant the development of the germs;

merely to bring them into being and place them vividly in juxtaposition was not enough. The "either—or", a deep and impassioned absorption in the fate of mankind and the world, would have been necessary, and that the Egyptians lacked. Ra became immortal in their view, but Osiris died and yet remained a great god; the gulf between god and man was not fundamental; the hero Bataui remained immortal, but the Prince readily died, taking texts on the resurrection down into the grave with him. The Gilgamesh epic in Babylon grew out of the consciousness that man must die and must remain dead, and in it there is a sense of horror and utter despair at the lot of man; but the Egyptians, even in the *Dialogue of a Man Weary of Life*, knew only ills that the gods would heal. Nor did they advance beyond the elementary stage in probing the other major philosophic problem, that of the divine power and justice; here, too, they did not press on to a solution. Horus, as a god and a human king, was powerful and just; he established order by subduing Set and all the rebels of the earth. But the Egyptians had no great vision of a struggle between the power of order and the powers of chaos as a prerequisite of the world's creation in the time before time was, of the godhead's incorruptible love of order and justice which destroyed man in a flood when he had sinned. And this was the second source of the epic poetry of Babylon. Beside the Babylonian epic of creation and the flood, with all its terrors, the Egyptian story of creation is paltry and the tale of a flood of beer (borrowed no doubt) is ridiculous. The Egyptians failed to produce epic poetry because, though they developed and diversified the solar religion of prehistoric times and evolved from it a concrete picture of the universe full of possibilities and images, they never got beyond the concrete, visual "as well as". Their world was childishly unrent and lacking in antitheses.

They had, therefore, even less power to achieve drama than epic poetry, for that is based altogether upon the full development of contrasts between mutually exclusive views of life. Egypt had scenes and plays taken from the Osiris legend. Rameses IV (1100 B.C.) boasts that he defended Osiris' body from Set in a play, recalled Osiris to life, and placed Horus upon the throne. These were mystery plays, designed to give the participants concrete, visual assurance of all manner of benefits beyond the grave, but they were not tragedies. Nor was there any dialectic in the dialogue form of the controversial scenes between the man weary of life and his own soul, or between the body and the head. There were only germs destined to mature amongst other peoples.

## LEARNING

Neolithic science between 3000 and 4000 B.C. was the science of the calendar, the solar calculation of the calendar. Ever since man learned to count he had undoubtedly in practice marked short periods by days, longer periods by lunar months, and longer still by winters and summers. Neolithic thinkers worked out the earliest theories with this practice as their groundwork, naturally for the utilitarian purposes of agriculture. They discovered the necessity (in northern countries) of fixing seed-time with certainty, independently of the weather from day to day, and they managed it by learning to calculate the Spring equinox astronomically from the sun's course. This establishment of a New Year is the first step in calculating the calendar from the scientific observation of Nature. It seems to me very probable, almost certain, that these same Neolithic learned men also invented the division of the year into months of thirty days. They made other divisions of the year, natural and religious, found out the longest and shortest day, and established the cycle of festivals. They were practical enough to retain the lunar month as a smaller unit, and capable enough of theory, that is of intellectual effort, to fit it into the newly discovered great annual solar cycle; at the same time they were inaccurate enough calmly to ignore, in pursuit of a higher aim, the difference between the natural month and the month invented by themselves for purposes of calculation. When people made practical calculations based on the month—if, for instance, they fixed appointments by a monthly reckoning and not by solar festivals or days—then they followed the moon itself. The artificial month no more troubled them than the position of the moon did those who reckoned by the solar calendar and the festivals. The solar year, with its twelve artificial months and five epagomenal days, continued to be the year of agriculturalists from Neolithic times onwards, except where learned men, with their stricter astronomical requirements, supplanted it by a revolving lunar year. The five "days over the year" coming at the end were included in the Neolithic cycle of festivals; they are everywhere met with as the fools' festival before the New Year, the time of topsy-turvydom, the carnival.

The Egyptians, too, adopted the Neolithic solar year, at least the ruling class did so. But they must have discovered as early as the period of the Min kings that in the valley of the Nile the solar calendar was of no importance in agriculture; indeed it was essentially

useless ; for here seed-time was not determined by the solar year, but by the inundation which began when the sun was at the zenith, in July (the river rose from mid-June till the beginning of October). Observation of the sun for calendrical purposes was, therefore, gradually discontinued. The New Year was pushed on into the middle of July when the floods became noticeable as the Nile waters rose. On the other hand the old division of the year was retained, the Min-Hor festal cycle and the monthly series of twelve times thirty days plus five epagomenal days.

And so the calendar was handed down to the Followers of Horus who learned to write. They began to regulate the calendar in writing, full of youthful pride because they could manage all their practical affairs by means of writing, foreseeing what was to come and able to test it accurately at any moment ; even the affairs of heaven could be directed from the scribe's closet. The year had 365 days, and for each there was a stroke ; the next year began with the 366th day. This calculation by strokes started, doubtless, at the time of Menes, with any " natural New Year " people might choose, perhaps the beginning of the inundation ; and so it continued.

But the true solar year has not 365 days, but  $365\frac{1}{4}$ . So at the end of several years the lists of days by the calendrical scribes were no longer correct, the " calendar New Year " lagged behind the " natural New Year " by one more day every four years. For a time people hardly noticed this, for the " beginning of the floods " was also a quantity that was not precise to a day ; it varied according to the rainfall in Abyssinia and according to the point on the Nilometer that was supposed to be under water. But as time went on the " calendar New Year " was no longer in July, nor even in June, but earlier still. A hundred years after Menes it was a month behindhand, and four hundred years after him it was more than a quarter of a year behindhand ; at the end of 1,460 years ( $4 \times 365$ ), it had run round the whole cycle of the natural year and come back to the natural New Year.

Nothing denotes more forcibly the quality of the Egyptian mind than the attitude adopted in face of this phenomenon. Of course the Egyptians could not help observing it, but they never understood it. They viewed it helplessly right on to the days of Augustus. The fact is, their minds worked in concrete, visual forms ; lapses of time and objects they classified by means of visual imagery ; here was a lapse of time, the natural year, and a second, their calendar year ; both were visibly, calculably made up of 365 days, and yet they

ceased to tally. Plainly and visibly there was only one remedy; the Egyptians wrote: "In the year X of Pharaoh Y the inundation began in the month Z" (whether it was March or December, there it was, recorded in writing), and waited till matters righted themselves.

Meanwhile wise men in Egypt discovered the possibility of determining the beginning of the inundation by means of the heavenly bodies. They struck upon the date when Sothis (Sirius) rose with the sun. By this means they might have linked the solar year once more to a stellar observation and brought it to a standstill. Apis, the Nile Bull, was given a star on his forehead because of the link between the rising of Sothis and the beginning of the inundation—but they left the year to go its own way. They simply had not grasped that it was running away because they had abandoned the connection with the movements of the heavenly bodies.

Under the Ancient Empire the year was adapted to the new company of gods. The names of the months and days and the times of festivals were taken from the sacred legend of Osiris and other gods; these dates and festivals were the heritage of the Neolithic period, but they had changed and been diversified and adapted to the country and its new religion. In essentials, however, there was no change; that did not trouble the people, who were told by the inundation when to sow, nor the learned men, who determined the rising of Sothis and also the day in the calendar upon which the inundation began in any particular year, and who were perfectly contented about it. Not till the Middle Empire do we find a system of calculation by lunar years in certain temples, and even so it remained an affair of the learned, possibly borrowed from Babylon, certainly without influence in demonstrating the error in the calendar.

The Egyptians were alone among civilized peoples in retaining the simplest and most practical of all calendrical systems right down into historic times, the solar year of twelve months. They were only able to do so because they were not accurate enough to observe the error and realize that a revolving lunar year is more exact; it was an advantage arising from their limitations. With this year they made their civic calculations for thousands of years because it was simple—in spite of its running away. A more highly developed people might have profited by its running away, for in the course of 1460 years the calendar New Year ran the whole round of the natural year; they might have invented a "world year". But for this the Egyptians lacked ability. At a later period, however, they cheerfully allowed themselves to be extolled as "inventors of

the Sothic era " by the Greeks, who grasped the connection, but not that the Egyptians had failed to grasp it. Thereafter Caesar brought the Egyptian year to a standstill on the basis of Greek scientific knowledge; he interpolated the Julian intercalary day every fourth year and so made the Egyptian year the basis of our own calendar. It was far simpler and more practical than the revolving year, and it was now equally exact, or nearly so. So near were the Egyptians to our calendar in practice, and so great was the distance separating them from it in theory!

So, too, the astronomical achievements of the Egyptians never passed beyond the range of visual imagery. At quite an early date they made pictorial representations of the fixed stars as they appear in the sky, and marked special stars which particularly impressed them on account of their size and brilliance. The morning star, which marches before Ra, and Sirius-Sothis which announces the inundation and is specially associated with the sun by its rising, both had their place in the heavens beside the paths and monsters of the Pyramid Texts; they sailed over the heavenly sea in boats, like the sun and moon. The movements of the heavenly bodies were observed, not only the daily course of the sun, who was supposed to complete his journey by passing through caverns or the Under-world, at night, but that of the moon, the sun's "vizier". The "imperishable" stars were distinguished from the "unwearying", that is, those which never set and those which disappear for a time and are thus perpetually in motion. But it does not seem that astronomical studies went further, although under the Middle Empire a few temples made their calculations in lunar years. Egypt never knew a scientific topography and division of the sky, a fundamental distinction between planets and fixed stars, or the careful observation of the rising and setting of stars (other than those which announced the inundation) and their conjunctions. The Egyptians attained to something more than the purely solar astronomy of the Neolithic age, but the sun was still the chief of the heavenly bodies, and for its sake the moon, the morning and evening stars, Sirius, and all the movements in the heavens were studied. There was no astronomical study of the planets, though there was an astrology of native growth.

Egyptian mathematics began by developing a fine system of decimal numeration, simple, concrete, and capable of counting almost everything. There were pictures representing units, tens, hundreds, thousands, tens of thousands, hundreds of thousands,

and millions. Calculations running into figures above a million appear as early as Nar-Mer's monuments. That was a great achievement; even the Homeric Greeks had no conception of numbers beyond tens of thousands. The Egyptians seemed to have advanced further. Their concrete minds found no difficulty, once they had grasped units and tens and their relation to one another (ten units abbreviated to a single ten, which was perhaps a Neolithic invention), in proceeding further in the same way, substituting one hundred for ten tens, one thousand for ten hundreds, and so on, inventing as many images as they chose for higher units. The images are rather indeterminate—when we find a lotus leaf standing for 1,000 and a tadpole for 100,000, we might inquire which is greater, the number of lotus leaves or tadpoles. The image representing a million expresses nothing but amazement that such great numbers should exist; it is a man striking his hands together above his head. In actual fact the Egyptians were able to count up to a million with these numerical symbols, mechanically writing a stroke to represent each thing to be counted; but their numerical concepts reached no higher than 10,000 at the utmost, perhaps no higher than 1,000. The leaves were "countless", a very large number; "tadpole" means a "swarming throng". One sum in their arithmetic book involved a figure of 19,000, likewise quite mechanically. Still, this was a great deal, for Neolithic man probably did not get beyond 365.

But not only could the Egyptians count, they evolved a true science of mathematics, as a result of their practical experience in distributing bread, storing grain, making ornaments, and measuring land. The scribes could do everything by writing; they could distribute any number of loaves equally amongst any number of recipients without seeing them; they could calculate in advance how much gold the goldsmith would need and how much storage room the grain collector, and their calculations would be correct. This was marvellous, mysterious, even to the scribes themselves. They called their book on arithmetic "instructions for penetrating all mysteries hidden in existing objects". This book was partly a collection of examples, partly a theoretical work.

The Egyptians could add and subtract; in particular they could multiply and divide by two and three; in exceptional cases they calculated with fives instead of twos and threes, because five is in simple relation to the decimal system. These calculations were done in writing. The numerical system made it easy to recognize the groups of units, tens, etc., and since there were never more than nine

in each group, they were easily taken in at a glance. From simple processes of addition and subtraction, people worked out multiplication and division tables. They put down:—

1	7	that is	$1 \times 7 = 7$	
2	14	„ „	$2 \times 7 = 7 + 7 = 14$	
4	28	„ „	$4 \times 7 = 14 + 14 = 28$	
8	56	„ „	$8 \times 7 = 28 + 28 = 56$	

and in this way arrived at  $5 \times 7$  by adding 1 and 4 in the table ( $= 5$ ) and 7 and 28 ( $= 35$ ); similarly  $28 : 7 = 4$  was arrived at directly;  $30 : 7$  is 28 plus a remainder of 2. These multiplication and division sums with the help of tables (by doubling) can be extended indefinitely<sup>1</sup> and are simple enough. It was a brilliant invention, dependent upon writing and unquestionably Egyptian.

These processes are taken for granted by our arithmetic, which proceeds straightway to higher problems, especially those of calculation with fractions. The Egyptians first invented signs for  $\frac{1}{2}$  and  $\frac{2}{3}$  in hieroglyphs, then for  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{3}$ ,  $\frac{1}{4}$  and  $\frac{2}{3}$  in hieratic writing. Then the sign for a fraction was invented, a flattened disc (in hieratic writing a dot), a kind of fractional stroke with the denominator added, but no numerator; the numerator was always 1. With these fraction-denominators they could make calculations as with whole numbers; they halved and doubled the fraction by doubling or halving the denominator; they brought it to unity by taking it as many times over as the number of the denominator. In this way the Egyptians were able to manipulate fractions, and their text book of arithmetic began with its most abstract part, a table for expressing any fraction whose numerator was 2 (which they could not write) and whose denominator ranged from 3 to 99 as a sum of fractions with unity for their numerators. Only simple division sums were involved; first the fraction was found which, when multiplied by the denominator, came nearest to 2, then the one which when multiplied by the denominator, brought the total to 2.<sup>2</sup> The Egyptians tried out how these manipulations could be most simply effected with the

<sup>1</sup> But no such tables on a considerable scale have yet been found.

<sup>2</sup> The process indicated appears to be as follows: Suppose it is required to express the fraction  $\frac{2}{7}$  as the sum of fractions with unity as numerator;  $\frac{1}{4} \times 7$  is more than 2;  $\frac{1}{5} \times 7$  is less than 2. The first fraction required is therefore  $\frac{1}{5}$ .

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{5} \times 7 &= 1\frac{2}{5} \\ 2 - 1\frac{2}{5} &= \frac{8}{5} \\ \frac{8}{5} \times 7 &= \frac{56}{5}\end{aligned}$$

Therefore  $\frac{1}{5}$  is the second fraction required.

$$\frac{2}{7} = \frac{1}{5} + \frac{1}{35}$$

—Translator's note.

means at their disposal, and they set out the results in a clear table. The breaking up of  $\frac{2}{3}$  became a type from which they proceeded to generalize, and treat every fraction in the same way—the sole rule of their arithmetic.

With the help of the table they proceeded to give the solutions of practical problems : how to distribute 1, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9 loaves among 10 people, that is to break up  $\frac{1}{10}$ ,  $\frac{3}{10}$  (and so on up to  $\frac{9}{10}$ ) into sums of fractions with 2 and 1 as their numerators. The fact that they left out  $\frac{2}{10}$  and  $\frac{5}{10}$  shows that already they were taking short cuts. And they knew how to prove a sum by multiplying after they had divided.

On the model of fraction analysis they solved the further problem of making up two or more fractions with the numerator 1 to unity (*Sekem* calculation : the search for a common denominator) ; that is they completed the process of breaking up that they had begun and, when they knew the sum of two fractions and the value of one of them, they calculated the other (*Hau* calculation). Thus they acted as true mathematicians and used a given process in every way theoretically possible as a method of calculation. There even arose something approximating to systematic progress in classification and an anticipation of theory (the tables) in advance of practice. At the end of this process of development the *Tunnu* system of calculation taught them an even more general formula by which they might distribute a number of loaves amongst a number of persons in such a way that the first-comers would get a different share from the later comers (perhaps 50 would get six and 50 four), and the difference between the shares would be indicated. At this point there is a break in the development, and two remarkable examples follow that were found by chance ; these problems, however, the Egyptians were not able to solve in a general way, but only in a single instance : we are concerned first with a *Tunnu* problem in which the investigator made a false start with a progression having a constant difference between the terms, beginning with 1, having 12 as the third term and 60 as the sum—the sole arithmetical progression in Egyptian mathematics ; secondly with an extensive multiplication sum leading to a geometrical progression which is likewise unique (7 cats eat 7 mice per day, and they each eat 7 ears of corn, each with 7 grains, which give a 7 fold yield). Both progressions were probably derived from Babylonia. The Egyptians made elegant use of them, but understood no more than that the first could be used to make a *Tunnu* problem more palatable and the second to introduce a nice story

into the curriculum. In Babylonia: 60 and 7 were used as the starting point of speculations.

The earliest arithmetic reached its high water mark in large-scale multiplication, division, and fraction sums, and geometry naturally developed side by side with it. This, too, is included in the book in question. The Egyptians took the square and the cube as clear and simple types and learned to measure them by the length of their sides. They applied the process to other figures, quite successfully where they were dealing with rectangular forms or right-angled triangles which could be made into rectangular figures by piecing together and halving, with approximate success when they treated trapezoids and acute-angled triangles in the same way. They never lighted upon the notion of "altitude" (as measured perpendicularly from the base of a triangle). But the results must have been adequate for their calculations of field areas and warehouse space. Remarkable amongst these calculations is that of the area of a circle; there is no indication whence it was derived. If the diameter of the circle is 9, its area is 64; this special concrete example does really give a remarkably good  $\pi$ ; i.e. 3.16 (instead of 3.14). There is no telling how the Egyptians reached this solution; perhaps simply by arithmetical speculation on the ancient Neolithic figure 9, confirming the result afterwards by spreading out a circle with that diameter and rearranging the contents in squares.

The Egyptians' achievements in the field of medicine were on a par with their mathematical attainments. Their power of visual imagery fitted them peculiarly well for the study of medicine, for there everything depends in the first instance on concrete observation and practical experience. But one chance circumstance gave them specially favourable opportunities to study it: in all countries people shrank from opening dead bodies, whilst in Egypt it had long been customary, a sacred duty to the dead, to open the body in order to remove the intestines in the process of embalming, and to preserve the intestines separately. One would suppose that this must have led to an empirical science of anatomy and physiology.

The Egyptians' visual imagination achieved excellent results in medicine. The study of the symptoms of external and internal diseases was highly developed. They distinguished and gave definite names to all manner of external injuries, diseases of the eye, the mouth, the throat, and the skin, dislocations and broken bones, and also to internal troubles, especially those of the alimentary canal, tumours, and women's and children's diseases. The doctors

not only watched everything that could be seen and touched, but also the temperature and pulse, and especially all excretions and waste matter, the breath, the blood, pus, mucus, the evacuation of the bowels, the urine, gall, and animal parasites. Long experience had supplied them with all manner of remedies, chiefly vegetable, but also animal and mineral, which they knew how to prepare carefully. All this was written in text-books which were divided even then into specialized fields, and partly based on theory. Practice, indeed, was dominant in diagnosis and therapy, the description of symptoms and the pharmacopœia.

Theory began with the naming of the disease, though this continued for the most part to be quite superficial—"running-eye, white eye, darkening of the pupils," "wasting, cancer, heat, nest of pain" are such names, solely the result of observation; but they had to be invented and introduced into the science before they could be replaced by better ones. And the Egyptians had a few names of the superior type that indicate causes. They looked at what was left over from food in the case of digestive troubles, and traced constipation and fever to the eating of "heating" food. When worms were excreted they assumed "putrefaction of the flesh" within the body. Besides the bowels with their inlets and outlets, they observed particularly the vascular system, but characteristically they made no use of the embalmer's observations. The doctors themselves did not dissect bodies. The *Theory of the Metu* (vessel-theory), the *Book of Medical Secrets*, is nothing but a book of metaphysics, starting from the nose, the inlet for the breath of life, and the outward structure of the body. The doctrine was then emended, extended, and made less superficial: the heart takes its place at the centre, the large intestine is provided with vessels, some intended to convey particular fluids; speculation assumes 48 as the total number of vessels. And certain not very definite instructions are added for cooling fevered vessels and softening hard ones. This supreme achievement of the Egyptians in the realm of theory contains very little anatomical observation; its central teaching is that the nose and heart are the seat of life, that all kinds of things flow out through the openings of the body, and that vessels pulsate. The savage knows as much, but the savage does not embody it in theory, he has no uniform, quantitative conception, and it is here that scientific progress lies. A final explanation of disease which also cropped up in Egypt is that of demons. It played a part especially in therapy, when the personified symptom, say the stench, was

commanded to depart, or when efforts were made to lure the "death spirit" to a more suitable place. Great gods, too, were called in, for a similarity was discovered between a sick child's illness and that of the child Horus, and efforts were made to bring the miraculous powers of Isis, the Mother, into play by force of analogy. So, too, medicines were reinforced by charms recited whilst they were prepared or swallowed. But this whole field remained undeveloped in comparison with Babylonian medicine; the demons were vague in form and nowise terrible, and in particular the sense of sin was absent.

Associated with medicine was botany in the form of herbal science and also of short lists of plants (love-songs); likewise zoology, also used for the purpose of medical science, but exemplified, too, in Thothmes III's pictures of Syrian animals.

A great work belonging to the New Empire, written by a wise man (who therefore gives his name) Amen-em-ope, promises "to teach the student all that exists, all that Ptah has created and Thoth written". It is a list of the names of all things in the world and the sky, of the heavenly bodies and what appears on them, the earth and its parts whether large (mountains and lakes) or small (fields), all personal beings from God and the king to the vizier, the priest, the wise men, scribes, craftsmen, and soldiers; then foreign peoples and towns; buildings and their parts; lands and fields; drinks, baked foods and kinds of meat; cattle, birds, and so on. Here we have a well-ordered survey of the world, in which numbers are used. Possibly it was made under the influence of Babylonian lists, but it lacks the Babylonian wealth of material. There is no formation of real generic notions, no separation of sacred from everyday things; it is half a list of beings (names) and half a set of directions to scribes. Such was the Egyptians' knowledge of the art of cataloguing which, in the kings' catalogues of peoples, served the glory of the gods and kings.

Turning to the humanities, fairly lengthy fragments of historical works have been preserved. Here the Egyptians, simultaneously with the Babylonians, invented the system of designating a year by an important event and stringing these names of years together in lists; that was a great step in advance of the Neolithic age, which knew nothing of history. We have a fragment of Egyptian annals belonging to the Fifth Dynasty (2500 B.C.) which begins as a list of the names of ancient kings, develops into a list of years, and is finally extended into something in the nature of a chronicle, recording

several events for each year. These annals served the practical ends of the Empire, or the offices or temples that kept them. Lists of kings arranged according to the ruling houses and giving the exact length of each reign, with the total period added up to the end of the dynasty, produce a very scholarly impression. Unluckily they tell nothing of the dynastic wars or co-sovereignty, and wholly ignore heretics—there is always, on principle, one single Horus only—and they alone are therefore inadequate for chronological purposes. In the New Empire the annals of the sovereigns blossom forth, in exceptional cases, into lengthy narratives, descriptions that are poetical in form and in vigour. Such is the account of Thothmes III's victory at Megiddo and Rameses II's danger and victory at Kadesh. These histories describe the campaigns, the particular battle, and the part played by the sovereign individually; the accounts are vivid and truthful, now objective, now rhapsodic.

Many of the epitaphs of great lords contain echoes of Stone Age heroic songs in which the hero was identified with sun-hero; they became more individual and, as we saw, they developed into a work of art in the *Adventures of Sa-Nehat*. In the king, the earthly god Horus lives for ever on earth and is for ever protected by Ra, by Amen. Here is no soil for a philosophy of history, and yet something of the kind is discernible in the story of the Fourth Dynasty's fall and its supercession by the sons of Ra. In the *Romance of Khufu* the change appeared as divine dispensation pure and simple, and in later times, following Babylonian models, it became a turning point in the world's history, the overthrow of a sinful by a pious dynasty. At that time the priestly view prevailed that prayer was the best policy, and the old story was remodelled in places, but not throughout in this spirit; Sesostris and Seti are types of great, that is pious, rulers; one story tells how Seti marched against the Assyrians praying and unarmed, and won the day because field mice had eaten their opponents' bow-strings. Thus the Jewish version of the defeat of Sennacherib took an Egyptian form.

There was no real study of philology in Egypt. True, foreign languages were learnt in the New Empire, but only by a handful of scribes for the purpose of diplomatic intercourse, which had to be conducted with the Eastern nations in cuneiform. The way had been prepared for the writing of foreign names in hieroglyphs since the Middle Empire by the introduction of purely phonetic syllabic signs. There now followed a prescription for writing Cretan names.

The scribes were much occupied with the study of Egyptian

itself, but they were concerned with orthography and calligraphy, not grammar. Some beginning was made with drawing up rules of orthography and calligraphy, such as the priority of "sacred" signs and the arrangement within the rectangle; but most things remained subject to custom, and variable. Nevertheless, practice in writing did train men to think. They learned to distinguish the pictorial and phonetic value of the signs, took delight in their interplay, and puzzled over their relation to one another and to reality.

In this connection we must mention the first scholarly commentary which is preserved in the seventeenth chapter of the *Book of the Dead*. It elucidates a hymn which the dead man recites when he enters the presence of the gods. It is intended to introduce him as a god, as Atmu, Ra, Min. Clearly the object of explaining this hymn was a practical one; the explanation told all manner of facts that the dead man would need to know when closely questioned regarding his divinity. But it has also a theoretical value to us, for it shows what "explaining" meant to the Egyptians. If something is explained to us, it means that we have placed it, as it exists or evolves, in its relation to a larger whole; but to the Egyptians it meant that they had given it a place in a divine myth (a genetic explanation), or that they had circumscribed it, given it visible, concrete unity, and called it by its name (a systematic explanation). So the commentary proceeds with a certain rigidity, annotating the hymn sentence by sentence.

The "image" is the essence, and the "name" is the essence; both images and names are in a relation to reality that is immediately evident, for in both I recognize the object and in both I feel its influence; an image awakens my desire for the object; a name calls to me. The Egyptians could not explain these relations to reality, but upon these depended their hopes of continued life after death. So they amended and elevated the old, naïve conceptions of the Stone Age, according to which one became a god as a matter of course if, like a god, one entered the mountain-side. They practised magic with pictures and phrases. In this way the great literature of death came into being, from the pictures in the painted tomb of Hierakonpolis and the Pyramid Texts to the *Book of what is in the Tuat* (other world) and the *Book of the Dead*. This is scientific literature—the science of magic—in the service of immortality. It spread from the realm of death to that of life. In the New Empire magic was widely practised, not only in medicine but for other purposes than healing. Men searched for the universal medicine and

the great spell, " the keys to the house of Thoth " (originally the signs used in writing !). The doctrine of omnipresent divine causality, as well as moral ideas, came into play, but they did not become dominant in the realm of magic, which remained a thing apart, a juggling with pictures and words. In the latter-day romances piety and magic (at least in kings and princes : Setni) seem to be regarded as in a sense opposed to one another.

By far the greater part of the Egyptian literature that has been preserved is scholastic. Almost all the great works of the poets and philosophers of Egypt have come down to us in copies made by scholars, as well as genuine letters and documents used as models. There are in addition actual educational works written for the schools, exhortations and warnings to the scholars, fabricated model letters and documents. Egypt and Babylon developed the first school systems in the world, simultaneously but independently. Egypt (even more than Babylon) always tended to stop short at the school curriculum, at actual instruction in writing as the principal effort and aim, at the business of the scribes.

Thus Egypt offers the first collection of books on ideals of education. These were the Precepts and Instructions which began with the close of the Ancient Empire and appeared recurrently on into the New, but flourished particularly in the Middle Empire. They began under the Third Dynasty with a few maxims, evidently written with painstaking assiduity and commended by a vizier to his son Kagemmi ; he exhorts his son to attend to his words, not to be boastful, not to be greedy at table. Here we have the first visual imagery in the realm of morals and manners, which two the Egyptians never quite learned to separate. All the wisdom that they inculcated retained the form of precepts of morality and manners, exhortations to observe discipline and temperance. The first complete work of this sort appeared under the Fifth Dynasty. The vizier, Ptah-hetep, wrote it under the influence of the first religious movement. He knows, he says, that everything happens according to the will of God and that in himself his Ka, or soul, lives, acts, and speaks. His ideal of education is the development of a loftier humanity through piety, ability to write, knowledge, and noble conduct towards all comers. A scribe in this loftier sense, a wise man, is he who learns from all men, the learned and the people, who strives to attain truth and proficiency, who never becomes arrogant, covetous, and restless, but always knows what is seemly in his relations with all men and serves his own truest interests.

Two hundred years later this philosophy of life gained ascendancy over the kings. King Merikere of Herakleopolis wrote Precepts for kings, claiming that the "god upon earth" should become human, a scribe in the sense in which Ptah-hetep used the word. A true king honours and fears the Deity; he is an Egyptian who protects sacred things and recognizes his compatriots even in the rival kings at Thebes. He can speak and write, and knows and respects the customs of his forefathers as well as the new learning. He makes his councillors wealthy, so that they have no occasion to oppress anyone, and he chooses them for their abilities, not their birth. He acts justly because his disposition is just, and he has perfect self-discipline. He does not himself strike, but he destroys rebels through his servants. He is benevolent and just, but his eyes are open. The era of the cultural kings was dawning.

Whilst the ideal of the scribe as a man was capturing the throne, a new ideal of the scribe as official was growing up among the scribes themselves, who had become so numerous that not all could be of noble birth. Dwauf, a man of low station, set up this ideal, exhorting his son to be industrious, patient, and well-behaved, so that he might serve his apprenticeship and become a lord, not subject to forced labour and well provided for. He draws up a long list of manual workers in order to show that they are worse off than the scribes.

Sober, practical class wisdom was the general rule. In the rising New Empire a more elevated wisdom grew up once again: the officer-scribes appeared, chivalrous and courtly, and the citizen-scribes. Of the first we hear only in the romance of the *Doomed Prince* and in a satire by civilian scribes. We possess an account of the educational ideals of the second in the *Maxims of Ani*. The scribe is now an educated citizen; he is pious, he offers sacrifices, celebrates festivals, prays in a low voice as is fitting; he is animated by filial sentiments towards his parents, especially his mother; he establishes a home and makes provision for his burial in good time. He does not drink or dally with love, he avoids all disturbers of the peace, and is on good terms with the police in his district. He is proud in the knowledge that he stands on his own feet, and does not depend upon legacies; he honours useful knowledge and possesses it and knows how to demean himself in society.

Such were the ideals of the class which allied itself with the priests to become masters of Egypt. The cultural ideal of the priestly favourite of the gods has been preserved to us only in the romance of Batau.

In Neolithic days there was one ideal for all men, that of the sun-hero, and one for all women, that of his wife. In Egypt a number of manly ideals grew out of this one, lofty human ideals and class ideals. Civilization had become richer and more various. Perhaps the change also affected ideals of womanhood, but no book of Precepts records the fact; only the wife and mother were sharply contrasted with the harlot.

### RELIGION

The religion of the Min kings was Neolithic solar religion with their bull-shaped divine king, Min of Coptos. Their sacred legend told of the victory of the youthful Horus over Set, his father's brother; how he ascended the throne (having now become "Min"), took a wife, and reigned; finally how Set murdered him, and his widow Hathor fled and gave birth in hiding to the child Horus, whom she brought up. The kings of Coptos were Min's sons and representatives on earth—whence "Horus". They ruled in his name, and when they died they entered the mountain-side like their god, to continue their rule in the person of the new king Horus, but to live on in God (like him) among the dead. The Min religion probably did not change very much after it had become localized in Coptos. It was not well suited to the Nile Valley, but it was sacred. It was to the interest of the dynasty to maintain it. The people were fully occupied for centuries with the labours of colonization and defending the new territory. Only slowly did an "Egyptian" nation emerge from the mixture of races, with the desire and the vigour to mould the world anew.

The overthrow of the Min dynasty by the chiefs of Edfu gave free reign to this youthful vigour. It was to the interest of the new Dynasty to adapt everything old and traditional to the country and the new popular character. Steps were immediately taken to revolutionize the Min religion; it was diversified, incorporated new experience in its personalities, and prepared for the consummation of the new concrete survey of the universe in visual imagery.

At first no more was noticeable than a political change and adaptation to the new conditions. Horus, the earthly god and victor over the enemy, was no longer the young bull of Coptos but the falcon of Edfu. Thenceforward the sun ceased to be a bull<sup>1</sup> and became a

<sup>1</sup> The bull amulets in the Naga-ed-Der graves were simplified and distorted till they were unrecognizable, but they still existed, as did also certain complete figures of bulls.

falcon, which flew across the sky, whereas a bull could not run along the sky. The original victory over Set took the form of the political Horus campaign. Ombos in the south, Oxyrhynchus in Central Egypt, and finally Tanis in the Delta—all homes of Set—were captured. In these wars certain nomes appear to have distinguished themselves particularly; the god of the jackal nome (Sept) in Central Egypt, was henceforth called the "clearer of roads"; and of Thoth, the god of the ibis nome (Ashmunen-Hermopolis), also in Central Egypt, the legend arose that first he had fought with Set against Horus but had afterwards gone over to Horus and that his help had been a decisive factor in victory.

Under Menes these developments culminated for the time being. The sun-god finally became a falcon, but he was still Horus the son of Hathor, the cow of Denderah. Min lost his bull's head and double-axe, the emblems of his sovereignty, but he retained his connection with the east and the phallus in a new form. He continued to be an important nome god, to wear the feather crown of Neolithic days, and to carry a whip as his sceptre. He kept the pillar-like form of the menhir (with a head), and his hieroglyph was the double-axe, only it had no handle. The king personifying Horus was still a bull who butted into his enemies' strongholds and knocked them down; on his robes of state was the ancient bull's tail, and he was the son of the cow. All this meant a conciliation of visible, tangible symbols, inspired by a political purpose. So too, perhaps, the king's name, "Menes", which resembles "Min" and may have designated him as a bull; his real name may have been Nar-Mer.

Policy, too, played a part in the erection of his new stronghold at the entrance to the Delta, which was the nucleus of the movable royal camp and thus became the new capital. Ptah, the god of Memphis, was likewise a pillar, a menhir with a head, just like Min and the sun-god of pre-historic times. A bull was worshipped in Memphis, as in Coptos. But Ptah was not in the first instance a sun-god, but the god of a class, the handicraft workers. And it was not he who was the sacred bull, but Hap (Apis), the Nile. At this point considerations of policy were set aside, and we have a glimpse of the more exalted speculations and the endeavour to adapt the solar religion to the new civilization and the character of the country. The god of the metropolitan citadel (not of the royal camp—that was Horus) was no longer a warrior, but an artist, who shaped all things with marvellous skill (a world-creator and bringer of culture in a higher sense than the first tiller of the soil). And in Egypt the

bull of fertility was the Nile, who carried the black earth (that is why Apis was black) and who flooded the land when Sothis rose early (that was why Apis had a star on his forehead). We cannot ascertain from the monuments whether the sun-god had already been differentiated at the time of Menes into Ra, who was a star and immortal, and Osiris, the mortal god of the dead, belonging to the plant world; but it may be so. Menes himself continued to be Horus; he had a Horus name, his tomb was a brick mound with palace doors, and a number of gifts were placed in it; there are no signs of a Ra or Osiris cult.

It was not till the revolutionary century in the second prime of Egypt's first culture, under the kings of the Fourth Dynasty that the solar religion was fully differentiated in the realm of theory. External conditions were settled and secure, writing (as an ocular world survey) had been perfected in practice as civilization developed, the first practical problems of administration had been solved, and a class of experienced scribes had arisen. Now, therefore, men could round off their theory of the universe so as to produce a fixed image of that universe. The Delta was the home of this new speculative thought which centred in two cities, On-Heliopolis and Zedu-Busiris. In both a solar pillar (menhir, phallus) was worshipped, and with it the speculative efforts of the priestly scribes were linked. 'Min, Ptah, Osiris, and Ra were still pillars, menhirs, which were transformed into coffins (Osiris) or into coffin-like lower parts (Min, Ptah), or on occasion into obelisks).

In Heliopolis, the Sun City, the Neolithic solar religion developed into a high type of Nature philosophy. Ra, who was the god there, was the actual natural sun in its course over the sky; he sailed in a boat across the heavenly ocean; he had a falcon's head, but the sun's orb rested upon it, and he was accompanied by officials who made their reports to him as king. He wore the uræus serpent upon his head as a diadem, the symbol of his destructive power (for the Egyptian sun can be deadly), of his power over all his enemies, the clouds and the darkness, and of his punitive justice. But he was also the bringer of the seasons, of day and night, of fertility and joy; he was the menhir Ben Ben (Babban? Babbar?) who now became an obelisk pointing upwards towards the sun, the first and last to receive his greeting. This god "lived in his own blood", he was immortal although submerged and obscured. By night he sailed in a different boat across a different sky below the earth, he shone upon the dead or fought his way through caverns and enemies; but he was

alive, absolutely immortal, the first immortal among the gods. This Nature god could have no earthly house; his sanctuary was the courtyard where the obelisk rose aloft and where an altar in the open air received burnt offerings (first fruits) and libations when men saluted and paid homage to the god in the sky. And an image of the solar bark was venerated in this sanctuary. The immortal god could no more have a grave than a house on earth. The mound, which had now become a pyramid, continued to be a royal tomb, but the dead king only lived in his fortified house as a body by night; by day he hoped to emerge in order to see and worship the sun as he had done during his life-time. His soul travelled with the god in the solar bark.

The solar god of Neolithic days was now no longer one; Ra was the immortal, life-giving and destroying sun of Nature. The sacred legend of the dying god was set aside; it was out of harmony with the visible facts in Egypt, it was unworthy of the One Eternal who "lived in his own blood". Rapture at the eternal splendour of Nature had remoulded old traditions. Ra, it is true, remained an animal, a king, a pillar, a god of the dead in imagery, but these were mere relics indicating particular characteristics and powers (his flight like that of a falcon, his sovereignty, his power over all Nature); they were essential relics, for men were not yet sufficiently capable of abstraction to worship the Disc. They needed a god who could do all things and protect the dead and the quick. But his character as a Nature god was settled, as is proved by the new interpretation of the pillar and the mound. The aim was to cut loose from too human qualities.

So it came about that the first pantheon of universal gods was created around this divine figure, the first visual image of the universe, the first explanation of how the universe came into being and how it moved, the first story of creation. The mythology of the sun's course through the year was supplanted by the mythology of how the different parts of the universe were brought forth and of their relation to one another. Apparently the Stone Age had no story of creation. The year had always run its course as it did in the sacred legend, and people looked no further. Now a cosmogony arose: Ra had fashioned all things, since he alone existed, out of his own hand. First Shu and Tefnut, breath (wind?) and fluid (water?). These two gave birth to Keb and Nut, earth and sky (the earth was conceived as a man and the sky as a woman, or cow). Shu, the god of the air, thrust himself between Keb and Nut, raised the sky above the earth, and held it up. The formation of a family, a genealogical

table, explained the coming into being of the universe, as it had formerly explained the year. But now man's image of the world embraced four principal parts, and so a piece of physical lore originated. The universe consisted of earth and sky, air and fluid. Perhaps Ra once "breathed out" and "spat out" these first two children, since he had to produce them by other than sexual means. First the sun, then air and water, lastly earth and sky, such is the order in which the parts of the universe came into being. It was only a small step from this to the first non-mythical image of the world's state; the earth then appeared as the Nile Valley (the mound would be out of place here), surrounded by deserts and sea. Four pillars (the cow's legs), or the air, hold up the sky above it. Beneath it are caverns where the dead live. By day the sun moves in the sky, sailing in the diurnal bark, flying, creeping like a beetle on the cow's belly (a dung-beetle); by night he sails through caverns in the nocturnal bark from the west back to the east. One or two further features were added; the sun was the beetle, the scarab, turning the ball of dung from which its young emerge, generated it seems, by other than sexual means; the sun, like the beetle, is self-begotten. The sky became a sea, Nun, the heavenly ocean, upon which other constellations also sailed, such as the moon (though it was usually held to be the sun's vizier, because it took his place at night), the morning star, and Sirius (the first associated with Ra as the sun's harbinger, the second as the sun's messenger announcing the inundation). There were monsters, too, in the sun's path and worshippers at his gates.

Such was the world as it appeared to the Egyptians, such were their efforts to create a pantheon of universal gods. It is all very blurred, and the figures are creations of the learned. Except Ra, none of these gods became living realities. Nowhere were they worshipped individually. Keb and Nut were mentioned frequently only on account of their association with Osiris. Amongst Egypt's vital gods Osiris did, indeed, become lord of the Underworld, but not of any part of this world.<sup>1</sup> Thoth became god of the moon through the ambition of the scribes, who placed their own god beside the lord of the universe, just as they stood beside the king as his viziers.

But in Zedu-Busiris speculative thought developed the Osiris myth, also out of the solar myth; not, however, in its astronomical

<sup>1</sup> We might assume a division of the universe into two main parts, the upper world of Ra and the Underworld of Osiris, but Ra appeared by night in the Underworld. No more was Ra the god of the living and Osiris of the dead, for Ra continued to be a god of the dead likewise.

aspect, but from its other half, the sacred legend. Osiris was the dying god ; he was no longer the sun, for that does not die in Egypt, but the vegetation that withers when the waters fail in the torrid land. The solar pillar, Zedu, was turned into a column, a conventionalized withered tree, or the figure of a mummy with a crown, sceptre, and whip. Osiris was no longer a bull, but a human being, like his wife Isis. His brother Set murdered him by human cunning (he shut him into a coffin, the seed-pod from which the plant grows). Set was lord of the desert, where there is no vegetation. In both there were traces of their ancient shape as bulls ; in Osiris' case these occurred in hymns, in Set's they appeared in his animal symbol, a fabulous beast with horns. So, too, traces remained of their solar form, and these are plainly recognizable, for Horus, the son and avenger of Osiris, retained his solar character. Set had robbed Osiris of his eye, and Horus compelled Set to spit out the eye, and restored it to the dead god in order to revive him. Just as the dying god was bound to become a god of vegetation in Egypt, so the fight between Horus and Set was transferred to the sky ; it was an eclipse of the sun, in which the moon (Thoth) ensured the victory of light by effacing the sun's eye ; for after the eclipse the sun is seen close beside the moon.

But this transformation of the sacred legend into natural and stellar phenomena was not the chief consideration to the Egyptians ; the chief consideration was that now they had a god of the dead (as Ra was the god of life) for whom they could create a kingdom within the earth, a Nile Valley upon which the sun shone by night, a land where the soil was tilled under the rule of King Osiris. It was man's first Other World, the first realm where the masses of the people could go after death, for only the nobles had a place in the solar bark. Moreover, Osiris maintained specially close relations with Horus, his son, as the sun and as king, and he was more human in his appearance and his lot than all the other gods ; as Ra became more remote from mankind, Osiris grew more and more human. It was he who retained the living solar family, the loving wife, the faithful son. Isis, the mother who flees from the tyrant with her baby to the Delta, the mourning lover who seeks her husband in all parts of the Nile Valley—no people ever conceived these human images more humanly and vividly, with more touching simplicity than the Egyptians ; nor, indeed, more divinely, for the idea of the Immaculate Conception of Horus by a ray of sunlight is also Egyptian.

Osiris, therefore, remained the second great god of Egypt beside Ra. Side by side with the religious movement which gloried

in the eternal immortality of Ra was a second inspired by the divine humanity of Osiris. After a long period of rivalry (Ra claimed the exclusive position of chief god at time of the Ra kings of the Fifth Dynasty) a compromise was reached; Osiris, Isis, Set, and his wife and sister Nephthys became the children of Keb and Nut (who now, being Hathor, had to be a cow), and thus entered the family of Ra of Heliopolis. In this way the first pantheon was completed numerically—the “great company of nine”. The unity of the ancient sun-myth had been broken; now, after a process of differentiation, it was outwardly restored, as also the circle of destiny. For after Ra, the solar king, and after the dead Osiris, Horus followed, the first of the second “little company of nine”, the young sun-god and king. He, however, did not mate and die as a god, but only as a king. Twice nine is the sum of all the great gods, the new total. This pantheon was little more than a list and enumeration; it did not mean much more than a formal summary.

Beside these principal gods, fashioned from the Neolithic solar religion, the gods of the nomes played a lesser part in speculative thought. But an incipient attempt was made to form them, too, into a pantheon, corresponding to the development of classes and occupations in the Ancient Empire. The god of the kings was the nome god Horus of Edfu; Ptah of Memphis was the god of the artist-craftsman. The scribes made Thoth of Ashmunen, the ibis, the god of their class. Khnemu of Elephantine became the potters’ god (he invented the potter’s wheel). Soldiers prayed to Month of Hermonthis. Only the priests had no god of their order, because they were not a separate class; when, later, they became a class their god was Amen of Thebes. In the second company this class pantheon was linked with that of the universal gods. Moreover, Horus was the sun and the child of Osiris. Thoth was the vizier of Ra, the helper of Osiris, and the moon. Whether the scribes chose him because of these associations or endowed him with them, we cannot tell. The other gods also put forward their claims, even to a share in creation and the sovereignty over the dead in competition with Ra and Osiris. Ptah was the artist who fashioned all shapes, Thoth gave their names and nature to all things, Khnemu moulded the earth like a pot, Anubis and Seker were gods of the dead. But in the main they remained attached to their class and nome.

Neolithic gods had no sacred images. The sun was worshipped in the open air with a certain symbolism which sketched in outline the figures of gods and actual scenes, such as the combat and loves

of the sun-brothers, besides all manner of totemic and fetish images. The Egyptians, with their habit of fashioning concrete types, made of these a series of clearly defined divine images. Here every god had his image as he had his house (but Ra his courtyard). This was not a retrogressive step, as might be supposed, as compared with the absence of images in prehistoric times. It was a step in advance, and the worship of the sun in Nature was not lost but reformed. Everything else was now clearly delineated; the characters in the Nature myth were distinguished and depicted as concrete persons, totemic animals were included in the scheme, recognized as gods, and given their appointed places. The plain and universal meaning of "god-head" emerged. Just as the life-like animal pictures of the Old Stone Age were simplified and turned, in Neolithic art, into scanty outline sketches, which yet were distinct and governed by theoretical considerations—symbols, that is—and just as this change was a step in advance, so the creation of a number of divine forms, mainly animal, in Egyptian religion was an advance beyond the indefinite "monotheism" and absence of "idolatry" in the solar religion. It is necessary to grasp and distinguish what exists clearly and fully before higher ideas of the godhead can evolve.

All the Egyptian gods were clearly conceived and distinguished externally. They include all forms: constellations (the Disc), human beings (Osiris and Isis), animals (Hor, Thoth, Khnemu, etc.). Indeed the majority were animals, including the greatest, Ra, and the most important, Thoth: the influence of the Egyptian "as well as" is truly at work here. At the dawn of history there is no doubt that men began to conceive the great gods as constellations or in human form: Ra was the actual sun; Ptah and Min, who took shape at the time of Menes, have no animal traits like Osiris, Isis, and Nephthys. But practical considerations promptly entered in; for political reasons it was desirable to associate the falcon with Ra, for religious reasons to realize that Ptah, Min, and Osiris were pillars. And then the nome gods came into consideration, and must needs retain their animal shape. And so a compromise was struck: all the gods were depicted with human bodies, all were clothed in godlike robes, all were adorned with the solar Disc; that was what "god-head" implied. The rivalry of local cults prevented any one from lagging behind, and each one was allotted his family—and his animal. But to each one was attributed his own special shape, and that was an animal shape in most cases: animals' heads rested upon human bodies crowned with the solar Disc.

The Egyptians did not separate gods from animals because they did not regard men and animals as mutually exclusive opposites. They saw the gulf; their gods acted like themselves, as human beings; but they did not love the conception "either—or". These animals had been regarded as sacred by their ancestors, and why should they break with tradition? But first and foremost, the animal images enabled them to distinguish each separate figure so clearly, and without them it would not have been easy. For in soul the gods were little defined, like the Egyptians themselves. If they had all been depicted in human form, they would have been too much alike; nothing could have kept them distinct but outward symbols. Thus Isis was characterized by her humanity and Thoth by his ibis-head. True, it would have been possible to show the animals beside the human figures; but the root cause was the Egyptians' lack of any clear and strong sense of the contrast between men and animals, or between gods and animals.

We have a primitive polytheism, with its gods differentiated by purely outward marks, and a correspondingly primitive bond of union by means of human bodies, characteristic garb, and the solar Disc. Even in the Ancient Empire the Egyptians produced, under compulsion, pictures which seem almost like portraits and at any rate reproduce pictorially the age and temperament, race and demeanour of the original; but they lacked the capacity to portray their gods with as much individual character. Here they had no model to copy, and they were limited, therefore, by the extent of the theoretical knowledge they had mastered and of the individuality they possessed; and that was very little. "Man," timelessly conceived in contrast to "animal", was yet to be developed as a type.

The gods of the Egyptians had as little inner soul as they themselves. One or two universal human emotions were incarnated (in the Osiris cycle the love of wife, mother, and child; fraternal hatred and revenge) besides a great deal of outward dignity and decorum. Nor had Sa-Nehat in the Middle Empire much more; that is why the whole amounted to ocular, typical expression through action, a doctrine of right demeanour. Ra destroyed the "rebels", he is "just", but how formal was his justice, regarding every enemy as a "rebel" and utterly alien to any sense of sin.

Till far on in the New Empire the Egyptians typified feelings, as observed from without, in prescribed, expressive movements. So, too, they typified the soul from without and established a scientific psychology based on ocular observation. Primarily man was a body

and that individual body must be preserved, as it had been from the earliest times. But man, too, was the "double" of his body, "Ka", the imaged "figure of the body", somewhat as it appeared in dreams (represented by two hands raised in supplication). Man, too, was "Ba", the bird with a human head, which could fly out and change its shape during sleep. He was "Khu", the spirit or essence, and "Khaibit", the shadow (in the sun); he was the name, and so on. Once more we have visual imagery assuming many shapes, all, in fact, that have been familiar from pre-historic ages (shadow hands in the Palæolithic caves) to our own days (harpies; ghosts of the dead; the damned praying for mercy; the spirit). But there was no separation of body and soul by mutual exclusion and contrast, no discrimination between "soul", "name", and "solar shadow".

Among the great gods Ra strove for sovereignty at the expense of all the others in the days of the Ancient Empire. He induced the kings to add Ra names to their Horus names. The Fifth Dynasty fought and won the throne in his name. He sought in rivalry to supplant the nome gods by a pantheon of universal gods, and the religion of Osiris by a religion of death stamped with his own character. But in the end he missed victory. He remained the chief, but amongst approximate equals; he was the eldest, the head of the family, the royal sun-god, but Osiris and the gods of nomes and classes held their own.

Then in the Middle Empire a city god emerged, Amen of Thebes, who cherished the same ambition as Ra, and to whom it was granted to satisfy it in the New Empire and become lord over the other gods. He originated as a nameless nome god in the shape of a ram without individual character; his rise was not due to speculative thought, but to the victories of the counts of his nome, who later became the kings of the Eleventh Dynasty. In the Middle Empire he was endowed with attributes by speculative thinkers, quite uncreatively but very copiously, as the god of the capital, as the heir of the earlier Min, as Ra. His wife Mut succeeded Hathor, his son Khensu became the heir of Thoth, the god of the moon and of wisdom. Finally the Hyksos victory made him absolutely sovereign of the gods, just as it had made the kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty absolute sovereigns of the nome counts. Subsequently he became lord of the world and ruler of Syria as far as the Euphrates. Then the religious movement of the New Empire, and perhaps Babylonian influences, rendered him creative service: Amen-Ra acquired spiritual qualities, he became the Pure, the Merciful, the Gracious, the Good Shepherd and

Father. His wife Mut became the Gracious Mother, Hathor's successor fashioned in human shape. It was not only as a scribe that his son was god of wisdom (like Thoth), but also as the "Beautiful and Tranquil", who thought and planned, as the executant of plans. All of a sudden great gods began to embody spiritual qualities, virtues like mercy and kindness; it seemed that a new, loftier, and more spiritual notion of godhead was in process of growth. If the myth of the flood as the punishment of sin was brought at this period from Babylon to Egypt without being attributed to Amen, it is proof that the Egyptians thought it too brutal for this most exalted of the gods. They transferred it to Ra, who appeared as an old fogey, and they gave it the ridiculous form of a flood of beer. They simply did not possess the profounder idea of sin which compels men to approve that judgment.

Amenhetep IV attempted to set up a purified cult of Ra, as the king's sole worship, in opposition to Amen, the upstart in virtue of his luck and his appropriation of what was not his. He removed all the too human features from Ra's image. He resolved to worship henceforward only the solar Disc, Aten, with life-giving rays as hands, and not Ra himself. He repudiated narrow nationalism—this universal god was the god and Providence of all; he repudiated all other gods (he actually persecuted Amen)—Aten alone was his, the king's, god. But this was the limit of his "monotheism". Primarily, Aten was Amenhetep IV's god, his Father. Everywhere his image appears above the royal family, over his son and prophet. It was a personal relation, but not that of god to man; rather it was the relation of the god to the king and to his priestly favourite in the person of the king.

As a reaction against the royal religion Amen Ra thereupon became the lord of the Egyptian pantheon, not the god of one royal priest, but of all who became priests and favourites of the god through education and goodwill; he was the god of men as priests and citizens. And here we touch the Babylonian stage evolution.

God and animal, man and animal, were not clearly distinguished in Egypt; no more were god and man. In actual fact the Egyptians placed the gods high above men, but in principle the two merged. Kings were men who were gods in their lifetime; and every man could become god, and had the assured expectation that he would become a god when he died.

Amongst more highly civilized peoples the dividing line between gods and men is drawn, in the first instance, at the place marked by death. Gods are immortal, men mortal. The Egyptians discovered

that Ra was immortal, that the sun lives in his own blood. Ra had no tomb, no house upon earth in case he should die, and none in life. And some visible trace of this immortality of the sun was extended to all gods, for all adopted the solar disc as one of their divine emblems: deity has a share in the sun's immortality. But the immortal Ra still bore the visible mark of his share in mortality: he fought hard by day and night against monsters. Here we have the incipient mythology of the fight with the dragon, but it was not associated with creation, nor did it assume grandiose proportions and become the subject of epic poetry. It was no more than natural delight at the sun's reappearance. Ra himself was sometimes said to grow old; he shone upon the dead, and he himself was a god of the dead. Osiris, on the other hand, was the god whose tomb was everywhere (hence the myth of his being cut in pieces); he was the god of the dead who died each year; but he remained a great god although he died; he did not become a hero. Nor was he the only god of the dead. Ra was one also, and more especially Anubis, the jackal god of Kynopolis, and Seker of Memphis. Immortality was a divine characteristic, but it did not involve any fundamental distinction between the gods; the great god did not shun the dead, the dying god was no less a god, he did not become a mere hero. There were men who were also gods; gods, therefore, who descended to the level of men need not become the prototypes of tragedy and be doomed to die. True, Osiris appears as Batai in the New Empire romance, but his "heroic" character consists in rising from the dead, which he does four times. It really seems that nothing is less dangerous than dying.

Nor did the dividing line between "great" and "lesser" gods produce a fundamental separation of gods and men. It was noted, but effaced immediately. The Egyptians were no longer so childish as to deduce that men rose from the dead merely from the analogy of death and resurrection in Nature, because men entered the mountain-side like the sun; the matter was not as simple as all that. But at rock bottom they felt resurrection to be as natural as death—only that the conditions had become harder. Man's assimilation to the divine image required more points of similarity; the new knowledge, the loftier idea of godhead, came into play; it came to be an art to ensure resurrection. During the transition period before the Middle Empire, the Egyptians had before them the spectacle of numbers of pyramids where no cult was observed, rifled perhaps during the disturbances, and they were assailed with doubts regarding

the value of embalming and strong tombs. They exhorted men to enjoy life, for with death it was assuredly at an end. But even this generation did not doubt of life after death in the world of Osiris. And in the great poem in which mankind is depicted as utterly bad and joy in life as impossible, the *Dialogue of a Man Weary of Life* who seeks death, the object of aspiration is precisely immortality and union with the gods.

The Egyptian religion of death, with its funeral ceremonies and funeral offerings, is the finest example of the "as well as" character of Egyptian thought. Like Neolithic man, the Egyptians' first aim was to support the body, to give it the necessities of life. This they did with great outlay; they embalmed the body, surrounded it with all the luxuries of household equipment and made offerings of food and drink at the tomb. Like Neolithic man, they attributed importance to a burial mound which developed into a strongly built house of brick or stone, then into the pyramid and the palace of the western hills. Like Neolithic man, they likened the dead to the sun, giving them golden masks so that their faces shone; the priest of the dead "transfigured" them in the sacred games at the tomb so that they were turned into the sun, or Osiris.

Here we see the influence of the new science of visual imagery, of pictures and sounds. An image was the true essence, it possessed reality; from the time of Menes onwards, therefore, images were given to the dead man as part of his equipment with all the good things of life; these were modelled in the round or moulded in relief—food, herds, storehouses, and workshops, ships and troops, besides women and servants (realistically fashioned at first, then as ushabti figures mummified in the manner of Osiris). The dead were also given Ka statues as substitutes for themselves, exact likenesses in wood or stone; these lasted longer than the corpse and, when the Ba breathed life into them, they could go out freely without swathings.

As early as the time of Menes attempts were also made to avert the dangers on the road to the sun by pictorial means. Such was Nar-Mer's paint-palette with beasts of prey devouring other animals (including a solar gryphon); in the midst of these terrors a little long-eared animal (the young solar animal which we picture as a hare) goes unharmed: so might the dead man go his way! Perhaps, too, the dead king was also the lion, as on other palettes, always sure of finding food. The painted tomb of Hierakonpolis, with its boats and its pictures of combats and hunts, also contains magic images. Whether it is the dead man himself who as solar hero is killing

enemies and holding them by the hair, and capturing the animals portrayed, or whether they are lurking along the road that he must traverse (the former is probable), at any rate enemies and beasts are to be subdued pictorially in advance. The goal to be reached is the solar bark, and the dead man is represented as in it already, as Ra or beside Ra.<sup>1</sup>

In addition to pictorial charms there were verbal charms in the service of the religion of the dead. These must always have had their place in the "transfiguration" at the open grave, and in sacrifices to the dead: in later times the Egyptians wished every dead man "ten thousand geese and all good things" when they passed a tomb. But a new feature was the practice of giving the dead written charms to take with them. Such coffin texts are first found on the walls of the royal tombs of the Fifth and Sixth Dynasties, where they form an entire literature taken by the dead for use in the realm of Ra and Osiris and on the road thither. Instead of the few pictures of the "painted tomb" there are charms for every method of ascent to the sun, every situation in the realm of Osiris, and every danger on the road thither.

These developed later into the "Books of the Dead" which went with a man into his coffin; there were texts and pictures, the *Book of the Dead*, the *Book of What is in the Tuat* (the other World), the *Book of the Two Ways*. And the *Romance of Bataou* was found in a royal tomb.

Meanwhile, increasing demands were made upon the knowledge and capabilities of the dead man; for the more men practised magic the more they realized how easily a charm may fail, how very necessary it is to find the correct one. Annotations now appeared in the coffin texts; in case the dead man should be subjected to detailed examination they put secret names and pictorial substitutes at his disposal. And whilst in the Ancient Empire the dead were expected to have made themselves acceptable alike to the gods and the king in their lives by services and offerings, in the Middle Empire they were required to take thought for the judgment of souls, to walk justly in life, and to find assurance of sinlessness in the *Book of the Dead*. For at bottom the judgment of souls was merely a new condition attached to immortality, a condition which must be fulfilled with the help of pictorial and verbal charms. The *Negative*

<sup>1</sup> Compare *Die jungsteinzeitliche Sonnenreligion im ältesten Babylonien und Ägypten*, *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1922-3 (Hinrichs, Leipzig).

*Confession*, which does not confess and repent of sins but disavows them all, is no more than a superior charm, proving that no serious sense of sin ever dawned upon the Egyptians. To each of the forty-two judges the dead man disavowed one sin ; a prayer followed that he might be saved and not accused, because " his mouth and hands were pure ". Further, there was an amulet that could be palmed off on the Weigher of the Dead as the heart.

Unfortunately we know very little about Amenhetep IV's beliefs about death. He was buried in the traditional manner in a rock tomb. According to one prayer he believed that his body would be rejuvenated and united eternally with the spirit that dwelt in the solar Disc. But the *Hymn to Aten* says no more. Bataui's self-righteousness in the consciousness of his purity and chastity shows how a man may be genuinely moral without any sense of sin.

Just as the Egyptians had painted the path of the sun at the time of Menes, so they did the realm of the dead in the Ancient, Middle, and New Empires. The dead man is received into the bark of Ra in the sky (even in the tomb of Hierakonpolis there are several barks) and the god is surrounded by his court ; the dead man accompanies him on his voyage across the sky by day, and by night across the other sky, through the cavern beneath the earth or the realm of Osiris. This ship, constituting a realm of dead kings, high officials, or particular wise men and scholars (such as the " Man Weary of Life ") is represented with the realism of this world. The kingdom of Osiris in the West (a solar relic) was a reflection of Egypt, with a royal palace, officials, peasants, and probably a Nile too, upon which the sun shone by night. As time went on it became more melancholy and other-worldly ; it was now situated under the earth, all the inhabitants had to perform peasant labour, and all were mummies like King Osiris. Lastly, moral demands penetrated and began to transform the kingdom ; the judgment of souls was instituted at the entrance ; the fate of the dead was determined by decree of the forty-two judges and the weighing of the heart by Anubis against the feather of the goddess of Truth, with Thoth recording the result. The numerous monsters on the road to the sun were now united in one, the " Eater of the Dead ", who devoured the wicked, the damned. But for those who were acquitted the road lay open to the House of Osiris ; Horus led the souls of the blessed into the palace and into the presence of Osiris. Thus the underground Nile Valley in the West came to be the mansion of the blest and " Hell ", destruction in the maw of a " hell-hound ".

Amongst the most lasting and influential achievements of Egyptian visual thinking is this elaboration of their ideas of a kingdom of the dead in the West, an "other world" beneath the earth that first consisted of broad arable acres for all, then came to be a palace and garden for the virtuous and an abyss of destruction for the wicked, their development of the conception of the judgment and weighing of souls, the Eater, and Horus as an archangel conducting the dead to the Lord of Paradise. All these still live in our own minds, transformed into Christian imagery.

The first religious movement that we can trace in Egypt was the outcome of speculations concerning Ra in Heliopolis. It produced the great temple courtyards dedicated to Ra, and the pyramids, also the Ra names of the kings of the Fourth Dynasty. It raised the sons of Ra of Satchebu to the throne, the founders of the Fifth Dynasty, the creators of the new solar courtyards with their altars and obelisks. The god thrust aside the house of Khufu, although it had committed no sin (*Khufu Romance*) in order to magnify his own sons. The *Precepts of Ptah-hetep* belong to the period of the Fifth Dynasty, preaching a common-sense piety, efficiency, and moderation in all things: all things happen according to the will of the Deity; he is wise who knows that it is his soul, his Ka, that really lives and acts in him, and who obeys his Ka; the Ka exhorts a man to learn from everybody, to work well, and to be truthful, benevolent, and well-conducted, not to count too firmly on good fortune, and to enjoy what is allotted to him. "Follow thy heart all the days of thy life for it is an abomination to the Ka if his time is shortened."

Two hundred years later these words of wisdom were taken up again in the *Harper's Song*, or *Song from the House of Intef* (that is, from the tomb of a king of the Eleventh Dynasty), which Herodotus appears to have heard, with little alteration, nearly two thousand years later as the *Dirge of Maneros*. "Follow thy desire all the days of thy life," the minstrel exhorts his hearers, and gives as a reason that "men have passed away ever since the days of our forefathers and others take their place", that the pyramids, which conceal the great kings, and the houses of wise men have fallen in ruins; "no man cometh thence to say how it is with them till we also go thither, where they have gone"; therefore, "be joyful," forget death; "put myrrh on thy head, clothe thyself in fine linen, and anoint thyself with the true marvels of God's works"; "pass thy days joyfully and be not weary. For behold, no man can take

his possessions with him. Behold, none cometh again who has once gone forth."

This is precisely the substance of the melancholy-gay *Gaudeamus*, and the Egyptian poem was also a banqueting song. But what has become in the interval a drinking song like any other, was a new and solemn realization in Egypt, a philosophical perception, the first scepticism to be grasped and expressed theoretically in the history of civilization. Ptah-hetep's piety led to a form of rationalism that was not at all radical and yet impugned essential features in the cult of the dead, and more besides. Ptah-hetep was very quiet and unassuming in his submission to God, but still he saw the prospect of happiness in culture and humanity which made life worth while. The Harper preaches material pleasure as the last word of wisdom—to enjoy and forget death. It was this poem of all others that remained dear to the hearts of the Egyptians for two thousand years; it contains the sum total of their rationalist wisdom, the element which, in the form of doubt, stimulated them and urged them onward. It was for Egyptian culture what the *Book of Job* was to the Jews.

But this rationalism, this materialism, destroyed the old piety and its valuations. We come upon the *Teachings of Dwauf*, which pays heed only to the advantages and profits attached to the profession of scribe; we listen to the laments of the *Eloquent Peasant* and the *Admonitions of a Prophet*, showing the spread of selfishness, hypocrisy, and greed, and how domestic revolution had reduced the country to the utmost wretchedness.

In the *Wisdom of Merikere* this misery is made the subject of an exhortation to the king always to remember the Deity who made the world for mankind, who rises as the sun and gives nourishment, who values the just man's virtues more highly than the ox of the unjust, who knows all, good and bad alike, by name, who strikes down the wicked and compels all men to stand and answer before the judge of souls. Order is to be restored by the energy, culture, and power of a ruler who loves Egypt deeply, by his wisdom and his consuming wrath against rebels among the nobility, in the cities, and among the troops.

The poet of the *Dispute of a Man Weary of Life with his Ka*, the greatest poet that Egypt ever produced, overcame these doubts on a theoretical plane. The poem meant to Egypt what the new poetry of the Psalms, following Job, meant to the Jews: doubts are overcome by a more exalted and personal piety.

The man weary of life is poor, deserted, maligned, despairing, and resolves to take his own life; he resolves to burn himself in order to be united directly with his god, the sun. His "soul" refuses its consent, for according to the prevailing doctrine, if the body is destroyed and not buried, the soul loses all possibility of repose; and it cannot stay where its body is. So it exhorts the man weary of life to live: "Follow the happy day and forget thy care", and it quotes the *Song of the Harper*, in an intensified version: the sacrificial tables of kings in the pyramids are as bare as those of the poor; but its conclusion is: "live, then," not "so your grave, too, is worthless".

The man weary of life, who tells the story himself, like Sa-Nehat, answers in four poems, the sublimest produced by any Egyptian. In eight pictures he shows how "his name is accursed", and how all despise and loathe him; none is willing to listen to him or take an interest in his life; there is no longer any such thing as brotherhood, friendship, gentleness, and confidence. Insolence holds sway, greed and hypocrisy, ingratitude and injustice. Sin afflicts the land, and there is no end to it. That is why death appears to him (the man weary of life) to-day like the fragrance of myrrh and lotus-blossom, like drawing breath, a return to health, like home-coming after war and captivity<sup>1</sup>; for in death he will be a living god and punish sinners; he will stand in the solar bark and make gifts to the temples; he will stand before the divine Ra and it will be granted to him to see and speak the truth.

We see that the trouble of the man weary of life is dissatisfaction with the world, not poverty and distress; it is despair of mankind, which is so utterly remote from his ideal. He is weary of life, because he knows what it is to be humane, and is ridiculed and persecuted if he acts on that knowledge, or even speaks so. That is why he is resolved to die; for he never doubts for a moment that the Deity is pure, great, and good, and that he will find the happiness in God which is denied to him here, that he will be permitted to be sincere, to speak truly, and to punish sinners.

This holy zeal seeks death in order to be with Ra and despises all earthly things, the body and the tomb, and it is through this that doubt is overcome, incidentally and unintentionally. The man weary of life adopts a position so high above that of the *Song of the Harper* that the questions posed there lose their significance. To

<sup>1</sup> Here for the first time in human history we meet with the image of life as warfare and death as restored health, release from captivity, and salvation.

him the pyramids and the rotting of the unburied body by the wayside are equally irrelevant—he is resolved to burn his body, for God is the solar flame. The pleasures of life are nothing to him—he is resolved to live in God, in the truth. He does not ask what awaits him in the other world, he knows that God awaits him there, and he burns to see him. And his Ka will lose nothing through his fiery death; to think that the Ka needs a resting-place is superstition, funerary materialism. The Ka is his very self, what survives and enters into the presence of God.<sup>1</sup>

This is Egypt's profoundest poem, and it ushered in the revulsion which led to the loftier piety of the New Empire. The man weary of life was the earliest favourite of the gods, the first to contemplate an ethical Deity, and to introduce ethical standards into religion apart from decorum. At first his influence did not exercise its full power and he remained isolated, like Amenhetep IV, but he renewed old traditions in a creative spirit. And yet if we examine his notion of sin more closely, even this great poet is impersonal. His lament, his yearning—it is all sincere and forceful and fresh; but he who feels the sins of others so strongly that he will rather die than go on tolerating them, never dreams for one moment that he, too, may be a sinner. He does not grasp sinfulness in himself, but as something external, like a child that calmly stresses its own blamelessness when it sees that other children do wrong. That is why he is so sure that he will be with God when he dies. Man can become a god: that is the conviction of even the greatest of Egyptians. That is why even this work belongs to the Egyptian stage of evolution, and is closely akin to the *Song of the Harper*: "life is short, enjoy it"; "life is wretched, full of sin and deception, cast it from you, be one with the solar flame." These are two aspects of the same notion, which appears with short-sighted disillusionment in *Gaudeamus*, with over-hasty exuberance in the song of lamentation and yearning. Cool reason and burning emotion are subject to the same limitations.

The two great problem poems of the Egyptians are lyrics. They never attained complete objectivity and saw themselves detached from themselves, even externally. These poems contain wisdom and the counsel to enjoy life or to sacrifice it for a better one, but they are not epics of man's universal destiny.

The children of God in the New Empire were in the first instance the kings, whom Amen-Ra chose to overthrow the Hyksos and

<sup>1</sup> It may be that the setting and the hymns did not originally belong together, as is the case with the poem of Job.

dominate the world. Physically, too, they felt themselves to be the children of God; they kept the divine blood pure by marriages between brothers and sisters, accorded unquestioned sovereignty to that pure blood in women in preference to strong men in whose veins it flowed less pure, and guarded it anxiously when family disagreements arose. Moreover, this consciousness of divine grace released the human element in these kings until for the first time in Amenhetep IV's religious fervour the "natural man", unique as king, stood in the presence of the "natural god", the One, the solar Disc, naked and rapturous in this natural relation. Amenhetep felt himself chosen as the beloved of God, though only as a scion of divine descent, a king by divine right. He took the divine causality upon earth seriously; in his capital he shut himself off as a kingly priest and let Aten rule; he only served his God, adoring his beauty and majesty with the pride of the chosen one who stands nearest to the great God and is like to him. Such monotheism is akin to the sense of sin in the man weary of life; it is personal, but only for kings, purified but not without images. Just as the man weary of life sees the sins of others but not his own, so the king sees clearly the distance between others and the Deity, but does not see it in his own case. He serves, but he does not search out the will of God like the Babylonians—he knows it, for he is God.

After his death a new religious movement surged up, following his but reversing its principle doctrine. Amenhetep IV, as a divinely appointed king, a son of God who knew the truth, might be human. And now every human creature who knew the truth might be the beloved of God, a king, a god. And so the priests arose. Their piety ousted the rationalism of the nobility (the idea of destiny in the *Story of the Doomed Prince*), just as the piety of the man weary of life had ousted the rationalism of the *Song of the Harper*. And the ethical demand for purity and virtue made by the man weary of life was incorporated in the new ideal. Knowledge and purity and piety were now regarded as the means by which a man may become the favourite of God, a ruler by the grace of God like Amenhetep IV (a class), immortal, and blissful like the man weary of life. The ideal deteriorated by reason of its adaptation to a wider circle, but on the other hand it became the possession of a whole ruling class, which made it actual. The priests rounded off Egyptian knowledge and adapted it, as the possession of the schools, to the needs of all classes. They ruled in place of the Deity and made the Egyptian people the most religious in all the world. They made

everything depend upon expressions of the divine will, upon the choice of days and the drawing of lots, and thus approximated Egyptian to Babylonian customs in externals. But they were still Egyptians ; with all their piety, they were the kindred of the Deity, without any deep consciousness of disparity or of sin, destined immortals in spite of their lifetime preparations for death, assured of future deification in virtue of their conduct and their magic charms.

#### SUMMARY

Human civilization begins its development with definite progress in practical fields. Neanderthal man learned to strike the *coup-de-poing* into shape, Aurignacian man to use pitfalls in hunting, to chip, and to paint ; Neolithic man to till the soil, keep domestic animals, and much else that gives material security and makes man lord of the earth. Slowly there came the endeavour to transmute practical acquisitions, technical ability, into theory and knowledge which would be at the service of thought and taste even where these latter were not stimulated by practical needs. This process began in the form of art, in late Palæolithic times, when men simplified their magic pictures of animals and sowed the seeds of a symbolic solar religion. But Neolithic man was the first to evolve theory of a higher type. His theory or philosophy first conceived the sun's annual journey poetically as the life of man, that is it embraced Nature and man (spirit), the two aspects of the universe ; he added symbolism appropriate to the myth, and solar astronomy. Here was the single nucleus of all ideas of the universe, embracing art and science, poetry and thought, as an undivided whole, whence the whole world could be mastered intellectually.

The Egyptians led this intellectual advance ; diversifying the uniform nucleus and creating visual images of all beings and things within and around them, and of their activities and qualities, they produced the first complete world survey in images and words. This they accomplished first in their hieroglyphic and phonetic writing, afterwards in art and science. Parallel with their development of static visual imagery, the earliest logical assimilation and classification proceeded. Models useful for practical purposes made their appearance in art side by side with types, science grouped objects in pairs and developed specific concepts (in picture form), the germ of generic concepts. Efforts, too, were made to re-unite the parts by pictorial identification (the solar disc upon all the

gods' crowns) and grouping in families (the Ra family). But none of this developed beyond the germ. The visual images of small things (species) and of great (parts of the universe, parts of the soul; "the real" and "what is written") persist side by side in the region of "as well as". But all the future was there in the germ: monotheism (Aten, Amen-Ra; the concrete image) and the complete circle of universal and class gods, all the arts of the moulding hand and speaking voice (architecture in stone, plastic art, high relief, and low relief, painting, pottery, metal-work, and stone carving; colossal statues and delicate work; lyric poetry in the form of hymns, philosophic poems, and love-songs; narrative poetry as the germ of the epic and dialogues as the germ of the drama) and all kinds of separate sciences. If we are to characterize briefly this stage of evolution, we are compelled to make a selection which cannot be other than arbitrary, for every aspect of the civilization of the period is characteristic: the Egyptians had a religion in which Ra, the sun, and Osiris, the god of the dead, were equals; they had a philosophy which attained to its loftiest expression of thought and emotion in *Gaudeamus* and the ecstatic yearning of the man weary of life to be one with the pure divinity of Ra; a mathematical science of which the highest achievements were fractional calculations and the mensuration of quadrilateral figures; architecture which erected temples of stone for all eternity, with their pillars and pyramids; art which could reproduce all reality that can be confined within static images; and writing which had pictorial and phonetic signs for the whole known world, but which wavered between picture and sound and had no vowels. The time had now come for "either—or" to follow "as well as", for the world conceived by unifying thought to follow a world of spatial extension: that was the Babylonians' task.



## B. BABYLONIAN CIVILIZATION<sup>1</sup>

### RACIAL FORMATION AND POLITICAL HISTORY

Not one but several racial mixtures again were responsible for Babylonian civilization. Its rise and cultural development cannot, however, be traced so clearly as in the case of Egypt. We have no such excellent basis of calculation of the date of the first racial mixture and the first cultural flowering-time as we have for the date of Menes in the beginning of a Sothic cycle. The second wave of culture never reached its springtide; it received a serious check during a prolonged period of barbarian rule under the Kassites<sup>2</sup> and possibly the Hyksos. Naturally these barbarian invasions resulted in a third racial mixture, but again the resultant cultural product suffered damage; the Babylonians were conquered and ruled now by the Assyrians and Chaldæans, now by the Medes and Persians. Indeed their unfortunately exposed position, surrounded by mountains, steppes, and deserts full of barbarians, was the real cause of these unending invasions. The first phase of Babylonian, as of Egyptian, civilization arose between 3000 and 2500 B.C., in a wide southern tract watered by the rivers Euphrates and Tigris. This country had been conquered by a Neolithic people who built canals and cities and turned it into rich cornland. Here we are fortunately able, as we are not with Egypt, to name the people who made themselves masters of the country; the Sumerians came across the mountains on the borders of Persia down into Southern Babylonia, as did the Medes and Persians at a later date. Their home had been in the region of Neolithic solar civilization, which they demonstrably brought with them. They were pre-Indo-Germans, and called themselves "the black-headed people". For a long time the centre of their kingdom was the city of Nippur. The god of this capital city was called "Mun" (later Enlil, when Mun became his secret name); he was shaped like a bull, as is indicated by hymns to Enlil and generally by the emblems of the gods. He was a great writer

<sup>1</sup> Described in detail in my book on *Kultur und Denken der Babylonier und Juden*, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1910.

<sup>2</sup> Properly speaking Kashshu, as "Sumerian" should properly speaking be pronounced "Shumerian". The customary spelling is here adopted.

who bore the sacred weapon (the double-axe, though no longer recognizable as such) and the net when he went to war in springtime ; he died and went to his death in the mountain : his temple in Nippur is called E-kur, the hill-dwelling ; it is the first terraced mound (Babylonian tower), and it was his grave. "Min", the Egyptian name of the sun-god, also applied to the bull in Babylonia ; it meant the value of a bull in metal, later the *maneh*. Beside the prehistoric sun-god was a woman, Nana, his mate and mother ; at a later date "Nin" was the word meaning "lady, mistress" and Nana the name of the divinity of another city, not Nippur, just as Hathor moved to Denderah. A young and powerful hero was worshipped in Nippur, akin to Horus, who was later called Ninib or Enurta. All the symbolism of the Neolithic solar religion was found on the seals of Farah in Southern Babylonia (destroyed about 2800 B.C.). Here are the solar wheel and the solar disc, the solar bark and the double-axe, the two bulls and the combat of the two heroes. We can safely assert that the Sumerians had brought them from northern lands where the sun does die.

The Sumerians must have settled in the country between 3500 and 3000 B.C. The races began to mix about 3300-3200 B.C., for "Babylonian" culture proper developed from less definite types about 2800-2700 B.C. We cannot be sure whom the Sumerians found already settled in the land. I consider it very possible that there were Semites in Southern Babylonia too, but that they were thinly scattered so that they quickly lost their language and racial character. But there may have been tribes who had crossed the mountains on the borders of Persia before the Sumerians.

At any rate the Land of Sumer with Nippur as its capital had become a cultural unit between 3300 and 2800 B.C. Sumerian was the national language, a unique form of writing and a characteristic art came into being, and Babylonia surpassed Egypt both in poetry and the plastic arts. About 2800 B.C. this new civilization was coming into full flower ; the old solar civilization had passed away and the first "Babylonian" civilization, with Sumerian as its language, was in process of growth.

Just as in Egypt the Coptos Dynasty was forgotten as soon as the characteristic civilization of Egypt had reached maturity, so the Dynasty of Nippur is not included in any Babylonian list of kings.<sup>1</sup> One single circumstance proves their existence and the fact

<sup>1</sup> A single royal name, Tabi-utul-Enlil, cast up in a later hymn, might have belonged to the first purely Sumerian Dynasty.

that they reigned for centuries ; for centuries the Babylonian rulers in newer capitals were first called " governors " (*Patesis*) under the god of Nippur, then they sought his confirmation of their sovereignty over the Land of Sumer, and finally the Kings of Babil legally transferred the battle of creation and thereby the ultimate claim to sovereignty from him to their own god Marduk. And Enlil always continued to be a great god whose horns and net were adopted by all the others ; he was the Terrible One who sought to destroy mankind in a great flood.

When the Nippur Dynasty lost its power, probably between 3000 and 2800 B.C. the city States supplanted it, precisely as in Egypt. Its princes, hitherto governors under Enlil, made themselves independent and the struggle for supremacy began. In Egypt the Horus campaign of the counts of Edfu brought that struggle to a speedy close. The invasion of the Delta by Menes supplied the new kings with a legal basis for their claim, and a source of dynastic power. In Babylon no one city gained a lasting supremacy over the rest ; there was no prize of victory here, like the Delta, by means of which one dynasty might secure all the glory and the supreme power. Moreover, later historians in Babylonia knew hardly anything of this period except a few names which they put together from the genealogies and legends of later royal houses and from chance discoveries, and decked out with fabulous dates and myths. Our excavations show that the princes of Kish and Lagash, Ur and Erech, and others, were engaged in endless feuds (as in the fourteenth and fifteenth century in Germany) first one and then another, gaining the upper hand for a generation. The titles "*Patesi* of Enlil", " King of Kish ", " King of Erech ", " Lord of Sumer ", " King of the Land " appear by turns ; and at the same time civilization seems to have been advanced. The rivals were united by a sense of cultural fellowship and superiority to the barbarians, and by religious patriotism. They all felt themselves to be governors in Enlil's name, although they stripped him of all his special character and merits for the benefit of the gods of their own capitals, and believed in other universal gods<sup>1</sup> beside him. The last prince who thus rose to sovereignty over the whole land was Lugalzaggisi of Erech, who is important because after him the lists of kings of the Babylonians became reliable. He seems to have wielded greater power than

<sup>1</sup> A more human water-god in Eridu, a sun-god Babbar in Larsa, a moon-god Nannar in Ur, and a goddess who ruled sexual life, the Underworld, and the morning star, Nana of Erech.

any former "Governors of Enlil" or "Kings of the Land", and to have penetrated with his conquering armies to the Mediterranean shores. Possibly he owed his power to a skilful use of new forces arising from racial mixture, which had now reached maturity. It no longer centred, however, in Southern Babylonia, but in the north, towards Upper Mesopotamia. Here in Northern Babylonia, Sumerians and Semites had been intermarrying for centuries, the Semites being strong in numbers. And it was here that Babylonian civilization reached its fullest perfection. The Babylonian-Sumerian language, with its world-outlook, its poetry and pictorial art, was surpassed and supplanted by a Babylonian-Semitic language which represents the enduring character of Babylon, whilst in substance and style it represents a stage in the evolution of man.

I think it possible, indeed almost likely, that about the time when the Sumerians were penetrating into Southern Babylonia the Proto-Semites, also having their origin in the realm of Neolithic solar civilization, but from a region populated by a different race with a different language, crossed Asia Minor on their way to Syria and Upper Mesopotamia. Gradually they must have occupied and settled this spacious but not altogether fertile land; but some of them penetrated to the flat steppes and deserts of Arabia and remained racially pure or bred pure, living a nomad life. In the rear of these immigrants Asia Minor was occupied by other peoples, who thus cut off their return, but in front of them, in Arabia, the land formed a basin seething with peoples which thenceforward overflowed at regular intervals for several thousand years and sent out waves of people Semitic in race and speech to sweep over the neighbouring civilized nations, until all adopted the Semitic tongue.

But round about 3000 B.C. this Semitic stream from Arabia had probably not yet begun to flow. The first Semitic settlers in Syria, Palestine, and Upper Mesopotamia did not probably come from the desert; it is more likely that they pushed forward from Asia Minor and became the neighbours of the Proto-Egyptians in the Delta, and of the Sumerians in Upper Mesopotamia. The racial mixture must have begun about 3200 B.C., reaching its prime and rising to sovereign power with the Dynasty of Agade about 2700 B.C.

Sharru-kin, the ancient Sargon, was the first Semitic-Babylonian king. He built the city of Akkad round about 2700 B.C. (2652 according to Ed. Meyer, 2772 according to Fotheringham), and thereby gave Northern Babylonia its enduring name. He was to the later Babylonians what Charlemagne was to Germany and France, a favourite of the gods enveloped in a cloud of legends, the beneficent

king of early days, the founder of the empire. He was master of the Semitic language as well as Sumerian culture. He founded a great empire with the help of a vigorous and youthful nation possessing bronze weapons and a knowledge of writing, an empire which stretched from the Mediterranean to the mountains on the Persian frontier (Elam) and the Persian Gulf. He was a great builder; possibly he built the city of Babil as well as Akkad. In Sumer he distributed the land and established colonies where naturally Semitic was spoken; his governors ruled in the cities of the Sumerians. But clearly he allowed free play to the older civilization and sought to be invested as lord of Nippur, though he called himself only "King of Akkad", "King of Kish", and not "*Patesi* of Enlil". His fourth successor, Naram-Sin (about 2570 or 2680 B.C.) was after him the greatest king of the dynasty, a mighty conqueror who earned the right to call himself King of the Four Quarters of the Earth, and likewise a cultural ruler whose monument of victory is an example of Babylonian sculpture at its zenith; nor is poetry, represented by Semitic epics and hymns, likely to have been behind plastic art. The Babylonian style had reached its culmination.

There followed a period of revolutions and foreign invasions, such as occurred repeatedly in Babylonia, with its open frontiers, when the government was weak. A Sumerian dynasty in Erech raised its head once again. For more than a hundred years (2429 to 2306 B.C. or 2549 to 2426) the barbarian "host of Gutium" ruled, and other Semites—the Amorites speaking a Canaanite dialect—were forcing their way from Arabia into the civilized region at least from 2500 B.C. onwards, and paving the way for the second phase of civilization.

At last the Kings of Ur (2298–2180 B.C., or 2418–2300) established peace and order, as the kings of the Fourth Dynasty did in Egypt. Civilization and commerce flourished for centuries. The Kings of Ur called themselves "Kings of Sumer and Akkad", meaning that they aimed at the cultural unity of both countries, which differed in language, not culture. Their capital was in the south, hence Sumer took the lead. They themselves bore Sumerian names at first, but in fact they completed Sharru-kin's work and soon adopted Semitic names. The south continued to grow more Semitic in character. They were pious rulers, supporting and honouring the priestly king Gudea of Lagash; they aspired, that is, to his priestly ideal of civilization, but without sacrificing their own divinity and renouncing the means of worldly power.

They were overthrown by a barbarian invasion from the mountains on the Persian frontier. The empire collapsed. Two separate dynasties arose in the south, both calling themselves kings of Sumer and Akkad and seeking thus to carry on the old policy of civilization and unity. The Babylonians recognized the dynasty of Isin (2179–1954 B.C. or 2299–2074) as the legitimate line, for the dynasty of Larsa (2179–1918 B.C. or 2299–2038) was under the domination of the barbarians in the mountains of Elam, and was certainly the offspring of a mere second son belonging to an Elamite empire in the mountains.

The northern region, Akkad, broke off from both empires at latest 2049 B.C. (or 2169). Here in the meantime the new Canaanite-Babylonian mixed race had reached its prime (dating from 2500–2600 B.C.) and was represented by the kings of Babil, the dynasty that was to produce Khammurabi. They ruled from 2049 B.C. to 1750 B.C. (or 2169–1870), at first over Akkad only. Then they allied themselves with Elam and destroyed the Isin Empire (1953 B.C. or 2073). Finally Khammurabi drove the Elamites out of Larsa and the plain and created a great empire which he ruled as “King of the Four Quarters of the Earth, King of Sumer, and Akkad”, but primarily as “King of Babylon” from 1947 to 1905 B.C. (or 2067–2025). Assyria, too, formed part of this empire from the beginning of Khammurabi’s dynasty, though it was ruled by native governor-princes.

This first Babylonian dynasty came from Sippar, the sister city to Sharru-kin’s capital Akkad. Their language was Semitic, so that they felt themselves to be direct heirs of Sharru-kin’s policy of uniting the whole country from the north. It seems that the first of the dynasty, Sumu-abu, moved his residence to Babylon, in the centre of the land. Marduk, the god of that city, became god of the whole Empire and supplanted the earlier Enlil of Nippur as the god whose valour overthrew Chaos and created and governed the world. Sumu-abu rose to power in the struggle against Isin, at the gateway to the Sumerian south, and in alliance with Elam. Then he proved his worth as the liberator of all Babylonia by expelling the Elamites and purging the land. The situation was very much that of Egypt after the expulsion of the Hyksos—old traditions vanished and the claims of the provinces were reduced to a few ceremonial rights. The new empire now really had one capital (besides a few sacred spots without political significance), and its god and its king were over all the gods and princes in the land. And this capital endured.

The country could now be called "Babylonia" instead of "Sumer and Akkad". Khammurabi completed the task begun by his dynasty. Outwardly he came as a mediator; he spoke both languages, called himself king of both regions, and gave Sumer precedence; he worshipped Enlil of Nippur and Ea of Eridu and made the god of his city the son of Ea and the legally acknowledged heir of Enlil. But in fact he completed the victory of the Semitic over the Sumerian elements. The great poems that were produced or finished in his day were written in Semitic. His laws and his administration were Semitic. In the succeeding centuries Sumerian became the dead language of scholarship. Whether or not Khammurabi aimed at this result, his was the deciding voice, for his intention was perfectly clear of using the loftiest cultural forces in the service of his unifying endeavours. Alike the great epic and religious speculation justified Marduk's rule. An all-embracing code of laws made Babylonia a constitutional, commercial State. The frontiers of the Empire were widely extended, and after each extension of sovereignty great canals, roads, and fortresses were built; these and the unified military force and administration that had their centre in Babil ensured peaceful conditions to the citizens and markets for their manufactures. Great energy was devoted to the building of sanctuaries. Babylonia now engaged in world commerce; it was surrounded on all sides by lands which its merchants exploited and supplied, received as welcome guests by the barbarian princes who derived from them the art of writing, luxuries, gifts, and manufactured necessities of life; in return, the Babylonians bought raw materials and paid taxes on their trading agencies. The Deity smiled upon this earliest peaceful spread of civilization through a strong commercial State—the priestly view that the sagacious favourite of the gods shall inherit the earth proved as sound in Babylon's prime, between 2000 and 1800 B.C., as it did subsequently in England's prime.

Externally, indeed, the empire did not prove capable of defence. It was not situated upon an island, but was surrounded by steppes and mountains which constantly poured forth barbarians. Khammurabi's actual successor had to fight against the Kassites who had captured the Persian mountains. At the end of his reign the South seceded, supported by the barbarians and in the name of down-trodden Sumerian nationality (1868 or 1988). Then Assyria was lost; its governors made themselves independent and founded their own trading colonies. Finally a wave of migrant peoples from Asia Minor swept over all Mesopotamia and Syria, as well as Egypt,

In 1750 B.C. (or 1870) Babylon was captured by the Khatti (Hittites), Khammurabi's dynasty fell, and Marduk, their own and their capital's god, was carried off to Khani on the Khabur, where the conquerors had their capital at the time.

The succeeding centuries of Babylonian history, right on to the fifteenth, are obscure. According to the lists of kings the Kassites reigned, and brought back Marduk from Khani after a few decades. But for a long time their principal kingdom seems to have been Elam. At times, apparently, Hyksos rule extended as far as Babylonia, but it was certainly no more than a passing phase. In the seventeenth century an Assyrian king, Shamshi-Adad, called himself "King of the World". At last conditions became settled once more. The Hyksos tempest, the first great migration of peoples of which we have tangible knowledge, passed over. It had brought the first Indo-Germans to Hither Asia, and the movement of the Kassites to Elam was part of the same complex of events: Semite tribes from the desert joined the movement in Syria and further south. The northern peoples brought horses and the military tactics associated with the war-chariot—the first horses appeared in Babylonia with the Kassites round about 1900 B.C. (1896 or 1916) and were called "mountain asses". Round about 1500 a number of large kingdoms existed side by side in Hither Asia: that of the Khatti (Hittites) in Asia Minor, the Mitanni in Northern Mesopotamia, the Kassites in Babylonia. It was none of these, however, who exercised predominant power, but the Egyptians who had just pushed forward as far as the Euphrates.

Meanwhile, Babylonian civilization had not been destroyed. Khammurabi's creation, the world-wide trading State of Babylonia, continued its activities, although trade must have been very nearly wiped out in the long period of disorder. But all the ruling nations with foreign tongues, and some with a foreign script (Egyptians, Hittites) continued in the fifteenth century to use the Babylonian cosmopolitan language for diplomatic and commercial intercourse. Slowly commercial relations were resumed in the civilized regions where order had been restored, and Babylonia recovered her position as a commercial, constitutional State under Kassite rulers, who had fallen completely under the sway of Babylonian culture. Politically, indeed, she did not rise to great importance for the time being. The new mixed race (Kassites and Babylonians) was slowly growing to maturity between 1700 and 1200 B.C. From 1200 B.C. onwards the Chaldæans were forcing their way into Southern

Babylonia and preparing the ground for a new flowering-time about 700 B.C.

About this time the political centre of gravity of Babylonian civilization shifted to Assyria. There the tempestuous movements of peoples in the ancient cultivated land of Babylon about 1800–1700 B.C. had resulted in a fresh mingling of races, which was ripe to bear fruit in the thirteenth century. Shalmaneser I (who came to the throne about 1270) conquered Upper Mesopotamia and Northern Syria, and his son subdued Babylonia, which the Elamites had invaded once more. They came as defenders of Babylonian civilization against the barbarians, but were themselves repudiated and abused as barbarians. It was only when this Assyro-Babylonian civilization reached its second prime, in the ninth and eighth centuries, that a lasting Assyrian world empire arose; Ashur-nasir-pal (885–860 B.C.) and his son Shalmaneser II (860–825 B.C.), the husband of Sammuramat (Semiramis), ruled the whole Land of the Two Rivers and Syria nearly to the gates of Damascus. Their successors after 745 B.C. were military kings who based their power upon a mercenary army and abandoned peasant forces. With the help of their mercenaries they conquered all Syria, Palestine, Egypt, and a great part of the Armenian and Persian mountains. The army forced them to make conquests in order to employ and pay it. But at the same time the kings used it to spread and protect Babylonian civilization, which now permeated the whole region under their sway.

We have not yet been able to form a just conception of the creative, civilizing achievements of the Assyrian nation. We have architectural and sculptural works from their hands which show signs that Babylonian art evolved yet further in magnificence and sometimes in delicacy. On the whole it does not appear that the younger nation passed beyond the Babylonian stage of evolution (as often happens in relation to an older civilization). On the other hand, the Assyrians did great things in spreading civilization; they were to Hither Asia and Egypt what the Romans were to the whole Mediterranean world. The military kings of the eighth and seventh centuries are fully comparable to the Roman Emperors, especially those about the time of Diocletian.

The greatest of these Assyrian military kings (722–705 B.C.) called himself Sharru-kenu (the rightful king) or Sharru-ukin (the king assured); he sought to link himself with the earlier Sharru-kin, Sargon, the legendary king, whom the gods themselves raised to power, the sovereign who scattered blessings and ruled the whole

world. Babylonian priestly and civic culture could acknowledge no sovereign but the Deity, no power but that of the gods. Sharrukin wished to be their king, without whom they could not live in a world full of violence; he wished to serve the gods and to be no more than Marduk's representative; he wished to spread the priestly-civic culture, to establish a realm with a uniform civilization by crushing the small kingdoms in Syria (he led Israel into captivity and settled other inhabitants in the land); he wished to protect his civilized empire against all the barbarians of the mountains and the desert. That was a great object worthy of a civilized king who felt himself to be a sword in the hand of God. His son, Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.), aspired to something more; he actually called himself "the new Adapa", the prototype of the priestly sage. But his rule was too arbitrary and his reign was occupied with struggles against his subjects who would not tolerate a master but only a guardian-policeman. He was driven to destroy Babylon and carry off Marduk. His successor Esarhaddon (681-668 B.C.), therefore, made concessions once more. He subdued the rebels but left them their indigenous princes. Babylon was restored and a Chaldaean empire recognized in the south. Thus he was enabled to conquer Egypt, which was to be governed by the Saïtes. The greatest menace came from the mountains in his rear whence the Cimmerians and Scythians were pushing forward irresistibly. Esarhaddon divided them, allying himself with the Scythians by marriage and so winning them as confederates for fifty years. He repulsed the Cimmerians in Syria. Finally he divided the empire, as Diocletian did later the Roman Empire, taking second rank himself. His son Ashur-bani-pal (668-626 B.C.) retained the central region, Assyria, and the crown; his task was to keep closed the mountain passes in the rear of the empire, and for that purpose, in spite of his alliance with the Scythians he needed immense power, for the mountains were seething with barbarians. Another son, the child of a Babylonian mother, became king of Babylonia, and Esarhaddon himself wanted to hold Egypt in a firm grip. In this way he sought to avert the dangers of a too extensive empire. But Esarhaddon died, and the son who had been made governor and king of Babylonia rose in arms against his brother. Ashur-bani-pal was driven to resume the part of tyrant and sole ruler, although he was a religious, cultured man, the creator of the great library and the most delicate sculptor of reliefs in Nineveh. Egypt was lost. The king stayed in his palace. Directly after his death the empire collapsed under the storm of invading

Cimmerians. Syria was lost. Then the Scythian Empire collapsed too. The Medes dominated the mountains. They captured Nineveh in 606 B.C., whilst their allies the Chaldeans provided Babylonia with a new line of kings.

In the period between 1100 and 539 B.C. Babylonian intellectual life was active once again. It sprang from the racial mixture of Kassites and Babylonians, then of Chaldeans and Babylonians, and the periods of maturity of the two overlapped to a certain extent. The sacerdotal outlook on life reached its highest expression—none but Marduk, the divinity, was to be king. The earthly ruler was to be a whole-hearted servant of God, absorbed in building temples and celebrating divine service; everything that he did was to be in accordance with heavenly omens and he was to become a warrior only in extreme need and for a short space. The Deity orders all things according to his will, and he hates men of violence. Amidst such ideas a strong ruler could rarely accomplish great deeds: Nebuchadnezzar I (Nabu-kudurri-usur), the scion of a princely house in Isin, conquered Elam at the end of the eleventh century and brought back Marduk who had been carried off again by the barbarians. Amongst the kings of the eighth century who exercised local sovereignty in Babylonia between the national dynasty and the military Assyrian kings, Nabu-nasir (747–734 B.C.) is of some importance, for in his reign the Babylonians began to observe the stars with such thoroughness and regularity that their observations were of value to Greek science. Possibly these more accurate and scientific observations were partly due to the perception of a great change in the face of the heavens, which made the Ram instead of the Bull the first sign of the zodiac. The “Era of Nabonassar” had a beginning not identical with, but very similar to those of the later eras of the Olympiads (776 B.C.) and the foundation of Rome (753 B.C.).

After the fall of the Assyrian Empire, Babylon once more attained world-wide power. Nabopolassar, a Chaldean king who was allied by marriage with the Medes, and so protected in his rear, handed down to his son Nabu-kudurri-usur II (the Nebuchadnezzar of the Bible, 605–562 B.C.) sufficient power to subdue all Mesopotamia, Syria, and Palestine. Nabu-kudurri-usur II sacked Jerusalem and led Judah into Babylonian captivity. It must have been a triumph particularly desired by the pious servant of the universal god, Marduk, to destroy the “universal god” Yahu, who boasted that he had destroyed Sennacherib’s host. He could hardly suppose that by

doing away with Yahu's image, which was brought to Babylon in Marduk's train, and by leading his worshippers into captivity, he was actually laying the foundation of Yahu's world-wide sovereignty. If Esarhaddon is comparable with Diocletian, we may compare Nabu-kudurri-usur II with Constantine. With him neo-Babylonian piety attained a world-wide sway, supported by a great general and diplomat. Nabu-kudurri-usur II saw, no doubt, that his power rested solely upon his army and his alliance with the Medes. He therefore fortified his capital, Babylon, and extended it so as to be capable of serving as a stronghold and military camp. His heir, Nabonidus (555-539 B.C.) devoted himself wholly to piety and the service of the god, to restoration of temples and the reading of omens. His priestly dignity forbade him to lead the army, and he left that task to the heir to the throne, Bel-shar-usur (Belshazzar). Thereupon Cyrus overthrew the Median dynasty in the mountains (550 B.C.), and after years of warfare conquered the mountainous country and Asia Minor (for it was here that his real opponents were established). Not till he had achieved all this did he appear with his Persians before the gates of Babylon and capture it (539 B.C.). Foreign domination by the Persians from Elam began. To the Jews it meant liberation, and to the priests and citizens of Babylon it was more tolerable, as barbarian violence permitted by Marduk, than the rule of Assyrians with a kindred civilization.

#### CONSTITUTION AND GROWTH OF SOCIAL CLASSES

In Babylonia, too, the State was a monarchy from the earliest times down to the Persian era. Here, as in Egypt, the path of evolution led from a tribal monarchy by way of the priestly and civic organization of the towns to a military monarchy. But the tribal monarchy lay far back in the prehistoric past. At the dawn of history we find pious city kings, one of whom would attempt to rise above his compeers. Then followed an absolute monarchy in the form of a constitutional, commercial State, and finally a military monarchy with world-sovereigns ruling rebellious small States, cities, and nobles. The process which constituted the main substance of Egypt's history, her development from an archaic monarchy to an empire of the Hohenstaufen type, was only the introduction to Babylonia's development, belonging partly to prehistoric times and partly marked by barbarian invasions. Egypt's final state, half germ, half finished growth, was the middle period of Babylon's

history. Conditions corresponding to the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries in Germany—Hapsburgs and Luxemburgs struggling to maintain their control of rebellious cities and nobles by the exercise of commercial ability, the imposition of laws, and the practice of piety—arose in Babylonia as a new stage of development. In Germany too, the process of evolution ended with the "Assyrian rule" of Charles V, the foreigner, and after him came anarchy.

The monarchy of Nippur is prehistoric, like that of Coptos, though perhaps the kings of Nippur held the provinces and cities more in subjection than had been the case in the ancient kingdom of Coptos. For the god of Nippur, Enlil, continued to hold sway in the land after kings of Nippur had vanished. His symbols on seals (the solar disc, pictures of bulls, and spring combats) remained for all time the mark of legal possession of property; he was the possessor of land and property, and invested the kings with both; they only governed in his name.

I think it possible that the dynasty of Nippur ended with a figure like that of Amenhetep IV, a king whose whole life was merged in his god's as lord of the whole world (though not the solar disc). Possibly, too, the dynasty was overthrown by a priestly democracy of civic princes who refused to tolerate a divine king, acknowledging only the god as king.

At any rate, it was the gods who ruled Babylonia round about 2800 B.C. A triumphant religious movement was in progress. With it must have begun the ascent from the out-of-date Neolithic way of life to the new Sumero-Babylonian civilization, simultaneously with the invention and introduction of writing. When the city kings fought or were reconciled, they were mere tools in the hands of the gods; their monuments tell only of the victories or treaties of the city gods by the will of Enlil, by his faithful promise, or his grace. The kings, too, had themselves represented, whether in priestly garb when laying foundation-stones or in warlike garb on their campaigns, as standing always in the presence of the god, who was disproportionately large; they called themselves Grand Viceroys or Viceroys of Enlil and of their own city gods, High Priests and priests of other gods. Every city prince, including the "king of the country" for the time being, was a mere man in the sight of the Deity; they all felt in his presence that they were recipients of the divine grace, personally privileged, like Amenhetep IV, but they had a greater sense of the distance between gods and men and of their own dependence. They had also more political consciousness and less

feeling for Nature than the Egyptians; the gods were feudal lords who fought and concluded treaties, not natural phenomena like the solar disc, although the process of identification with the heavenly bodies had already begun.

As the favourite and servant of the gods the king was human, but at the same time he was lord, raised far above all who were not kings. Ur-Nina, the first ruler of Lagash, entered the presence of the Deity with his whole family, like Amenhetep IV, as a husband and father; but at the same time he was an absolute ruler over his people. These Sumerian princes were priests, and tolerated no priests between themselves and the deity. They were brave warriors and capable merchants, and now they began to place all their vessels and bales under divine protection by means of seals in the form of solar symbols. Their gods raised them in person from civic princes ruling a small city to lords of a great city or of the whole country, but for all their humility they never forgot their own achievements. There were scribes, priests, knights, and merchants in their retinues, but these were and remained their servants.

A class of scribes must have grown up in Babylonia when writing came into general use, and when the custom arose of governing and negotiating with the aid of writing. But the scribes had already ceased to count for much when the historical era dawned, although writing was still a novelty. The religious movement had robbed the bare capacity to write of its value—there were too many officials and scribes. Writing was still, indeed, an art, but everyone employ a scribe.

The priestly class was highly developed as is proved by the earliest priestly titles of the kings; but the kings dominated the college of priests, being themselves High Priests. True, in technical matters they would take expert advice, but the science of divination was in its infancy, and technical knowledge can hardly have advanced very far on the road towards specialization.

There were knights, too. Gilgamesh in the epic was no other than a knight, pious, courtly, high-spirited, the soul of decorum and good-breeding. But probably they grew out of the single combatants of an earlier and again a later period (Semites, Bedouin chiefs). The Sumero-Babylonians fought in closed ranks, heavily armed with spears and shields, thus paving the way for the phalanx; the kings did, indeed, fight in single combat in front of the ranks.

That a merchant class of some importance already existed is proved by various documents (some from the time of Lugalzaggisi)

which indicate a certain development of legal forms. The commercial prerogatives of the kings, and perhaps even at that period of a few priestly colleges at important sanctuaries, required a class of executive traders and travellers who naturally demanded a share in the transactions.

Under the rule of the Sargonids (2652-2470 B.C.) there was an apparent reaction; the kings appeared to revert to the position of gods. Sargon the Ancient, whom the later priestly legends made the prototype of common humanity (a gardener's son) loved by the Deity and raised to the throne, certainly figured on his monuments as the son of Ishtar of Akkad. His third successor, Naram-Sin called himself literally "the god of Akkad", and had himself represented as a god with horned helmet and apron, weapon in hand, and two stars above his head; and he added to his title "King of the Four Quarters of the Earth", the determinative of godhead, the star. His son had himself represented on his seal as a bull to whom the god gives water. This seems like a reversion to Egyptian ideas of the era before Amenhetep IV; curiously enough at the same date we find a "scribe" in a high official position as governor of Lagash; and the knightly element is emphasized; Naram-Sin fights on foot in single combat in front of his army as a kind of Gilgamesh; nor does the army form a phalanx.

But at the same period the priestly and citizen classes seem to have risen in importance. The knightly conquerors in their character of High Priests were more dependent upon experts than the city princes of Sumer and Babylon whom they had overthrown. The number of seals increased and henceforth the custom prevailed of guaranteeing treaties with seals, not merely closing vessels and bales. During the rule of the barbarian kings of Gutium priests and merchant must have become absolutely indispensable.

The kings of Ur (2298-2180 B.C.) still placed the divine determinative after their names, but only as part of the title "Kings of the Four Quarters of the Earth", for they wished expressly to be humble, pious servants of God, and in particular defenders and restorers of the southern Babylonian sanctuaries. An ideal king of this period was Gudea of Lagash who won high honour far exceeding the importance of his principality and persisting undimmed for centuries, by devoting all his own diplomatic, commercial, and intellectual powers and all the resources of his State to the glory of his city god, to whom he built a great temple, and to the care of the sanctuaries and strongholds of his gods. He was through and

through a priestly king, in whom the old Sumero-Babylonian ideal reached its consummation, but that was only possible because he lived in undisturbed times, and was probably the actual vassal of the first king of Ur. The labour involved in the priestly calling, and the demands made upon a man's intellect and resources had increased to such an extent that they left him no strength for anything else. Gudea was the first to use a seal upon which the old battle scenes, with their half animal forms, were replaced by a religious picture, the owner being presented at the great god's court by his guardian divinity. The kings of Ur followed his example. But they regarded Gudea's son as dangerous, and removed him from Lagash; the fame of the priestly king menaced the power of the great kings.

During this period and the succeeding era of national dismemberment the conditions must have grown up upon which Khammurabi (1947-1905 B.C.) set the stamp of his own spirit. It was his creative achievement to link the monarchy and the priestly citizen class once more and enable them thus united to exercise a powerful influence. Both were devoted to the same ideal, the peaceful rule of the Deity on earth through reason, law, and order. A pious and enlightened monarchy ruled over pious subjects under a constitution which guaranteed the rights alike of the king and his subjects. The king was the representative of the Deity and as such he was absolute, bound only by the ideal of godhead. But that ideal made him the punisher of every injustice and the benefactor of his country, the promoter of wisdom and efficiency in his subjects, the armed guardian of its frontiers and of domestic peace, the pacific diffuser of commerce and civilization in neighbouring countries. Seated in his closet the sovereign maintained the country's unity, governed it, and stimulated its progress; all manner of decisive questions were settled in his actual letters. But most affairs were regulated by a carefully organized administrative and police service and a great code of imperial legislation which was drawn up and completed as a homogeneous whole and regarded as a gift to the king from the sun-god (Shamash of Sippar). By this measure the king bound himself and his people to observe a written code of law, whereas hitherto there had existed only the laws acknowledged by custom, partially and locally recorded in writing. The first constitutional State came into being. And this code of law regulated the most important civil affairs, such as the rights of consanguinity and inheritance, water, commerce, and transit. Babylonia became the first commercial State.

The old city principalities had been destroyed in spite of many honours still paid to their priesthood and nobility. But the king won these classes to support him in his work of enlightenment; the Deity was to rule, the merchant to make money. The religious and commercial prerogatives of the former ruling classes in the cities were restored to them as important elements in a loftier philosophic system, as vassals of the king; but at the same time they were required to devote personal service to the larger whole as did the king, to admit the strongest personalities from other classes into their own ranks.

Such was Khammurabi's State, the greatest social contribution of the Babylonians to human civilization. Khammurabi succeeded where the Hapsburgs and Luxemburgs failed; he established a unitary State, not a merely dynastic power. True, his State did not endure but collapsed under external attacks. Even without them it must have crumbled. For at that date the first capitalist system, the product of a religious movement, was passing through a phase in the development of individual character which began, like later capitalist systems, with the triumph of reason and peace, of the ideal; but inevitably there followed a period of struggle and disintegration, caused by the liberated forces of speculation and egotism to which the monarchy fell a victim. Not till individual character is fully evolved does it learn to restrain itself, after being bound by the fetters of a strong military monarchy and officialdom.

After the terrible era of Kassite and Hittite invasions, Babylonia began to recover from about 1500 B.C. onwards, and during the succeeding thousand years it was evolving into the land known to the Prophets, and later to the Greeks, where merchants were more numerous than the stars and every inhabitant had his seal. The ancient civilization and the more recent infusion of Kassite and Chaldean blood, together with the foundation of a great Assyrian Empire, provided a soil in which trade flourished. Babylonia had always been a land of cities; it now rose to world supremacy in trade and finance. It still exported corn, oil, dates, and cattle, and had besides extensive manufactures and a complete financial system which permitted banking transactions. The silver talent was invented in Babylonia and divided into sixty *maneh* (pounds), each containing sixty *shekels* (half-ounces); the ratio of silver to gold was fixed at an early date as 1 : 13½.

Finance was in the hands of a ruling class of priests and merchants

who rose above other classes as representatives of a godly and enlightened ideal of humanity. The educated and the wealthy, proved to be favourites of the gods by their learning and their riches, assumed dominant power. They sprang from the older city aristocracy, and gradually gained possession of educational and material resources and commercial privileges, which involved the possession of money and land. Through the medium of religion they subjected the kings, and controlled the people through the medium of religion, the interpretation of laws, and their wealth. A capitalist trust stood foursquare and confronted the claims of king and people and the force of external powers ; it stood secure, buttressed by its philosophy of life. Of its members we are acquainted with one or two great commercial houses that have acquired special prominence because fragments of their contracts and correspondence have been preserved.

This class was democratic in its relation to the king, aristocratic towards the people. They regarded kings as mere men ; men whom the Deity had raised to special dignity without any merit on their own part and who, therefore, owed special service to the Deity ; men who had to answer to the Deity for many others and who were, therefore, under the obligation to be exceptionally pious, for if they sinned the whole country suffered the penalty. The kings were therefore required to live up to an ideal standard. A mythology arose to serve as an example and a warning : the beneficent King Sargon was said to be a gardener's son who was exposed, but was raised by the Deity to honour, guided by omens, and yet punished at last ; also there was an accursed king who brought disaster upon his country. The king was expected to recognize absolutely the divine causality ; his whole life was to be devoted to prayer, the consultation of omens, and the restoration of temples. He might use force only in order to punish transgressors, and then he must put the memory from him. This meant that he was in the hands of the priests ; but the merchants were at one with them. They wanted a king who would not hinder trade and restrict profit, a police-king at all costs, and one who made modest demands on the tax-payers, who would neither wage war nor limit their own power. But when both classes had secured a pious and peace-loving king after their own hearts, they could rarely make use of him : Nabu-kuddurri-usur was acceptable, who recovered Marduk from Elam and then gave thanks to him for graciously returning home ; Nabu-nasir who directed astronomical observations, and Nabonidus who merely unearthed and perused ancient

foundation deeds with pious awe, were both virtuous rulers, but useless in actual fact.

All strong rulers, however, were useful within limits; they maintained order at home and kept the trade routes open; but they were men of violence who offended against the priestly ideal and involved the merchants in heavy expense. Nabu-kudurri-usur II was a pious sovereign like the Assyrian military kings before him, who had reigned only as viceroys in Babylon, and under different names from those they bore in Ashur; but they were not satisfactory, with their everlasting campaigns, so alien to the idealogy of a theocracy; and all the time they appealed to the gods of Babylon! It was really pleasanter to be ruled by barbarians, like the Persians, to whom one paid tribute and whom one cursed and yet tolerated, or to get along as best one could between the cities and the Bedouin nobility of the countryside in a confused medley of small States, relying on treaties and money, as one did abroad in foreign lands.

In spite of all the efforts of the Sargonids of the later Assyrian period (745-626 B.C.) to be pious rulers, to use their armies solely to defend their frontiers from external attack and preserve order at home, only to serve the interests of Babylonian civilization and commerce by unifying the civilized world, to live as the omens directed and to be cultured like the priests, they were in fact always regarded as tyrants against whom Babylon would ally herself with any enemy, from whom she would secede whenever the opportunity occurred. And this was not because Babylon repudiated the predominance of the Assyrian god Ashur over Marduk, for no such claim was ever made; it was based upon the principle embodied in the fable of the eagle and the serpent, upon hatred of the man of violence, which must have been directed with equal force against the conqueror Nabu-kudurri-usur II. The Sargonids were royal protagonists of civilization; but their civilization allowed of no more kings on the same cultural level; they were incapable of developing a civil service out of their army, nor could it have survived in face of a public opinion which totally denied the legitimacy of their claims.

Only the Deity could be king—and tolerate the barbarian king till the divine power overthrew him.

The citizens and priests constituted an aristocracy which ruled the masses; in the sight of God they were men, but distinguished by the divine favour in virtue of their sacred knowledge of God's will, and in virtue of their wealth, which God granted only to the pious. They felt equally and fully justified in their domination of

the lower orders and their stubbornness towards their superiors ; both were based upon the same philosophy of life.

But that philosophy proceeded neither to overthrow the monarchical principle nor to encourage the growth of an aristocracy based upon principle. The king continued to be the accepted chief of the nation or town, the representative of the Deity who clasped the hands of God every New Year, the beneficent and accursed being of mythology ; he had to be a priest, and the puppet of priests, and yet remain king. On the other hand, no restrictions were placed upon the Deity's choice of favourites ; according to mythical tradition a dealer in liquor became queen in Kish and a gardener's son king in Akkad, and long after Sargon the gardener, Enlil-bani, is said to have ascended the throne of Isin. But the true favourites of the Deity were the men of learning, the priests. Adapa, the priest of Ea, escaped from Anu's wrath as the pre-historic king Xisuthros (Noah) escaped from the wrath of Enlil. At this point, democratization ended ; there was no merging of the State in a world-wide commonwealth, no merging of the priesthood in a class of learned scribes, no republic.

#### PLASTIC AND PICTORIAL ART

For their building, the Babylonians always depended on brick ; stone could be brought from a long distance for single victory columns or images ; Naram-sin was the first to introduce diorite. But for whole edifices it was hardly possible. Buildings of wood and brick were not very durable. They had to be renewed every few decades, if fire or flood did not destroy them sooner. This gave the Babylonian kings constant opportunity of performing pious works of restoration, when the old foundations were searched out and new ones laid. Nothing, therefore, has been preserved of their larger buildings except the foundations, but these contain a record of their architectural history.

Babylonia's original temple was the " mountain house " (E-kur), the sanctuary of the ancient sun-god Mun-Enlil in the capital city of Nippur. This was taken as a model for the other temples. We can still recognize the sun-gods' burial-mound in the main body of the temple, belonging to the Neolithic sanctuary. But the grave has developed into a terraced tower (ziggurat), the original from which all church-towers evolved. It seems that until a late date the grave

of the god remained in the lower part of these Babylonian towers, unrecognized by the learned but indispensable for the purposes of the cult; in the Hellenic era the "grave of Bel" was still decked with green as a signal of the resurrection. But the whole terraced mound was now a symbol of the earth regarded as a mountain (for Enlil had become a god of the whole earth); on its summit was a chamber for the god (a mountain dwelling, anticipating Olympus); perhaps it was the "chamber of destinies" in which the god assigned to each man his lot. The burial-mound, therefore, had turned into a house of the god, near to heaven. We find the other parts of the Neolithic sanctuary associated with the sacred legend similarly transformed. There are chambers in Gudea's temple of Ningirsu at Lagash in which we find the grotto where the sun-child was born, with the goat that gives him milk; also a house for Enlil's dragon which had supplanted the dark brother in the New Year combat, and the ocean (apsu) to which the solar bark belonged that was now sacred to the god Ea; there is a chapel for the symbols of the solar disc and more besides. We can trace the whole sacred legend in the Babylonian festivals—the New Year victory, with the ascent of the throne and the drawing of lots; the marriage; and lastly the death, burial (Tammuz), and resurrection. All this was dramatically represented and celebrated with processions just as it was in pre-historic times, but diversified and adapted to the country and the new divinities. Babylon transferred the sacred legend from a grove to a covered building; in the temple every figure every action, and every symbol had space allotted in a special chapel, from the cellar where the tomb would be and the oracles would speak, to the roof with its altar to the sun. And even though dramatic representations passed from one temple to other temples and sanctuaries there was a settled dwelling and a place for all participants in the temple.

It was the Egyptians who first turned the sacred grove into a dwelling-place for the god, a courtyard, a pillared house with a pond and a garden. The Babylonians partitioned the house, so that everything should have its own proper place; they developed the interior architecturally so that everything essential was brought beneath the roof; it was a unit and yet divided into a number of parts, complete and scientifically arranged according to rank and need. They devoted themselves zealously and wholeheartedly to the work of arranging everything with propriety and dignity, every temple vying with the rest, for their salvation depended upon pleasing the god.

The principal hall now became the god's reception chamber where he sat upon his throne and received his adorers, and where he was worshipped and served. The divine image acquired importance and individuality. It was not the tiny figure in a niche in the Holy of Holies, fetched out by the priest, that was the heart of the temple, but the seated image in the hall, which king and priests alike approached in all humility. In Egypt there are numbers of images of the gods in their temples, on the walls and by the roads; and for that reason they are of small importance. In a Babylonian temple there was one single image of the principal god, and it had individuality; it reigned and received offerings, took journeys and paid visits, received booty from a victorious people and was itself (from about 2000 B.C. onwards) carried off in case of defeat. The god had become more individual as an image; his character and activities and surroundings had become more concrete and elaborate, and at the same time he was less concrete, more divine, as we shall see.

Besides the god's reception hall there were other rooms for ritual purposes, such as the "chambers of destinies" or birth and burial chambers, and rooms for the use of the family and the court, for every great god had a wife and children and a retinue of courtiers; further, there were chapels of other great and lesser gods with their symbols, for each great god must be represented in each principal temple of all the cities, and even lesser gods of various kinds expected consideration (for instance, the personal guardians of kings or tribes that had occupied a town: Judah?).

The interior arrangements of such a temple were the product of great learning; Gudea's inscriptions show us with what care every claim was borne in mind. The creative artistic impulse embodied in these edifices must have stood at its zenith in the time of Gudea; after that it became stereotyped. Once the problem had been successfully solved, correctly, completely, and workably, the temple might, indeed, be increased in size, its form might be repeated by the addition of further spacious chapels, the rivalry of kings and priestly communities might embellish it with plentiful new devices and precious objects, but as a whole it was bound to remain unchanged as a product of the human intellect and an object of reverence; for men aspired first and foremost to create something right and eternal; beauty and grandeur were only secondary considerations.

The palaces of the Babylonian kings must have resembled the temples very closely; kings, too, needed reception rooms, rooms for family use, and rooms for officials and servants. Their tombs were

quite plain and simple. All that was required was that the dead should be properly laid to rest, then they would remain dead.<sup>1</sup>

In Assyria we have besides the ruins of temples ruins of great palaces dating from the last thousand years before Christ. These, too, the centres of a world empire, were built chiefly of brick and covered an immense area. They stood on sloping ground, and constitute whole cities with temples and courtyards. Stone was used for the colossi that adorned the round, arched gateways; it was used, too, for panelling in the reception rooms; its use for memorial columns was an old custom continued, whilst for frontier pillars it was a novelty. The first of the great military kings, Tiglath-pileser III (745-727 B.C.) erected the first "pillared house", probably after a foreign (Egyptian) model. The columns of a small edifice of this period modelled in relief forestall the Ionic voluted capital (twofold, doubly superposed). Besides friezes on slabs of stone or alabaster, bronze reliefs and pictures in coloured tiles were used to adorn the halls and gateways and doors.

Babylonian plastic art began with figures in wood and clay, few of which have been preserved. The graves yield no Ka statues like those of Egypt; the practical motive for accurate portraiture was absent. What we still have are a few stone statues of sovereigns who had themselves immortalized as founders of a temple in solemn adoration of the god. For such purely formal purposes the statues were true enough to life; the heads are conventionalized, but they reproduce the indications of race and general appearance quite plainly; the bodies are more stiff and formal. Sculptors who could produce works like the Gudea figures (before B.C. 2300), in stone of such unaccustomed hardness as diorite and severe in style, would have been fully equal to hold their own with the sculptors of Egypt. That view is confirmed by a marvellous bronze animal's head belonging to the earliest period.

We cannot, indeed, trace any development of this plastic art on a grand scale. The statue of King Ashur-nasir-pal of Assyria (about 900 B.C.), facing rigidly frontwise, with its conventionalized head of curls and its closely fitting fringe without folds, is on precisely the same level as the Gudea figures. What we have here is sacred art, which only attains its object if it adheres rigidly to rule.

So, too, the colossi on the gateways of Assyrian palaces are rigidly bound by rule, though they bear witness to the Assyrian artists'

<sup>1</sup> In the graves and tunnels of ancient Babylonia we first come across corbelled pseudo-vaults and true arches constructed with wedge-shaped blocks.

ability to produce giant statues, hybrid creatures part human, part lion, bull, and eagle ("cherubs"); they were dominated entirely by priestly regulations and by the fact that they were part of an architectural structure which demanded symmetry. These figures were meant to strike the beholder as severe, solemn, and grand (the Jew Ezekiel, who had no love for Babylon, actually made them bearers of Yahu), and appropriate for their purpose; they were therefore given five legs, four in motion from the side view, two standing side by side as seen from the front.

Reliefs and paintings in Babylon were still not distinct from sculpture in the round; the Assyrian winged colossi have close beside them heroes throttling lions (Gilgamesh) in high relief. Hardly any works of art in the flat except reliefs have been preserved.

In Babylonia as in Egypt art rose rapidly from its poor beginnings and evolved the new style about 2800 B.C., and its finest achievements quickly followed. The Babylonian, like the Egyptian, reliefs were the fruit of visual imagery, representing primarily distinct types of beings and actions. To accomplish that aim the sculptors carved men and animals with mixed profiles, placed them in ordered rows, represented actions as seen at separate moments, and resorted to varieties of size and emblems.

But in their oldest monuments the Babylonians had advanced as far as the Egyptians of the New Empire, and in some respects decidedly further. When King Ur-Nina of Lagash (about 2800 B.C.) laid the foundation stone of the chief temple, he came into the presence of the god with his wife and children, like Amenhetep IV; but he was humbler than the Egyptian and conformed better to his chosen rôle, for he appears without royal insignia wearing priestly garb, the upper part of his body and his legs are bare, and he is carrying a load of earth; he is larger than his family, who, in turn, are larger than the officials; but the differences in size are within the limits of possibility—as compared with the god, all are human. King Eannadu of Lagash, a great conqueror, also had himself depicted marching to battle in warlike garb, not in his state robes, and very little larger than his soldiers; only his god, Ningirsu, is very large; for he was the real victor. His picture is separate from the human figures and occupies the whole front face of the monument of victory; he is riding in a chariot with his enemies' heads in his net. Eannadu himself is marching before the serried ranks of his soldiers on one section of the rear of the monument; they are following him in strictly ordered ranks, their shields above their heads and their spears advanced,

as he marches over his enemies' dead bodies. There is no Egyptian battle picture that gives such prominence to the army. The king in his chariot, indeed, does then settle the issue of the war in single combat, but the army stands by and looks on. Finally the fallen soldiers are buried if they are friends and exposed to the vultures if they are foes. Sacrifice is offered in gratitude to the gods. This "vulture stele" is also covered with written characters. If we compare it with the Nar-Mer palette, which sought to convey the same meaning very little earlier, with all its figures that are half pictorial, half writing, with the little goddess in the border near the top and the symbols of the king holding his enemy by the hair and of the bull, we cannot fail to recognize the artistic and intellectual advance.

A little later, Naram-Sin (2570-2520 B.C.) celebrated a victory by a pillar two metres in height. In this greatest work of ancient Babylonian art the attempt is made to picture the decisive moment of victory in the surrounding landscape. The king is standing in a forest on a mountain-side, with the mountain towering above (no Egyptian ever fashioned anything like this); he wears a horned helmet on his head, but is otherwise naked except for his apron (his warlike garb is that of the sun-god, the apron like those of his soldiers); his figure is tall and he stands above all the others, and is lowering his spear in token of mercy; behind him his soldiers are pressing upwards, before him the enemy leader is falling, with a spear through his neck, and his followers are suing for mercy. The naked bodies are well modelled, lifelike and mobile. A few figures, distinct but natural, suffice to tell everything essential; it is a picture in spite of its portrayal of types. Art might have evolved to something freer, tending towards the Cretan style; at least we might expect more numerous types, and more picturesque in character than formerly.

And there were actually a few new types in Gudea's pictorial art, but they reverted to the stiff, cramped style. A god drives a chariot with fabulous beasts; Ningirsu clasps his wife Bau affectionately on his lap (a love-scene like that of Amenhetep IV, but about 2300 B.C. and the characters are divine?); Gudea watches a procession of sacred symbols or is led into the presence of a god. The ability was there to invent new types; some were used for the representation of gods, others of royal piety; all were confined within sacerdotal limits. And the remainder were forbidden; scenes of violence (war) and scenes portraying natural humanity were unworthy of great art,

all too human in character. Pious princes and pious artists no longer ventured upon them.

Those who are sufficiently mature to take up the "either—or" attitude, to accept responsibility in a serious spirit before God and man, are also mature enough to eradicate what they hold to be sinful. As the capacity increased to paint in a naturalistic style, so also intellectual vigour increased and the power to form concepts. That intellectual power had taught men to classify distinctly and simply, for all their naturalism; it now reached down to fundamentals and forbade too much naturalism, demanding a religious art.

Increased intellectual power combined with a great wealth of vital perceptions formed a fruitful union. We have a seal of King Shar-gali-sharri (round about 2500 B.C.) with a picture of the king in the shape of a bull being given the water of life by the naked sun-hero Gilgamesh; the bull is a marvellous image of concentrated strength, and the hero of manly, athletic beauty, with the finely modelled muscles of his naked body and his full-face framed in a mass of curls. The presentation of Gudea to a great god pictured upon that prince's seal is delineated with the same unforced simplicity, an image of piety at once meek and proud, and of divine graciousness towards a virtuous man. The aim was now to produce idealized pictures of strength, of manliness and womanliness, and of piety; but the Babylonians soon began to shrink from the portrayal of naked men and women as representatives of their sex; they preferred always to see their gods draped, and that was a hindrance to their art. From very early times the Babylonians had readily drawn animals on coats-of-arms, in heraldic pairs, and now they developed into allegorical beings. The lion with his broad chest and powerful claws became the image of strength, the eagle with broad wings outspread stood for speed; the cherub with a bull's body, lion's claws, eagle's wings, and a human head was the spirit of the bull's fertility, the lion's strength, the eagle's swiftness, and man's wisdom; Gilgamesh the lion-killer symbolized the conquest of death.

The Egyptians, too, fashioned hybrid creatures—solar monsters, such as the gryphon of the Menes period, and later gods with animal heads or the king as a sphinx. But they did not think of them allegorically, did not clothe their speculative thought in concrete images. They did not pass beyond the stage of childhood. The Babylonians distinguished animals from gods; a great god might have an animal beside his throne or chariot, but there were no traces of the animal about himself. Yet the Babylonians created the whole

imaginary world of angels and devils and allegorical monsters, handing them down to all posterity. Such beings symbolizing a concept were in harmony with the Babylonian mentality which invented and devised winged bearers of grace, wholly or partly human, and all the demons of the seven plagues, the faun (Enkidu), Medusa (Gilgamesh), the dragon (chimæra) and Pegasus, the equine man (Centaur) and the merman (Oannes), and such things as the water of life, the herb of life, the tree of life, and the snake-staff.

As development advanced these concepts grew more and more intellectualized. The great Deity whose mercy and grace it was at best hard to represent pictorially, vanished into the clouds. The demons were simplified. Ecclesiastical art admitted of fewer and fewer images, and grew more and more weighty in its naked truth.

This process was arrested once again in Assyria by the stone and bronze reliefs of the great Assyrian kings. Great monuments to the kings, like those of Egypt, have been preserved. There is nothing new or original in their portrayal of sovereigns performing religious or semi-religious acts, with the two ideal types of beauty, either with curls and a beard or clean-shaven. They were bound by priestly regulations. Where the king was portrayed in his chariot in battle or on the hunting field, Egyptian influences could make themselves felt, and were in fact developed further along independent lines; indeed hunting pictures might equally well have originated in Assyria and been adopted by Egypt. The long friezes representing real campaigns of the great kings, with the rivers, passes, and cities that were crossed and captured, surpass anything that Egypt produced; they are the successors of Naram-Sin's column of victory, though many *genre* pictures of life in the camp and on the march are reminiscent of the Egyptian realistic pictures, and mountains, trees, and men (often full-face) are still types of course. Finally in the pictures of garden and hunting scenes of Ashur-bani-pal, the last great Assyrian king, we have one more attempt to break the fetters of tradition in the portrayal of royal persons; no love-scenes resulted, but an idyll, and great success in the representation of animals at rest, in flight, and in death. Some of these pictures of animals occur in landscapes, some stand alone on empty surfaces; not only is every movement closely observed and natural, but the figures are placed and designed in accordance with purely artistic canons. The Egyptians found an empty surface dull and promptly painted something in to fill it; the Babylonians now began to find irrelevance dull; they were emancipated enough to think a single animal upon

a white tablet more beautiful than a miscellaneous swarm, and they had taste enough to place the animal in the best possible position.

Some of the hybrid creatures of the Assyrian friezes might have been fashioned first in Assyria, not Babylon. A great art in bright-coloured glazed pictures might likewise have reached its full consummation in Assyria; what remains of it is all that we have of Babylonian painting, together with a few Neo-Babylonian pictures of dragons, bulls, and lions. A few beautiful vases in stone and metal from the early Babylonian period and a few more metal bowls with pictures of animals and pieces of carved ivory from the Assyrian period prove that Babylon equalled Egypt in her miniature art. The potter's art was somewhat overshadowed, as it was in Egypt, by more artistic crafts; besides metal and ivory work the lapis lazuli of Babylon was specially famous.

One product of miniature art to which we must devote fuller attention is the seal; it is important because of the numbers preserved, their artistic merits, and their cultural significance. Wherever writing has been invented it seems that the seal has always been invented too. Anyone who scratches written characters in stone or clay may easily happen to make an impression of them in a soft substance, such as loam or clay; that really means that he has the discovery of printing within his grasp, and it is a striking proof of the necessity for a certain degree of maturity and a certain concatenation of outward circumstances that the Chinese were the first to invent book-printing, not the Egyptians or Babylonians, the Indians or Greeks.

We have Egyptian and Babylonian seals dating from the era when they invented writing, and these seals are cylindrical. Both peoples ornamented them in the same way at first with solar religious images, and used them for the same purposes; kings used them to secure the fastenings of vessels containing oil and other supplies.<sup>1</sup> But later the ways of the two peoples parted. Whilst the Egyptians advanced no further than a State ruled by scribes, ultimately assuming the forms of chivalry and sacerdotalism and corresponding to the twelfth and thirteenth centuries in Germany, the Babylonians rapidly passed beyond that stage and created a State ruled by priests and merchants, corresponding more or less to Germany in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. In Egypt the seal-engravings

<sup>1</sup> See my essay on *Die jungsteinzeitliche Sonnenreligion im ältesten Babylonien und Ägypten*. *Mitteilungen der vorderasiatischen Gesellschaft*, 1922, 8, Hinrichs, Leipzig.

soon lost their connection with the primeval solar religion and became mere scribes' seals, official seals in the royal service. They did not appear on treaties and documents. Egypt never became a constitutional, commercial State; the king still owned everything and trade was a royal prerogative. When a new race reached maturity (at the beginning of the Ancient Empire and periodically under the Middle and New Empires) more individual names appeared for a time on seals, but they did not persist. And the cylindrical seal quickly developed into button and beetle seals, that is into a kind of amulet which commended its owner to Ra (the scarab) and showed him to be a man of standing and culture in this world and the next.

In Babylon it was quite different. There seals were numerous and important from the outset and as time went on they became more and more numerous and important until "every Babylonian had his seal". From the time of Sharru-kin (2650 B.C.) they served to guarantee treaties as well as securing the fastenings of vessels and bales. When Babylonia became a constitutional and commercial State, it was a mark of personality to possess a seal: a man who had a seal and used it felt himself responsible before God and the judge, took his place seriously and consciously within the divine yet human constitutional and commercial State, demanded his rights and accepted his duties as a citizen. A man who had a seal was a personality in national, civic life.

Consequently, the whole history of Babylonian civilization, especially of the plastic arts, can be traced in the seals. The royal custom of marking and securing the king's supplies and goods by means of the symbols of Mun-Enlil, the god of the royal house, must date back to the era of the Nippur dynasty. When writing was invented, when the Nippur dynasty was overthrown and the worship of great universal gods developed, the ancient symbolism of the solar region remained on seals now used by all princes for the protection of their prerogatives. To this purpose it was suited as well by its diversity as by the traditional awe in which it was generally held. And it was no longer needed for the major purpose of religion. We therefore find this solar symbolism in universal use on the oldest seals (2800-2600 B.C.); it is most fully represented in Farah (2800 B.C. ?) where, indeed, it is almost complete. There are solar wheels with eight and ten spokes, solar discs, crosses, solar barks and chariots, bulls, half-bulls, and heroes, even portrayed with relics of the double-axe and the phallus. But the New Year symbolism occurs most frequently, the sun-hero's fight and victory

over the rebel. It was a warning to the criminal who sought to tamper with the seal. We may designate the victorious hero bull or half-bull Mun or Enlil, although the animal form was no longer seemly for the great god of that name. Later he was called Gilgamesh, "Flaming Jaw" (the sun), and he had a comrade called Enkidu, "the Child of the Watery Depths".

Sculpture must have developed at this period as rapidly as religion. Side by side with seals covered over their whole surface with a confused medley of figures, there were already others simplified and clarified by intellectual grasp and an artistic sense. There are seals with a single wheel, beautiful in their symmetry and ornamented with delicate bands. Egyptian coats-of-arms of the earliest times were single totem animals; the Babylonians invented coats-of-arms with animals in symmetrical pairs. Gradually the ancient solar symbols almost disappeared; only one remained, the New Year's victory of two heroes over lions or bulls, and this was already interpreted as victory over death; in the best works it was fitted into the space with masterly skill and sufficiently diversified, for all its simplicity, to make a number of distinctive seals. The masterpiece in the art of seal-cutting about 2400 B.C. was Shar-gali-sharri's, the son of Naram-Sin; the old subject of the solar giant and the bull is modernized and transformed into something peaceful and pious; the god in human guise is giving the water of life to the human king who, besides the god, is but an animal; both figures are idealized and beautiful, and the composition forms a marvellous heraldic design within the allotted space.

At the same time efforts were made to introduce into the seal engravings the more advanced religious conceptions of great gods and pious humility. Shamash, the sun-god in the pantheon, was to be surety for the sanctity of the seal, and he was represented as victor over the enemy and rescuer of the earth-maiden from the cave. Finally in Gudea's time the most dignified seal-engraving was held to be the presentation of the owner before the great, life-giving Deity.

After this no new types were created; progress ceased and was replaced by mere variation. The demand for seals had become enormous and the paralyzing influence of intellectualism made itself felt. New designs still emerged sometimes (barbaric seals), but the principal advance was in piety. Under the Kassites, prayers were engraved upon seals, for men were no longer satisfied with the ocular prayer of the presentation scene. In the Chaldæan period

the owners of seals worshipped symbols instead of divine figures : they were treading the path that leads to the realm of the abstract, devoid of images, the realm of Judaism.

# WRITING

Babylonian writing was invented for the Sumerian language and only subsequently adapted to Semitic dialects. If it had been picture-writing, like the Egyptian, the process of adaptation would have been easy ; people would simply have interpreted the pictures in Semitic instead of Sumerian. And in fact a few signs were treated in this way, as signs that stood for a concept (ideograms), which could be read in Sumerian or Semitic ; but they are confined to names, especially those of gods, heroes, and cities ; they were a remnant which were felt as a difficulty even by the later Babylonians and were therefore learnedly discussed in vocabularies. Except for these and a further remnant of determinatives, Babylonian writing, in contrast with Egyptian, was purely phonetic. Even the ideograms and determinatives were regarded phonetically. The Egyptians never succeeded in detaching their characters from the confusion of phonetic and pictorial meaning, whilst the Babylonians accomplished this feat at the very beginning of their civilization. They abandoned the pictorial and chose the phonetic meaning, and so acquired a uniform system of writing with far fewer characters than the Egyptians—about four hundred, with forty determinatives in addition ; their writing was, therefore, much easier to learn. It was purely syllabic, and had the further advantage over the Egyptian system that it gave vowels as well as consonants, so that it was perfectly clear and legible. It could be used to write everything, and could therefore be easily adopted by other nations. This, and not merely the conquests and trading settlements of the Babylonians, accounts for its becoming the first universal system of writing. True, it had been originally fashioned for the Sumerian language, and even in Semitic some sounds were difficult to express, much more so in languages phonetically further removed from Sumerian.

The Babylonian characters were originally pictures, for the most part at any rate. It has been found possible to identify some forty simple characters with simple pictures. Later Babylonian scholarship preserved the memory of the original pictorial meaning of the characters, but in quite a general fashion ; attempts to

recognize particular pictures often led to the wildest errors. For at a very early date these characters lost their pictorial value and all their resemblance to pictures; the simplest line drawings developed into complex figures made up of separate lines, or wedges (the result of writing with the stylus on clay); what emerged was a combination of strokes corresponding first to concepts, soon only to a sound. The Babylonians distinguished some two hundred simple characters and an equal number of compound ones (gunation). The attempt to arrange the wedges composing each separate character in a square or rectangle is evidence of the impulse and the ability to evolve an order at once ocular and intellectual.

Determinatives were indispensable in this purely phonetic writing, because it still contained ideograms, names, and various other words, which could be read in Semitic or Sumerian. Names might designate all kinds of things, and the Babylonians, who had been too thorough simply to omit vowels like the Egyptians, were also too thorough to leave the reader to guess what kind of being or object was indicated by a name. When the characters were adapted to Semitic, opportunities of misunderstanding increased and the retention of the determinatives became a necessity.

The Egyptians needed determinatives in order to avoid confusion between the phonetic and pictorial meaning of their images and their determinatives therefore took the form of pictures to be attached to phonetic series and letters to be attached to pictures. The Babylonians did not waver between the phonetic and pictorial value of their characters, for the significance was definitely phonetic. But they needed brief, clear aids to the reading of names and for that purpose they used single characters, whose pictorial value was, therefore, more easily remembered. Of these there were, of course, only a few (about forty). Except in the case of five, the Babylonians placed them before the name, so that you knew beforehand what was to come.

Unintentionally the determinatives provided a framework of general concepts into which the names of beings and objects could be fitted: God, man, woman, social, or occupational group; constellation, city, land, mountain, river; ass, sheep, bird, fish, serpent, grasshopper, bee, vermin; plant, wood, reed, edible herb, corn, fat, oil; stone, clay, bronze; cloth, wool, leather, wicker-work; part of the body, disease; such were these readers' sign-posts with their classifying tendency. At the first glance they hardly seem more abstract than those of the Egyptians, but if we examine them more

closely, we find that a set of generic concepts have been selected where the Egyptians left a wealth of terms too manifold for enumeration; and these selected signs do really classify objects and give a survey of them in lists. The selection was the outcome of the practical experience of scribe and priest and merchant, but it gives in outline a classification of the universe under the headings of God and man and the three kingdoms; within the three kingdoms, again, we recognize certain main groups: tree (wood), reed, herb, stone, earth (clay), metal (bronze). These already provide good general terms for the classification of the vegetable and mineral kingdoms. Thus the Babylonians really had advanced a good deal further than the Egyptians in their survey of the world in its static aspect, and in classifying it systematically under concepts.

When the Babylonians decided in favour of purely phonetic writing they escaped the problem of the relation of reality to its image and to the word which represents it; that problem was not solved, but it was shelved in practice, because it ceased to force itself upon men's minds every day when they wrote. None the less, the Babylonians practised pictorial and verbal magic, but the former became unimportant, an inferior branch of knowledge, whilst the latter grew to vast proportions and struck deep roots in the Babylonian philosophy of life. The principal problem came to be that of causality in the world, a problem that was not merely touched upon, as in Egypt, but posed and solved. Magic spells were supplanted by prayers to the great gods, penitential hymns, and the consultation of omens.

#### LITERATURE AND MUSIC

The invention of writing enabled men to record poetry, but it did not lead directly to the preservation of all poems. Only what seemed important to the scribes as a class was written, and, indeed, written over and over again, and so that its preservation was fairly assured. That is why we have a preponderance of scribe-literature in Egypt; the satire of knights directed against scribes, which certainly existed as the counterpart of the scribes' satire upon knights, has not been preserved. In Babylon it was the priests who wrote, and they selected and preserved what they held to be of value. And here a new, philosophic motive entered in beside the influence of class and the practice of the scribes' schools: anything regarded as "sin" or "vanity" was refused admission to the

libraries. Wherever, as in Babylon, men think in terms of "either—or", wherever they hold their beliefs passionately, they eradicate with conscious intent what ought not to be preserved. Just as pictorial representations of campaigns and battles vanished in later days, so too purely worldly subjects vanished from literature; they were not recorded in writing. This has falsified the picture presented to us of Babylonian culture, though the error is partially corrected because the priests were Babylonians with an inborn appreciation of the finest contemporary achievements of their people; they were sensible of the beauty of their poets' works even when they were bound to condemn them in principle; and before long these works were so transformed that they could receive the blessing of religion. The epics, with their crude ideas of God, contained "knowledge from the days before the Flood", and the love-songs were put into the mouths of a divine couple. This was not too difficult, for Babylon had not reached the Chinese or Greek Pythagorean stage of absolute logic, in which alternatives utterly excluded one another to the point of annihilation, though she was far more acutely logical than Egypt.

Babylonian poetry was written in lines, and the same metre was used for all types, for epic, lyric, and didactic poetry, and for fables. It consisted of two half-lines, each with two or three stressed syllables; the lines are often grouped in stanzas. This was the artistic form proper to such poetry as was worthy of preservation; it was a sacred gift, divinely inspired and approved. Its uniformity corresponded with the religious trend towards unity. It is easier to arrive at one classical metre for all poems than one God.

Artificial embellishments appeared at an early date, further developed than in Egypt. Egyptian hymns were apt to give the same god a succession of new names in succeeding lines, but Babylonian hymns went further and applied a succession of epithets in parallel groups; duality as a means of surveying the subject was aided by the bipartition of the lines and double lines, and was carried out in detail, as with the coats-of-arms. The power of expression grew with practice. Egyptian refrains, too, were further elaborated (litanies, successive assonances, acrostics). The literal repetition of happily phrased passages, especially in epics, became an accepted feature in literary style; they were as welcome to the professional minstrels by way of padding as they were to the audience who were still slow to capture the sense, to the scribes who could add to the number of their tablets in accordance with numerical

speculation, and to the scholars who had to learn the poems by heart.

Chief amongst the poetry of Babylon are the hymns addressed to gods (and still to kings as well); they are preserved for the most part in Sumerian and Semitic, and were probably composed in Sumerian, for that was the older tongue and became in the end a sacred, dead language derived from the "great gods" of the south; nevertheless, since the purpose of the hymns was to win divine favour, there was a motive for the translation into Sumerian of hymns composed in Semitic.

If we compare Egyptian and Babylonian hymns to the gods, the Babylonians are on a higher level even in their hymns of adoration; their penitential psalms are far in advance of the Egyptian counterparts. In Babylon the lists of names are longer and the striking images used to illustrate the divine nature are more numerous. Certain characteristics which the Egyptians attributed to one great god only, Ra, such as "living in his own blood" (in other words, immortality), were attributed by the Babylonians to all as a matter of course, and ceased to be mentioned. The charming natural scenes in the Egyptian *Hymn to Aten* are lacking, although the Babylonians, too, could depict natural scenes powerfully, such, for instance, as a storm; they either saw Nature in all its immensity and the gods as stars in the firmament, or they saw it as mere environment and ignored it. The human qualities of the great gods became the central theme—justice in Shamash, mercy in Marduk; they grew more alike in outward appearance and inner nature; all were creators, masters of destiny, constellations, judges, founts of mercy. Thus the hymns tended more and more to become humble and sometimes fervent prayers; lists, formulæ, and images were still predominant, but they took the form of a ceremonial and the element of personal supplication increased in importance. The god's help was sought in some trouble, something concerning this world such as national or individual distress, war, hunger, illness, or poverty, but men were no longer concerned about resurrection from the dead.

Primarily, the king typified man. He, too, was worshipped and acclaimed in hymns; but hymns to kings begin as hymns to the god of the king and country, and end by commending him to the protection of the gods. He was no longer a god, not even an earthly god like Pharaoh, but a man in the sight of the great gods, a mediator and as such peculiarly dependent upon the divine grace. It was kings who first addressed psalms of lamentation to the gods in times of national distress, searching out their sin and repenting of it so

that they might find grace. There are psalms of lamentation and thanksgiving attributed to historic rulers (e.g. Nabu-kudurri-usur I, about 1100 B.C.) on particular occasions. Kings, too, appear in the first instance as singers of psalms in personal trouble, such as illness, which in particular makes men equal and human. The most fervent lamentation is attributed to one of the early kings of Nippur, yet it is only preserved in Semitic and must be dated as late as 2000 B.C.

At first the psalms of lamentation were no more than efforts to touch the hearts of the great gods, a method resorted to because there was no other way of moving the powerful. They were a kind of magic charm, though a higher type based upon a higher idea of the divine: the god is everything, man is small, dependent, vain; the god is pure, whilst man is always erring and sinful in his sight; the god is strong, man is weak, lost, helpless to avert disaster without divine help; the god is merciful and man can conciliate, touch, and move him. The Babylonian penitential psalms express this recognition of difference and dependence, and nothing more; that is why the most heartfelt supplications are found side by side with endeavours to get at the offended god by logical methods, by naming "every god and every goddess", by doing "penance" for every conceivable outward and inward impurity. But the fundamental recognition of sin and the duty of repentance in distress and illness was an advance beyond the Egyptians' naïve self-righteousness; and the fervent supplication, the prayers, "Turn thy face towards us!" "Be as a father!" the stress laid upon the will to repent, were a great advance beyond the denial of all guilt in the presence of Ra or the judges of the dead, although Tabi-utul-enlil of Nippur repeatedly declares that he is conscious of no sin. The Egyptians discerned sin in others but not in themselves (the Man Weary of Life), and they were quite equal to a little trickery (the judgment of souls); the Babylonians sought sin within themselves and did not find it, thus feeling something akin to the sorrow of Job.

As "democratization" progressed in Babylonia, humbling the kings and limiting their power, and making priests and merchants who "possess a seal" the type of humanity, the religious sentiment of the psalms of lamentation spread to wider circles; the most important thing in the world was the relation of the individual to the Deity. Naturally the hymns were used in the temple ceremonial of the divine court; but first and foremost they were used to mitigate human distress; the sick, the poor, and the wretched probed their

guilt and looked to a merciful god ; men passed by way of omens and lamentations in their daily lives to the more personal piety of the Jews and the personal prayers of Jesus.

Another important division of Babylonian lyric poetry is that of the love songs ; all that we have of these at present is lists of the contents of collections of love songs (the hymns to the gods were also brought together in collections), and they only give the first lines ; the texts are still lacking. We can tell from the first lines that there were men's and women's songs, as there were in Egypt, but also choruses sung by the woman's companions. To judge by the surviving fragments, the Babylonian songs were much more fervent, more passionately serious, than those of Egypt. Instead of little scenes taken from the lovers' intercourse, or jesting disguise as an oarsman or a huntress of geese, the women's songs tell of yearning for a husband, joyful surprise and tender caresses when he returns at night, or memories of him in absence. The men's songs tell of delight in a woman's charms, and extol them ; whilst the companions' songs salute the couple, now addressing the lover in the woman's name, now both, and greet their union with exultation. The Babylonians had learnt to express feelings such as joy and ardent love, they gave free rein to their feelings and expressed them by means of choice images which are still familiar to us but are seldom commonplace. " My love is a Light " ; " My Heart is full of Merriment and Song " ; " Songs of the Heart " ; such are the titles of the collections. True, the songs are not attributed to human beings, but to Tammuz, the god of love and death and resurrection in the world of Nature, and his beloved Ishtar, two deities in fact ; and the chorus of companions consists of the retinue of the gods. The sacerdotal religious element justified the inclusion of love songs in serious literature. Here we seem to come upon a restriction narrower than in Egypt, where wholly unmythological love songs existed side by side with the lamentation of Isis ; but in essence the Babylonian songs are as unmythologically human as the Egyptian, and far more fervent and heartfelt. Their significance is exalted by the bond which links them with divine figures ; they did not merely concern a special knightly class, they were not an amusement of courtly circles, but were the concern of all mankind, a sacred part of the religious system. It is very probable that they formed part of the marriage ceremony, and constituted a marriage hymn-book at every wedding, not only at the marriage of Tammuz. So far had the sacerdotal outlook permeated the whole of life and love and death.

For, together with the love songs, we find dirges for the dead Tammuz ; these have been preserved, and are put in the mouth of Ishtar, his sister, lover, and wife. She mourns "the strong man" "the radiant," "the bull," "the lord of the net," "the shepherd," and "the heavenly mourner" who has entered the mountainside, leaving his bridal chamber and journeying far away to the steppes. His beloved, still both sister and wife, seeks him in vain ; the world has grown bare and unfruitful. River and pond, field and garden, animal and plant no longer bring forth life. Here, too, the emotional note and the imagery are more powerful and varied than in the lamentation of Isis. This, again, is a hymn-book for funeral ceremonies, dirges mitigated by no magic spell to ensure resurrection from the grave, and for that reason more deeply impressive than those of Egypt.

Two principal features of the sacred legend of the Neolithic solar religion had, therefore, been preserved and developed, and that not only in songs composed for the festivals of spring and death in Babylonia's agricultural religion ; they had been consciously re-adapted in order to link religion and life on a higher level, where experience was remoulded. It seemed that the great universal gods of Babylonia, whose universal causality implied man's mortality and sinfulness, had wholly supplanted the solar religion of the Proto-Sumerians ; suddenly we find that religion living and vital once more in the marriage and funeral songs. And when Babylonian laws mention prostitutes in the service of Ishtar, and Herodotus refers to Babylonian women who sacrificed their chastity, we realize that even the Neolithic orgies at the spring festival had developed into civic institutions and sacred customs.

But we find the whole sacred legend of the Neolithic sun-god embodied in the subject matter of epic poetry. The Babylonians were the first people whose vision and creative power produced a great epic poem with a grand Nature myth as its subject, a myth deeply felt and telling of a glorious hero doomed to die. The single myth of the annual cycle became simple mythology. It divided into two principal parts, the divine and the heroic myth, at the point where men recognized that great gods are once for all immortal, whilst human beings, even kings, heroes, and demi-gods, are once for all mortal. In both of these mythical spheres the sacred legend is easily and clearly traceable ; it is a nucleus that has only been slightly remoulded by the new relation of god to man.

The divine epics treat of the whole sacred legend, but they divide

it among the several great gods who had come into being when the immigrant solar religion was adapted to the new country and refashioned on a higher plane. The ancient Mun of Nippur, called Enlil, "Lord of the Storm," in the new pantheon, was still the New Year's victor and lord of the earth in the epic. But he no longer subdued the "dark brother," representing the gloomy half of the year or the enemies whose menace is the solar eclipse; such solar natural history had become commonplace. Enlil subdued the powers of Chaos and disorder at the beginning of time, and the outcome of his victory is the divine ordering of the universe, the creation of a universe divided into distinct parts with earth and heaven and depths, with stars that move unswerving in their courses, with gods dwelling in the sky and in temples, with men who serve them and are commanded to make use of animals, plants, and stones. Here is a new and grandiose vision: in the beginning is no god who begets the world from his hand, nor an egg from which the embryo breaks forth, but superhuman energy, an ordering power, and a chaotic, rebellious mass. A struggle between the two was the origin of the ordered universe, the "State"; to create order was to create the world, to separate its parts, to establish its powers, and to allot to each its task. The enemies of order were Apsu the abyss, Mummu and Tiamat personifying noise, and Kingu their servant, besides the prototypes of the giants, monster serpents and dragons, tempests and demoniacal hybrids, men who were half-scorpions or half-fish. These were the kindred of the gods, just as the solar twin brothers were kin. Apsu, the abyss, was the ancestor of all gods; but the powers of Chaos refused to submit to the reign of light and order. Enlil's victory over the dragon Tiamat decided the issue of the struggle. Enlil hurled his weapon (the old double-axe, now transformed into a storm) at her and caught her in his net (the sun-trap); he hewed her in pieces and made from them the sky and the solid earth; then man was fashioned from Kingu's blood mixed with earth, so that he might serve the gods and offer them sacrifice.

That is the Babylonian poet philosopher's great vision of how the world order was established as the result of a primeval struggle. The Deity was conceived as subduer of Chaos, where formerly he had subdued winter; he was the shaper of the world and its parts, not the begetter of the natural world like Ra; he was the framer of order in the world and the State, its guardian against the chaos of tempest and crime, within Nature yet raised above her, belonging to Nature yet the founder of the State—such was the new offshoot

of the solar religion. Enlil was no longer a sun-god, but he was still the Lord, the source of order in the world and the State, the sovereign of sovereignty. Man was the servant whose part it was to worship and nourish the gods and to punish criminals; because he was of the earth, he was mortal; that he sprang from the blood of the rebel Kingu involved no tragedy in the eyes of the Babylonians.

Enlil is likewise the central figure in the second great Babylonian vision of the beginning of things, the myth of the Great Flood. Its kernel in the world of Nature is doubtless the knowledge that the spring rains, which seem to submerge everything, actually cause the seeds and buds to burst open; life which has survived through the winter concealed in a little hut, entombed, hidden, now emerges once more. In the Neolithic legend this cannot have been more than a subordinate feature; the Babylonians once again transformed it into a primeval event of worldwide significance, terrible and beautiful. They borrowed the colours from the mountain stormfloods that swept down in springtime, striking down and devastating all before them, the arm of Enlil. And they borrowed the new central theme from the saga which told how order was established in the world. Men who are the offspring of Kingu (but piety forbids that this should be mentioned) rebel like the powers of Chaos; a second war breaks out, but is rapidly ended, for Enlil drowns the whole race; one only is saved who has been a faithful servant to his god Ea, the lord of the sea; the ship is invented for the occasion, and he is rescued in it with his family and all kinds of seed. In the end Enlil is satisfied, for he is spared the necessity of creating mankind afresh when Kingu is not at hand for the purpose; he accepts sacrifices from a man who understands his position and whom, therefore, as the last man, he makes immortal.

The myths of Enlil's fight with the dragon and of the Flood must have grown up in Nippur, probably round about 2800 B.C., quite at the beginning of the new civilization. One would suppose that our own epics treating of the same subject must have been composed in Sumerian, for even the most similar version knows only Sumerian gods beside Enlil, in particular Ea of Eridu.<sup>1</sup> But

<sup>1</sup> Ea saves the hero of the Flood in defiance of Enlil's command. Possibly there was an older version in which Enlil himself made the exception; Ea's cunning and the distress in which the Flood involves the gods make Enlil ridiculous. In another poem the bird Zu steals the tablets of destiny from him, the very symbol of sovereignty; another god recovers them and becomes his successor. In fact, he is set aside as belonging, philosophically and politically, to the past.

hitherto, although epic fragments in Sumerian have been found, there are none that could be the original of the Semitic narratives. Sumerian writings on the creation and the Flood are obviously later and derivative; we might almost assume that, in contrast to the hymns, they were taken from a Semitic original at the time of the Sumerian counter-attack on Sargon's empire (the dynasty of Ur and Isin). On the other hand, it is difficult to account for the rise of the myths, with their new and mighty visions, except in epic form. We could more readily imagine that in the Sargonid era, with its aggressive spirit of chivalry (which, indeed, brought the plastic art of the Sumerians to perfection) Semitic speaking poets developed Sumerian ideas from the germ and left them in their Sumerian home, just as the poets of the *Song of the Niebelungs* and the *Edda* developed the Siegfried idea from the germ. Perhaps new discoveries will elucidate these questions. For the present we must assume that, unlike the hymns, all the great epics were composed in Semitic. There are no Semitic-Sumerian epic texts. But in all the epics, alike gods and the first traces of epic development and the scenes of action are south Babylonian. Demonstrably the only north Babylonian Semitic god, Marduk of Babylon, was introduced at a late date into the myth of Enlil's combat with the dragon; the earliest possible date would be after 2000 B.C. under the Babylonian dynasty of Khammurabi. And simultaneously the legal formalities were introduced by which sovereignty passed to him from the Sumerian gods.

The other part of the sacred legend—the sun-god's death, his entry into the mountainside and his resurrection—was likewise treated epically. But Enlil could not be the hero of this legend, though he continued to die as Enlil-Tammuz under some name or other in the local cult of Nippur. As a great god he had become immortal. Tammuz took his place in the epic, and also Nergal (Ningishzida also calls for mention). In Egypt this resurrection-spell was the most important part of the myth both to religion and literature (in the *Romance of Batai*). In Babylonia the religion of the learned knew no hope of resurrection; the death and return of Tammuz simply typified a natural process, and with him men associated their dirges and spring songs (the lament for Tammuz, the Tammuz greeting, without any Nature imagery). Individuals, prescient of mysteries, may have associated obscure hopes with it, but the great poems are silent on that subject. All that has yet been discovered are epic descriptions of the journey of Tammuz' wife (or mistress), Ishtar, to the Underworld; how she was imprisoned there

and set free by a minstrel (Orpheus ?) who was a mere phantom and therefore beyond the reach of the death goddess's vengeance ; it was Ea's craft that fashioned this " minstrel " in order to restore fertility to the earth, and taught him to entertain the queen of death and so to lure her into an involuntary oath to fulfil one wish of his ; he asked for the water of life which brings the new springtide. Tammuz hardly figures at all in this epic ; he is the occasion of the journey to the Underworld, and is, of course, set free at once. But the fertility of the earth depends on Ishtar, the great goddess of sex, the immortal who is only made captive and not killed (like the Earth Woman in the solar myth). The Babylonians almost eliminated the all too human dying god both from epic poetry and from religion. In the *Song of Adapa* he stands as an immortal before the gates of Anu, the god of heaven. He had nearly been supplanted by the great goddess of Nature. Interest centres alone in the eternal processes of Nature and in conditions in the Underworld.

It is true that in the poem of *Nergal and Ereshkigal* a god does descend to the Underworld, claimed by its queen in atonement for an insult to her messenger. But he comes as a conqueror, he is not dead ; immortal and mighty, he threatens the death goddess herself with death and compels her to share her sovereignty with him.

So far as we can tell, no epic recorded the death of Tammuz ; that was reserved for the ceremonial at the festival of death and the dirges. The divine epics reveal secrets of the world's beginning, secrets of the Underworld, always divine mysteries, but the great god no longer died.

Nevertheless, the death of the sun-god and his westward voyage were treated in epic form. But the god had to become a hero, a demi-god ; then he was mortal, but could no longer rise from the dead. This human quality, this mortal destiny, gave a new depth to the solar legend in Babylonian hands ; it provided the subject matter of the heroic epics. The divine epics re-fashioned the New Year's combat of the sun-god and the history of the grain that survives winter and the spring rains and returns to life, and made of them the mighty legends of the divine power of order at war with Chaos, and of the Flood. In the heroic epics the whole story of the sun-hero, but especially that of his death, unfolds as a deeply moving vision of human destiny, all vicissitude and death, whilst the gods live in eternal bliss. Both processes of transformation meant that the Babylonian legend had become more diverse and profound than the Egyptian ; the conception of " either—or " had creative force ;

the subject was raised from the sphere of the commonplace and obvious ; it had attained grandeur and emerged as the clear statement of the problem. The Deity was glorious and terrible, man and his civilization at once great and petty.

The Babylonians' greatest heroic epic, the first great work of its kind in the poetry of the human race, was the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. Its mythical content is the solar legend, possibly in its Enlil-Mun version. It is connected locally with the city of Erech in Southern Babylonia, and there are historical allusions to the conflict between Babylonia and Elam. The hero was originally called "Gish" (wood) and his friend "Enkidu" (child of the deep waters); in the process of adaptation of the solar legend to Babylonia the dying sun-gods had been changed to dying gods of vegetation. Later speculative thought afterwards restored the principal hero's relation to the sun, who does not "die" in the poem, by calling him Gibil-gamesh, "fiery jaw."

We have fragments of an older and shorter version of the poem, possibly the original, dating from 2000 B.C., and a newer, fuller composition on twelve tablets (speculatively associating it with the solar year), the work of a priest called Sin-liki-unnini; both are written in Semitic.

The whole sacred solar legend of Neolithic days is contained twice over in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*.<sup>1</sup> Enkidu, the friend of Gilgamesh, is the sun-hero born in the open fields among the animals, a naked giant with long golden hair who celebrates a natural union with the harlot in the grove, fights a New Year's duel with Gilgamesh, dies miserably after many victories, descends to the Underworld, and, though he does not rise from the dead, returns at the summons of his friend to tell how the dead fare. So, too, Gilgamesh is a hero whose fate follows the solar legend; he comes of the ancient lineage of the sun, but is only two-thirds god and one-third human, and is therefore mortal. His mother is a mortal and he has no father, like the sun-child (it seems that Shamash, the sun-god, takes the place of a father). He journeys eastwards for the New Year's combat, kills the hero Khumbaba on the mountains of Elam, frees the goddess Ir-nini and brings her back as his bride to his city of Erech. Here he kills the "heavenly bull"; Ishtar raises her voice in lamentation, and now Gilgamesh journeys westward into the mountain as if he himself had died, a feeble shadow; he crosses the waters of death

<sup>1</sup> See my essay on *Die Entwicklung des Gilgameschepos*. *Leipziger Semitistische Studien* VI. Hinrichs, Leipzig.

upon the path of the sun ; he, too, does not rise again, but he returns to the world of the living with a herb that restores youth, taken from the bottom of the sea, and reigns once more in his city of Erech.

Apart from adaptation to a southern climate by turning the sun-hero into a god of vegetation, these two versions of the sacred legend have merely been transformed and re-fashioned by the new philosophic content of the poem. The outcome is a new story of action, thrilling but simple, packed with heroic battles and world-wide travels, resembling the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, but that both are combined in one poem, universally moving in its portrayal of the vicissitudes of human life, as profound and religious in its demonstration of the uncertainty of all that man holds dear, the pride of culture and the joys of the hero, as in its acceptance of the inevitable.

Instead of the superficial psychology of Egyptian poetry we find in the Babylonian epics the first portrayal of the inner character, just as the Babylonian love songs are richer in the expression of emotion. Only a few principal traits are presented, but these are clear and well-marked. God and man are integrally conceived ; they are not of any particular age, but adults of full strength represented by few types. There is the Enlil of the divine myths, strong, fierce, terrible when he strikes, and beside him Ea, clever, cunning, cautious and gracious (Odysseus beside Ajax). Between the two stands the goddess Ishtar, a being all sex, endowed with the instincts of motherhood and of fierce jealousy and vengeance. In the course of further development all three combine to make the one Deity, uniform, almighty, wise, holy, pure, and benevolent. In the heroic myths savage man, Enkidu, a giant in strength, carried away at once by every passion, easily overwhelmed by terror even after his knightly training, is contrasted with civilized man (Gilgamesh), with his seemly demeanour and discipline, secure in his religious beliefs and his education as a courtier and knight, equal to every situation in life except death which is the end of all his piety and bravery. Beside the pair stands Reshat-Ninlil, woman as a mother, faithful, full of love and care for her son. In the course of further development all three combine in the man Atrakhasis, very wise and pious, who accepts things as he finds them and makes the best of them.

These characters now come in contact with one another, and the result is action. The action is altogether human, although the gods are constantly present and sometimes intervene (Ishtar, for instance) ; it is simple, although the scene of action stretches from the solar mountain in the east across the whole world to the solar

mountain in the west, and beyond into the land of fable where are the sea of death and the Islands of the Blessed, whilst some scenes are placed in heaven and others before the gates of the Underworld.

We see Gilgamesh, the proud hero, laying burdens upon his subjects, the people of Erech; they are compelled to slave day and night to raise the great edifice that this civilized king erects in honour of the gods and for his own glory. In answer to the prayers of men the gods create Enkidu, the mighty man, who is to provide ample employment for Gilgamesh's strength and distract his attention; Enkidu is the savage, an animal among animals, contrasted with civilized man; civilized cunning alienates him from the animals and brings him in contact with Gilgamesh by exploiting his passions, his sexual appetites, and his ambition to be the strongest man. Gilgamesh receives him superciliously, having been told in dreams that he will come; he does not fight in earnest but controls his anger and wins the savage for himself and for civilization. Such is the beginning of the first heroic friendship in the great poetry of the human race. Shamash desires glory and honour for his favourite, Gilgamesh, and at his command the heroes journey eastward where Khumbaba, the hero with the mighty voice and the sevenfold magic shirt, is guarding the world-cedar and beneath it Ir-nini, whom doubtless he has captured. With the help of Shamash he is killed, the cedar is felled, and Ir-nini is brought to Erech; the world-mountain belongs to the victors. At this point Ishtar intervenes, offers her love to Gilgamesh, and is repulsed; there is no room for love in epic poetry, though it has its place in lyrics. Enraged, she ascends to heaven and wins the promise of her father Anu, the Lord of Heaven, that a heavenly bull shall avenge her; but the two heroes who have subdued the world overcome the heavenly bull, too, and return in triumph to Erech.

Such is the account of the most glorious hero, the favourite of the gods, who has won the best of friends and scorned the loveliest of women, who is the handsomest and bravest of men, the world victor and subduer of all monsters. We realize his great merit and the merits of the civilization that raised him above the world of Nature, making the gods gracious to him, winning for him the obedience and friendship of the strong savage, and subduing all his enemies.

And now Enkidu dies of an insidious disease, not on the field of battle but as the victim of divine vengeance. Gilgamesh mourns by his couch, wrapping the dead man lovingly round as if he was his

bride, and then starts up, stung by the certainty that he too must die some day and turn to clay, withering to a feeble nothing. Faced with the certainty of annihilation, he breaks down utterly ; all his culture and magnificence drop from him, for in them there is no endurance, no support. All the treasure that he possesses, all that he has so magnificently won and subdued, is no help to him whatever in death ; culture is worthless, the favour of the gods is worthless, seemly demeanour and discipline are worthless. He grows altogether weak, unstable, and cowardly ; like a hideous shadow, he ranges the steppes by night in search of a herb to ward off death. He crosses the mountain and the garden of " the concealed ones ", he sails over the waters of death and finds on the Islands of the Blessed his ancestor, the hero of the Flood, the only man to become immortal. He fetches a herb from the bottom of the sea that has power to restore men's youth. But he does not find immortality ; he is forced to return home without success. A serpent steals the herb from him. Then at last he takes courage and shows his greatness ; he will die like all men, but will live, none the less, like a king. One thing only he asks of the gods : that his friend may return to give him assurance concerning the lot of heroes in the Underworld. It is gloomy, but now he hears the news calmly ; his terrible experience has made him strong—the " joyful man of sorrows ".

The Egyptians were naïvely proud of their civilization, naïvely convinced that they would live in death. They despised the savage Bedouins and trusted in their magic spells. The Babylonians were the first to perceive the limitations of values created by man ; to be close to Nature is something of value, too, they saw. Man cannot take his cultural treasures with him, whether of the mind or the body ; death is the end of all the assumptions upon which he bases his life ; no god can help his favourite, nor any human power relying upon self and self-development ; all is lost, all worthless ; man breaks down and then stands erect once more, borne up by the resolve to live and create cultural values in spite of all. For the first time he faces his destiny : " I must die, and all is over," so he clearly perceives ; perceiving, he knows himself more wretched than the unconscious beasts. He sees all things stripped of the values that made him proud, all things in which he put his trust. He is deeply shaken. But he rises again above the level of simple people, whether savage or civilized. He is not an animal, but can see the limits of what he treasures, the vicissitudes to which sooner or later they are subject, and he can declare their worth and go on living calmly. Even as

things are, life and culture are worth the efforts of the individual. These philosophic reflections do not proceed further; there is no perception of inconsistency in the idea of divine goodness having decreed man's transitory lot, nor of the duty of working for the good of others. It is a point of view devoid of the element of tragedy, primitive and individualistic. But for the first time a problem is consciously propounded and solved and regarded objectively—a world problem concerning civilization and Nature, God and man, values and destiny, though stated in the simplest formulæ. After four thousand years of cultural evolution it was a German poet, Kleist, who re-stated the philosophy of death in his *Guiscard* and his *Prince*.

The two other Babylonian heroic epics also touch upon the problem of death. The *Epic of Adapa* tells how immortality nearly returned to the world. The hero, a pious servant of Ea and a powerful magician, forfeits the immortality with which Anu intends to endow him by exactly obeying his god's commands. Since he was the first father of the whole human race, his obedience probably cost his descendants their immortality, but certainly forfeited his own. Here, too, the Babylonians saw nothing tragic; so the matter stands, and nothing can be changed; on one occasion obedience to Ea saved a man's life (the Flood) and made him immortal, on another he does, indeed, save his life, but loses his immortality.

In the short poem of *Etana* the hero flies to heaven on the wings of an eagle in order to fetch the herb of fertility for his wife; mile by mile the pair rise to Anu's heaven, then higher still to Ishtar's; the land below shrinks to the size of a cake, the sea is like a basket of bread, and at last both vanish altogether. At this point Etana is overcome with fear, and both crash down. My feeling is that this is a myth sprung from the ancient idea of the sun-bird, picturing the attempt of man to become a god in heaven and immortal. But Babylonian piety transformed it into a journey in search of the medicinal herb of fertility, undertaken with the consent of the gods so that all sinfulness is eliminated; all that remains is a warning against adventures unseemly for a citizen, and a marvellous journey which demonstrates once again how the Babylonians saw the universe as a whole cosmologically.

Associated with the *Legend of Etana* is the fable of the *Eagle and the Serpent*; like all Babylonian fables, it embodies a precept of wisdom and is composed in a classical metre. In Babylonia, unlike Egypt, the beast fable was a fully developed branch of poetry;

animals are clearly distinguished from gods and men, and the simple delineation of character lends itself to concrete teaching and is forceful enough to enable the poet to draw a moral. In early days animals were made to represent strength and swiftness and ruthlessness; dæmonology used them as symbols of such qualities. At a later stage the citizen-priestly class seized upon these symbols and used them in support of their own scale of values. The eagle in the fable is a creature of violence that robs the pious serpent of her brood; therefore he is made the victim of the serpent's cunning by Shamash, the god of justice. In another fable the fox is accused of robbery before Shamash and condemned to die, but the clever fellow manages to excuse himself; for he is not a violent brute, and his cunning is permitted and admired. The ox and the horse dispute which of them has the better claim to pride and honour—doubtless the useful ox prevailed over the warlike horse. The fable contains the wisdom of the earliest capitalist class who repudiated war but permitted trickery; they delighted in attacks on royalty personified by the eagle, in their own cunning like that of the serpent and the fox, and in the dialectic of the speeches held before the judgment seat of Shamash.

Another and higher type of wisdom was recited in the form of argumentative dialogue in verse. A master and his serf discuss the wisdom of a number of activities. The master gives an order and the serf approves its wisdom, giving his reasons; thereupon the master revokes the order, and behold! the serf finds equally good reasons for thinking this equally wise. Thus, it is equally wise to go to court, to eat, to hunt, to build, to love, to sacrifice, to hold one's peace under persecution, to rebel, to be a merciful ruler and—to do the exact opposite of all these things. Reasons can be assigned recommending all things and showing them to be advantageous. In another dialogue a man of low birth, Balta-atrua ("Stronger than I am"), complains to a friend that he has obeyed the commandments of the gods more strictly than anybody, yet he has been struck down by misfortune; he has lost his parents, is utterly without means and has been robbed. The friend tries to pacify this Babylonian predecessor of Job and to account for his misfortunes by sins "of the heart"; he is too short-sighted to detect the divine plan; the time will come when he will be rewarded and the sinners punished; true, men are hypocritical and unstable, contemptible and unjust, but the patience of the gods is limited. The poem, which is couched in elaborate stanzas, breaks off with a cry of lament in which the unhappy

man calls for immediate succour from Enurta, Ishtar, and Shamash.

These dialogues show a dialectic power surpassing that of the Egyptians. In the epics there are other dialogues full of pathos, such as the repeated descriptions by Gilgamesh of the fear that pursues him, effectively contrasted with the calm advice of those to whom he appeals, or his conversation with the living Enkidu before the fight with Khubaba, or with his dead friend at the gates of the Underworld. The love songs of Tammuz, Ishtar, and her companions group themselves naturally in scenes full of fervent expressions of emotion.

Moreover, processions were held at the annual festivals, especially at the New Year, in which the active participants marched—at the New Year's festival these were Enlil and the dragon; further, figures from the sacred legend, such as the goat that suckled the baby Tammuz or the little Ningirsu, were set up in the temple chapels and must, therefore, have been displayed and worshipped at the festivals. We know that, even under the Persians, Bel's grave was still decked with green in token of the resurrection. It would be strange if the counsels and battles of the gods and the powers of Chaos had not been presented in the words of the epic at the New Year processions, and if the love songs had not been rendered by soloists and chorus at the wedding feast of Tammuz. Lamentations in antiphony must have made up the ceremonial at the festival for the dead or mourning for Tammuz. The sacred legend must have been enacted in open spaces, in temple courtyards, and in chapels, just as it was in our own mediaeval Easter plays (but probably in a less developed form, for our Middle Ages were pre-ripened) and in the chapels of Catholic churches. The Babylonians introduced these ceremonies into their symbolism; there are commentaries which interpret the kingly ceremonial at the New Year's festival as embodying the action of the New Year's combat.

But these processions and plays, miming with chorus and speech either by human instrumentality alone or by priests with pictures, had not evolved into drama. The Babylonians had no drama, though they far outstripped the Egyptians in dialectic and characterization, in the expression of emotion and the statement of problems. Their conception of "either—or" did not reach the point of mutually exclusive contrasts; nowhere were they sensible of tragedy, neither in the contrast between God and man, between eternally blissful beings and wretched mortals, nor in man's fatal descent from Kingu

the rebel, nor in Adapa's obedience. They lamented that they must die, that they were not to reap the due reward of piety ; but they made no accusation. At long last the Deity was always in the right, for power was in his hands ; it is wise to submit and foolish to rebel. Like the Egyptians, the Babylonians went on seeking in their books of omens and hymns the magic spell that would do most to help the individual through life.

The Babylonians, like the Egyptians, had many musical instruments which we know from pictures or find referred to in texts. Amongst stringed instruments there was one with ten strings, played to accompany love songs (the flute, also, was one of the instruments used for this purpose) ; a triangular harp with four strings was a new invention. Wind instruments included the bagpipes, possibly a Babylonian invention. There was much solo and chorus singing. Recently attempts have been made to interpret the final vowels and syllables of the lines in one of the Creation texts as a kind of musical notation, and to read into them a harp accompaniment to the recited epic. It seems to me possible that the Babylonians made the first attempt to devise some kind of notation, either to direct the reciter's intonation or to indicate the instrumental accompaniment ; that alone would have been a great achievement. Where the metre is as strict as it was in Babylon and the lines as sharply divided and elaborately combined in stanzas, there must have been rules of recitation. We may suppose that the verses were recited musically, so that the division of the lines was stressed. Instruments might mark the time, emphasize invocations, and fill in pauses.

Music in Babylonia must have been taken seriously by the priests ; we find gods and kings playing the harp. When the Greeks said of the Chaldeans that they had discovered relations between music and the universe, they might have meant that in their learned lists musical instruments were reduced to the figure of seven or five, the number of the planets. No such list has been preserved. Probably the speculations of Pythagoras were attributed to the Eastern peoples, here and in Egypt.

#### LEARNING

The Egyptians made their survey of the universe in pictures, in visual imagery which only occasionally inclined towards the abstract. Their world had been divided into several main divisions, but these

were not systematically fitted together and mapped out. They knew many causes, but no uniform causality, and they never dreamed of evolution or any such general survey and grouping of historic events. Babylonia aspired to survey the universe and arrange it under general concepts, in lists, numerically; the main divisions of the world were exactly marked out, set in the framework of history, accurately mapped. Men conceived the idea of one divine causality and made it the basis of all right conduct and, further, of a number of sciences that sought to explain things causally. They sketched a scheme for the survey of history which elucidated not, indeed, in terms of evolution, but in terms of causality, and made a world history possible. The scientific form is a system of static concepts and of uniform, causal explanation; the Babylonians approached more nearly to both than did the Egyptians. As their ability to form concepts increased they aspired towards unity, though they did not attain to it. The Babylonians, too, sought knowledge and looked upon it as sacred; indeed all their sacred poetry was to them "the knowledge of Nabu". Man's whole happiness depended upon right knowledge in his general philosophy of life and in the small things of every day. Naturally there was a god of knowledge; in the early days Ea was the wise teacher, later Nabu was "lord of the art of writing on tablets", the expert, the god of libraries and schools. There were other gods, too, of special departments: Shamash proclaimed oracles and framed laws, Nisaba "knew numbers", and there were more besides. Two heroes, Adapa and Atrakhasis (Xisuthros) received knowledge from the gods in primeval days and were its guardians.

In mathematics the Babylonians supplemented the decimal system by a system of numeration in sixties, and laid the foundations of the system by which the value of a number varies with its position. They required only three figures, for 1, for 10, and for "zero". The sign for 1 also stood for  $1 \times 60$  (soss) and  $1 \times 6 \times 60 = 360$  (sar), whilst the sign for 10 also stood for  $10 \times 60 = 600$  (ner) and  $10 \times 360 = 3,600$  (10 sar), according to its position in a series of figures. The lowest values in such a series were always units (repeated up to 9) or tens (repeated up to 5); sixties and six-hundreds follow, then three-hundred-and-sixties and three-thousand-six-hundreds. If one type of numeral is not present, the "zero" sign must be put in, otherwise the succeeding figures will be misinterpreted. We have here all the essentials of a system based on the position of the figures; unhappily, however, it did not develop beyond the germ, with its

two basic signs and the embryo of a nought ; it was complicated and liable to be misunderstood. The Babylonians, therefore, used special figures for the higher units, in addition to their mathematical tables. But their vigorous advance beyond a simple decimal system bore fruit in another field ; besides writing a series of numbers to be added together, the Babylonians sometimes tried a system of subtraction when it was simpler. For instance,  $6,000 - 186$  instead of  $3,600 + (3 \times 600) + 360 + 60 + (4 \times 10) + (4 \times 1)$ .

To work with this numerical system called for much greater dexterity in calculation than the Egyptians possessed. The Babylonians lightened the task by drawing up mathematical tables. There are multiplication tables with numbers from 2 to 180,000 as multiplicand. The division tables never name the dividend, so that they can be used for several basic numbers, 1, 10, soss, ner, sar. There were tables also for dividing the basic numbers into halves, quarters, thirds, and two-thirds, whilst in general fractions were written by means of a series of special figures with denominators taken from the sexagesimal system ( $\frac{1}{6}$ ,  $\frac{2}{6}$ ,  $\frac{3}{6}$ ,  $\frac{4}{6}$ ), as well as a universal method of writing all fractions with the numerator 1. "Higher mathematics" are represented by tables for squaring and cubing and extracting square roots and cube roots (all processes of multiplication). To the Egyptians the systematic preparation and use of tables was as unheard of as involution and the extraction of roots, though all are processes of plain multiplication and division. The Babylonians were also superior to the Egyptians in so far as they made practical and constant calculations with these large numbers, in astronomy for instance.

Textbooks of geometry contained purely theoretical problems : a square with sides of a given length is divided equally into four or sixteen squares, or into four or eight isosceles triangles, and the size of the resultant parts has to be calculated ; or the diagonal of a rectangle has to be calculated, i.e. the hypotenuse, when the base and perpendicular of a right-angled triangle are given. Quite complex practical problems are propounded, such as the measurement of fields, involving the breaking up of all sorts of figures into simple triangles and rectangles ; these problems, however, are not always solved with strict accuracy.

The Babylonian calendar was naturally a solar calendar at first, such as the farmers needed. But plainly Babylonian scholarship was more thorough and found the "five epagomenal days" that could not be fitted into the  $12 \times 30 = 360$  days, a stumbling block. The

Babylonians retained a year of 360 days for purposes of calculation, and may have derived their system of counting in sixties from it, which was so easily applied to the circle and then to the heavens. But their actual calendrical reckonings went a step further (though the carnival saturnalia before the New Year persisted). They looked for a new objective instrument for measuring time, and found it in the moon. They reverted from the month of pure calculation to the actual lunar month, and established the lunar year, hitherto unknown. This lunar year was inconvenient and difficult to keep correct, just like the Babylonian system of varying the value of a figure according to its position; but it had no epagomenal days and could yet be calculated and proved direct from astronomical observation, like the solar year; both represented divine law, both were mysterious and difficult.

The moon was accurately observed. When it was new the new month began; if the new moon appeared on the thirtieth day the foregoing month had twenty-nine days, if on the thirty-first it had thirty days. Twelve such months made up a year. But as the sum total was only 354 days, a thirteenth month had to be intercalated from time to time, so that the seasons should not run away as they did in Egypt. The Babylonians, unlike the Egyptians, understood the danger and its cause, and saw how to keep their year in order. They ascertained by observing the fixed stars when it was time to intercalate a month, and the king issued a decree. The Babylonians did not discover an intercalary cycle; they looked at the sky more with the eyes of astrologers than astronomers. Their lunar year was more inconvenient to the ordinary citizen than the Egyptian year, but on the other hand it was more accurate, just as their writing had no signs for letters but could, on the other hand, record vowels.

The Babylonians borrowed a sub-division of their month from the moon, and so invented the seven-day week. The new moon, the quarter, the full moon, the last quarter, and the darkened moon were celebrated every month with special sacrifices and became days of special note, but the Jews were the first to carry the process further and devise the Sabbath and the succeeding week-days. Another division of the month into six weeks of five days each was one of a series of attempts to divide time according to a strictly mathematical sexagesimal system: the year would have 360 days and there would be twelve months of six weeks each.

It was this system which produced our own sub-division of the day. The Babylonians sometimes divided the day into three night

and three day watches, six in all, sometimes into twelve hours (double the length of ours) with thirty minutes each (equivalent to four of our minutes). This latter division is parallel with the division of the year; 360 minutes were grouped in twelve hours, like the 360 days grouped in twelve months.

The hours were measured by means of sun-dials or clepsydras, both Babylonian inventions. They were based upon the movements of the heavenly bodies. The path traversed by a shadow that the sun cast was divided into hourly strips, and the quantity of water that flowed from a star's rising to-day and the same star's rising to-morrow was divided into twelve equal parts.

Moreover, the Babylonians made the opening through which the water flowed of such a size that one *mina* of water escaped in two double hours, thus establishing a fixed relation between the measure of time and weight. The double hour already provided a measure of length which we still use in the "mile".

Equipped with this uniform system for measuring time, space, and weight, all derived from the heavens, the Babylonians could proceed to take accurate measurements of the great world and his small wares. To measure the world was the greatest venture of the new science. Nor were the more accurate small-scale measurements less important to intercourse and trade. The Babylonian measurement of time was the origin of punctuality, of life regulated by the clock, at first only for those who were priests and merchants, the possessors of seals. Hitherto the units used in making appointments were the day, or morning, midday, evening, and midnight, that is to say quarters of the day; the unit now became the double hour, or for scientific measurements the four-minute period. The advance is unmistakable, so that the Babylonian system of measurement, from the lunar year and lunar week to the hour and minute, the mile and *mina*, gained prevalence all over the world.

The *maneh*, the value of a bull in silver, doubtless derived its name from the early name of the sun-god who survived as the god of the kings of Nippur. Just as his symbols marked a seal as inviolable, so his name was a reminder that false weight was forbidden. The sacred legend of the god was finally used in the topography of the sky.

The seals of Farah (about 2800-2700 B.C.) bear the earliest traces of an astronomy based on the zodiac. That is very important. For the realization that a particular circle in the sky was of great importance in connection with the orbits of the sun and moon and of

all the planets, was the beginning of scientific astronomy. The zodiac came to be the heavenly stage upon which the principal movements were enacted.

There is a Farah seal upon which a lion and a bull follow one another as the two halves of the year, instead of two bulls; beside the bull is a scorpion, and the lion has a pair of horns. My own interpretation is that the bull has been stung by the scorpion and symbolizes the dying year, whilst the lion, magnified by the horns, stands for the year at its zenith. It seems, therefore, that three points of the zodiac had already been established at that time: the point at which the sun sets forth in spring, marked by the stellar sign of a bull, its highest point at the longest day, marked by the stellar sign of the lion, and the point at which its loss of power becomes noticeable, designated by the stellar sign of a scorpion. Three more signs of the zodiac show how the sacred legend of the sun's course influenced the development of the zodiac: the murderer of the sun-hero, Sagittarius, became the stellar symbol of the autumnal month, whilst the symbol of the winter month was the "goat-fish", actually a little bull with a fish's tail, indicating that the young bull lives in the water. After the bull in spring come the Twins, the solar brothers united in the harmony of early youth. So the sun, as he journeyed across the sky, passed by the principal scenes of his annual life-story, which in a southern land had become a mere memory. But other images were added.

The signs already mentioned marked the "path of the sun". Between 2000 and 1000 B.C. a "path of the moon" was already distinguished from it, and touched one or two additional stellar signs besides the twelve signs of the zodiac. During this period, therefore, the zodiac must have been completed. In the eighth century B.C. it must have been adapted to the new position of the spring equinox in the Ram (Nabu-nasir).

The greatest achievement of Babylonian astronomy was to map the position of the sun's annual orbit and the orbits of the moon and the planets in the sky. Compared with that the further partitioning of the sky was simple. The process was complete in the *Creation Epic*, that is well before 2000 B.C. The gates of the sun marked the eastern and western points in the sky, the "stations of Enlil and Ea", the northern and southern points. "Nibiru" seems to have been a Polar star. Just as the universe was divided between the three great gods, Anu, Enlil, and Ea, so the inter-tropical constellations were divided between the three; so, too, were Marduk, Nabu, Nergal,

Ninurta, and Ishtar, but as planets which we still call by the names of the corresponding Roman deities (Jupiter, Mercury, Mars, Saturn, and Venus) they were each in addition made ruler of a realm near the Milky Way.

The Egyptian efforts to find the Two Lands or the Nile in the heavens, were systematically continued by the Babylonians. A complete picture of the earth with its principal countries (Akkad, Elam, Amurru) and rivers, and with Enlil's and Ea's realms (the deep waters and the Underworld), were discerned in the sky, not as the result of an exuberant fancy or a passion for finding correspondences, but because the chief aim of astronomical observations was astrological prophecy. If anything happened on earth its issue must be written in the corresponding part of the sky; if anything happened in the sky, something was to be expected in the corresponding spot on earth. It was, therefore, necessary to ascertain the places which corresponded topographically on earth and in the sky. This prophetic need partly explains why to each single month, city, tree, plant, and stone was allotted a sign of the zodiac; anything happening in that sign could thus be associated with a particular date (month) and one place (city), and the correctness of the inference could be further tested by means of other special omens (animals). Moreover, there had long been a relation between the sun's orbit and the month, and men delighted in compiling lists.

The Babylonians now tried to conceive of the sky that they had learned to survey so accurately in numerical terms. They measured the earth in two-hour stretches or miles, and they attempted something similar with the sky. In the *Epic of Gilgamesh* we are told how many double hours it took Gilgamesh to pass through the solar mountain. In the poem of *Etana* the exact number of hours is mentioned that it took the eagle to fly to the first heaven, and beyond. There was a complicated method of measuring the distances of the fixed stars, though it was developed late. The time between the moments when the stars were at the meridian was measured with the clepsydra, and thence a fixed ratio was calculated between "earthly" double hours and the corresponding "heavenly" double hours.

The Babylonians' partitioning of the sky enabled them to observe and record not only the orbit of the sun and the orbit of the moon, and the conjunctions and eclipses of both, but also the courses of the five planets, their heliacal rising and setting, and their conjunctions in the sky. For this purpose they invented a diopter which, like the

Babylonian sun-dial and clepsydra, was afterwards adopted in Egypt.

It is true that these observations of the movements of the moon and planets were made solely in order to gain calendrical and prophetic knowledge, and were applied to those purposes alone. Hence changes in the weather and winds were noted as carefully as the movements of the stars, and the two fields of knowledge were not clearly distinguished. Natural laws were, indeed, observed in the form of concrete processes but, except in the case of the moon for the purpose of the calendar, they were not the object of study; on the contrary, it was the miracles and irregularities that were sought after. For this reason the records are lacking in regularity and accuracy. It was not till the time of Nabu-nasir that the sun's orbit was shifted to the beginning of the Ram, and only then did Babylonian observations begin to provide the Greeks with material that they could use. Even then men had no desire to search for laws; they had no fixed cycle for the intercalary month of the lunar year, nor did they realize that eclipses recurred at definite intervals. The Greeks were the first to reach that degree of maturity. When the Greeks came to Babylonia as masters, the Babylonians made stellar tables of full scientific value, but not before. Nevertheless, theirs was a very great achievement. Whilst the Egyptians drew no clear distinction between planets and fixed stars, made inadequate observations of the sun and moon, constructed all kinds of images, and were rather astonished to see strikingly bright or coloured stars, the Babylonians initiated an astronomy of the planets, traced the orbits of the sun and moon distinctly, and divided up, and measured the sky scientifically.

Babylon's second great scientific achievement, after creating a system of measurement for the heavens and the earth, was the introduction of a uniform hypothesis to explain the cause of all important events in the sky and on the earth. All that happens is in the last resort the work of the Deity, who determines lots on New Year's day, revealing his intention by an omen to this nation or that individual, and resolving to reward or punish them. Quite slowly this great idea of causality struck root in the course of Babylonian history, and though the notion of absolute oneness was never reached to the very end, yet to grasp the idea of causality even in merest outline was a great step in advance. People learned to consider everything in terms of causality; they sought to unify knowledge, regarding their experience as a sequence and finding causal explanations.

At the beginning of Babylonian history there were gods who fought one another and intrigued with very human selfishness, who were impulsive and at variance. Soon they all became wise, of one mind, benevolent, moral. Even though they favoured their own cities and sanctuaries and worshippers, it was done peaceably, with the give and take habitual to priests and merchants; a single Deity was in process of evolution. At the beginning of Babylonian history men could conceive a hero deliberately offending a goddess and killing the bull that she sent to chastise him, and of a demon acting in defiance of the gods. But even heroes and kings soon sank into complete dependence, and demons acted only with the permission of the gods. A multitude of divine, human, demoniacal, and natural causes (natural laws; animals) were striving towards unity in the form of one divine cause; but unity was never quite attained. The demons retained a certain independence, though in principal all that happened was held to be either an omen or a punishment or reward from the gods.

It was man's duty and his truest interest to discern the omens (announcements and warnings) and to interpret them rightly, to acknowledge the rewards with tangible gratitude, to accept the punishments, expiate and so diminish his guilt, and always to live in such a way that he was entitled to expect reward and not punishment and might hope to be able to avert actual or threatened disaster by the help of the gods.

Thus it was that the study of omens and exorcism evolved, and the arts of divination and magic which the Babylonians regarded as the most important branches of knowledge. And in fact they have survived to this day, though in a systematic form imposed upon them by the Greeks and Romans.

The Babylonians saw omens on all sides, and these the "seers" interpreted with staff and bowl. There were "prophets" too, who prophesied directly. Omens were everywhere: phenomena in the heavens (eclipses, lunar halo, solar hues), peculiar behaviour in domestic animals, the flight of birds, objects found when offering sacrifice, encounters with wild beasts, reptiles, ants, abortions, dreams, and any and every other alarming incident. All were recorded with the interpretation, sometimes with the issue (Sargon omens). Some were looked for systematically, especially those in the heavens and on the occasion of sacrifices. Those which could be tested by repeating a sacrifice or giving birds an opportunity of flight were, of course, especially suited for scientific development and were also a means

of regularly interrogating the gods ; the liver was examined or the goblet (oil on water and *vice versa*), and the flight of birds was watched ; these processes became the basis, side by side with astrology, for the most important sciences of divination.

Equally highly developed were the sciences of exorcism and magic, represented by the exorcizing priests, Ea's servants, and the sorcerers. They worked with an immense system of invocations which had to be repeated in a special repetitive order, with disguises and images, with sacrifices and acts of purification (the expiatory sheep ; the tamarisk branch) by torchlight, amidst the smoke of incense and the beating of drums. All this was gathered up in lengthy texts, explained, and brought into sequence.

We must not underestimate the value of these pseudo-sciences for the evolution of genuine science. The Babylonians in making their lists of omens learned to observe nature more carefully, even where no immediate purpose was served and nothing remarkable occurred, to record systematic observations, and sometimes even to test results. Their invocations taught them to search out and consider logically all the possibilities in a given case of defilement or of an offended deity. So, under the constant pressure of a practical purpose in which they felt a personal interest, they sharpened their intellectual faculties.

In their magic they retained all the Egyptian arts of invocation and imagery, but as part of their great causal philosophy. The hymns of lamentation and prayers which are the earliest expression of the sense of sin, of the desire for salvation, and of the more personal relation with God, are themselves magic texts and invocations.

The science of divination was an expression of this same causal philosophy. Everything that happens, however "accidental", is the act of the gods, by everything they mean to impart something to us. Causality was universal, but it did not yet give birth to the idea of natural law. When a star fell, people did not ask whether the earth attracted it, but what message from the god it was designed to communicate ; a lunar halo was as interesting as the movement of a planet ; the interest of a sheep's liver lay in its being an image of Babylon, not a healthy or diseased organ. Once natural law was discovered, this maze of symptoms would be lost to the art of prophecy, so sharp is the antithesis. The natural connection of cause and effect, say in medicine, was brushed aside as unreal compared with the invented demoniacal associations.

And yet the science of divination contributed something to the

progress even of the sober natural sciences. As we have seen, astrology gave occasion for exact observations of the moon and planets. In medicine the earliest theory of infectious disease was established (transmission by means of a living creature, the demon, through impurity and contact), and the great force of suggestion was brought into the service of the healer. Something of physics lay concealed in the assumptions upon which divination with oil was based, and something of anatomy in the enumeration of the sacrificial victim's principal organs, in order that none might be missing. But the Greeks were the first to deduce astronomical facts for scientific purposes, whilst the facts of meteorology, physics, and medicine were only partially grasped even by the Greeks in their full theoretical significance.

Babylonian physics was no more than the theory of three principal constituent parts of the universe, sky, earth, and water, and of the stars and their general and particular movements. And that is a good deal, measured in earthly and heavenly miles. We may add lists of stars, and, for geography, lists of countries, cities, and rivers, and road maps.

The rudiments of chemical science are to be found in texts dealing with the preparation of particular kinds of "stone", such as azure stone, "fiery stone," brick enamel, "swift bronze," and so on. They are purely practical instructions, but were adopted by science from the verbal traditions current among craftsmen, solely, indeed, because coloured glazed bricks were one of the principal means of ornamenting the temples, since the monuments of royal victories and other worldly decorations were no longer admitted.

Lastly we must include under the heading of natural science large portions of the lengthy Babylonian lists of all manner of objects. Primarily they were used by the scribes and their pupils, just as the soothsayers used lists of omens and the astrologers or tax-gatherers mathematical tables. They were Sumerian and Semitic lists of names, arranged under determinatives, and were meant primarily to enable people to translate a Sumerian word or to find the Sumerian translation of a Semitic word. But since they were arranged under determinatives, objects of one kind were grouped together and the lists could therefore be used as summaries of certain classes of object, as well as for purposes of translation. Doubtless they were used in this way in the schools. One great series of this kind contains names of animals, plants, and stones, thus foreshadowing in a sense the three natural kingdoms; there were also long catalogues of "wooden

objects", beginning with the trees that yield timber and fruit (a sub-section deals with the products of the date-palm arranged under the kinds of tree and of fruit), then proceeding to household implements, carts and ploughs, doors and staves. In a like manner wool and wool products and garments are enumerated. There were also lists of gods with their attendant stars, cities, colours, trees, plants, and stones; they still live in the names of our week-days, each of which was derived from a star and its god.<sup>1</sup> Babylonian lists, like all Babylonian learning, served practical ends; they were made for the benefit of scribes and students, but it would be a mistake to regard them as mere aids to translation or dictionaries. They were also aids to the theoretical survey of the world, of the gods, countries, cities, the three kingdoms, and aids to the survey of the products of man's labour needed by the farmer (dates, oil, and wool), the craftsman (implements and clothing), and the merchant (knowledge of the qualities of his wares). They were only names, but might serve as a peg for elucidation by experts. These surveys were still largely visual, but in them we have not visual imagery, but names systematically classified under general terms of a sort, the determinatives. It is fitting that the first attempt at a systematic classification of the objective world, a dictionary of concepts, should appear side by side with the first attempt to unify causality.

Babylonian legislation was a branch of the science of lists, especially the Laws of Khammurabi, the first great codification of civil law; they comprised laws governing leases, land, commerce, and marriage, besides considerable portions of criminal law. It was a great step in advance to record the acknowledged laws and make them the basis of a judicial system. The king submitted to the reign of law as well as his subjects; the State assumed at once a constitutional and commercial character. The practice of vendetta ceased; the judge was God's deputy. For the law was given to the king by Shamash, to be observed literally as a divine command. More than this was not achieved. No reasons were offered to justify legal maxims, nor were they elucidated; where guilt was established there was no inquiry into intentions or the existence of *force majeure*;

<sup>1</sup> Egypt had only the rudiments of mathematical tables, and lists of the names of things are contained in only one work belonging to the New Empire. In Babylon they were one of the principal types of learned literature; their origin is explained by the necessity of translating Sumerian written records and by the small number of determinatives. It is therefore likely that Egyptian lists were imitation of Babylonian works.

there was simply a rule to be applied literally and carried into execution.

Babylonian civilization had its origin in the Sumerian kingdom of Nippur. The Babylonians used a system of writing invented for the Sumerian language, and before the days of the ancient Sharru-kin their civilization flourished chiefly in the Sumerian south. From the days of Sharru-kin of Akkad (2650 B.C.) it became bi-lingual, Sumerian and Semitic, and after Khammurabi (1950 B.C.) Sumerian became a dead language, but sacred. The earliest school system grew up in Egypt, where writing was and continued to be the principal subject of study. The earliest scholasticism in the sense in which the word applies to our own Middle Ages (but not pre-ripened) arose in Babylon. Compared with the bi-lingual problem of translation, the importance of writing diminished. The double meaning of the written word was inseparable from the traditional system of writing. The study of that system freed people from verbal and pictorial realism, as is shown by the passage from magic hymns to penitential hymns. Anyone who observes day by day that words sound different in Sumerian and Akkadian and yet denote the same object, must come to see that they are but "breath", and will search the more zealously for the meaning in them and behind them.

As a result of bi-lingual conditions and the scribes' task of composing and reading documents in both languages, long lists were drawn up of characters and words and phrases in Sumerian and Semitic, primarily no more than a handbook of writing, systematically arranged, from the written characters to the Sumerian formulas for contracts, and the Hittite-Semitic vocabularies. But these scribes' handbooks were also the earliest philological works in human history. The Babylonians were the inventors of every kind of dictionary: the simple list of written characters with their names and phonetic values, the list of ideograms with their Sumerian and Semitic reading classified according to determinatives, that is objectively, lists of words in Sumerian, Semitic, and Hittite, or Kassite and Semitic, and, further, lists designed to aid the drawing up of Sumerian contracts, giving the parts of verbs and whole phrases; these were in frequent use. They paved the way for real grammars in which various parts of the verbs (make, I will make, I make, I do not make, let him make) were set side by side, showing a rudimentary capacity for systematization; so too the Sumerian prefixes, and infixes were half systematically translated into Semitic, synonyms for a creature or object (including foreign words) were collected, words of identical

or similar sound set in sequence, and even Sumerian dialects were dealt with. Here we have philology in embryo, born of the practical needs of the scribes; the lists were mere vocabularies for reference, but the collector's zeal elaborated them further than practical need required; the Babylonians were on the road to a systematic classification of forms, but here again the Greeks were the first to complete the process. The lists were framed as aids to correct translation, the correct formulation of contracts, and varied expression, and the outcome was that dictionaries were compiled, and words identical in sound or meaning collected, besides grammatical forms, all on an increasingly extensive scale. One such table, for instance, contains 480 verbal forms of the second person singular of the present tense.

The schools were for the most part attached to temples and were conducted by the priests, though there were some teachers as well; as in Egypt, their principal work was instruction in reading and writing. The method of writing and the use of two languages made it a difficult task, calling for great industry and patience in the pupils, great zeal and strictness in the teacher. Even King Ashur-bani-pal (650 B.C.) emphasizes the fact that "a wide ear" (i.e. power of assimilation) and "bodily strength" are necessary in order to master "the instructions". Besides learning written characters and lists by heart, the pupils had to write copies, proceeding then to compose letters, contracts, and poems.

A much-favoured practice was to impress Precepts of Wisdom upon the pupils by using them for copy-book material; they consisted in part of exhortations, and in part of proverbs—short parables are found in the Egyptian books of Precepts and occasionally elsewhere, but the Babylonian fable was the first example of literary imagery as a separate, zealously fostered branch of literature. Educated people understood immediately the figurative language of these proverbs ("There has been strife where the servants are and calumny where are the ointments"—i.e. both are daily occurrences; "a house without a master is like a woman without a husband"). Sometimes the proverb is stripped of its imagery and becomes an abstract maxim, emphasizing a simple relation of cause and effect ("So long as a man does not exert himself he will earn nothing"; "Do no evil and you will suffer none.")

It was a favourite custom to attribute the actual Precepts of Wisdom, in the Egyptian sense of exhortations to a wise conduct of life, to some primeval sage, such as Uta-napishtim, the hero of the Flood, and to clothe them in the language of poetry. The experience

of life of an individual vizier or scribe, whose success testified to the merits of his doctrine, was no longer enough; divine wisdom was demanded. Instruction in table manners and decorous behaviour in society disappeared almost entirely from these Precepts. But here as in Egypt we find exhortations to be wise and modest and discreet in speech, not to talk arrogantly, not to give dishonest advice, to hold aloof from strife, not to marry a harlot, not to slander but to speak well of others, to speak no evil but only good. The exhortations, however, had become more general, unlike Ptah-hetep or Ani, where the particular circumstances of the official or citizen coloured the whole. Babylonian Precepts, therefore, formed part of a greater moral and religious whole. Shamash punishes the slanderer, adultery is a serious sin; a man who does not honour his father quickly meets with disaster; truly he who touches an impure woman is himself impure. All this is summed up in the "table": "The fear of God brings prosperity, sacrifice prolongs life, and prayer frees from sin."

That, in the main, sums up the deep and solemn beliefs of Babylonia. Here for the first time is realization of the divine and of death. The Egyptians had broken up the unity of the Neolithic solar religion and evolved from it the many-coloured diversity of the world; thence men sought to find the way back to a new unity.

It was in epic poetry that Babylonian cultural ideals were first elaborated in imaginative form. We see Gilgamesh, the pious warrior and ruler, temperate and disciplined, high-spirited, handsome, and noble, the civilized man, far superior to Enkidu, the handsome human animal; he is beloved of the gods, guided by the direct inspiration of dreams; he is the world conqueror, the most glorious of heroes; but in face of death he is nothing but a despairing wretch, seeing clearly that all his victories and fame are worthless. Side by side with him we have Adapa, the priestly favourite of the gods beside the knightly favourite; Adapa is no reigning king but only the servant of his god in the sanctuary, controlling the world of Nature in virtue of his piety, able to defy even Anu's wrath successfully (with outward humility) as Gilgamesh defied Ishtar; but for his obedience to his god Ea he forfeits immortality. The validity of both ideals is limited and restricted; scepticism breathes upon them but does not destroy them.

In Atrakhasis, the "very wise man", the two ideals reach their consummation. He is the hero of the Flood, a more highly evolved Babylonian Noah, roughly corresponding to King Gudea of Lagash. He is no longer a knight nor, in fact, a priest, but the prototype

of a king, yet at the same time a man representing mankind in the eyes of the gods. He knows that Deity is the sole causal power in human life as in Nature, that man's fate depends wholly upon the benevolence of the gods. He is wise enough to draw the conclusion that he must be in all things a pious servant of the Deity and nothing else, if he is to prosper ; he commits no sin, but lives obedient to the divine commandments and so he is able to postpone the judgment menacing his fellow men, to mitigate the calamities that visit them, and when at last judgment is inevitable to save himself and his family from the Flood and to win immortality.

The very wise man represents the new and integral ideal of culture in Babylon, so much so that he even has his parallel in the beast fable ; Atrakhasis is the name of a young eagle that warns its father against attacking the serpent, for that Shamash would not tolerate.

It is true that this ideal of culture did not attain universal human validity in practice, but only in prospect ; where it was applied in practice, class distinctions remained : the king, most closely resembling his royal prototype, is degraded from his privileged position in the presence of God by the exhortation to be " very wise " ; he is enslaved by responsibility for his people, compelled to act as the omens direct and to lose himself in the service of God. The common people are " very wise " if they do what the priests tell them. Only the priestly and citizen class was free under the domination of the new ideal ; the priestly scholars, serving the Deity, felt free and proud because they had knowledge of his nature and his will ; they were his intimates and had studied his ways. The merchants as they served the Deity reflected that their peaceful trafficking with gods and men was altogether " rational " ; it was carried on altogether " without violence ", and all profits were signs of the divine approval and blessing. To his own the Deity granted long life and health, riches and offspring, and whoever had these things was justified. Here, too, scepticism raised its head, but it did not prevail. The first ideal of humanity, that of Atrakhasis, asserted itself as a class ideal of the priests and merchants, the learned and the wealthy.

Babylonian, like Egyptian, historical records begin with lists of the names of years ; in Babylonia the years were named after particular events (from 2800 B.C. onwards), in Assyria (from about 2000 B.C.) after the annually appointed officials ; very early they were reduced to a calculation based upon the years of the kings' reigns. But some of the lists of kings show the contemporaneous

kings reigning in Babylonia and Assyria ; contracts were increasing in number and had to be dated accurately.

Then the deeds of the kings were fully recorded. We have chronicles which record regularly all important events in each city and each temple (including signs and miracles), as well as the campaigns of Sharru-kin and Naram-Sin and Khammurabi's victories, the canals and fortresses that he built, his legislation, and the temples that he restored. In the later period it was only the great Assyrian kings who recorded their campaigns in detail. After 2000 B.C. the Babylonians only kept full records of their kings' works of piety.

All these historical works served practical ends. Accurate lists of kings and years dating far back were needed for purposes of law and commerce. The king, the temple community, and the individual merchant needed diaries (book-keeping) recording their affairs, amounting in fact to a survey of what the merchant gained and what was accomplished in the service of the god.

The poems telling of Sharru-kin the Ancient's journey to the western lands and of Khammurabi's victories over the Elamites must have been something between religious rhymed chronicles and heroic songs.

The aim of historical philosophy was to link the "primeval mysteries", the myths of the Creation and Flood, with actual history by inventing a succession of "kings before the Flood" and then "kings after the Flood", right down to historic times. The outcome was a uniform list of kings from the Creation, or at least from the Flood ; thus by means of the science of lists men endeavoured to grasp intellectually the whole course of historic events. Before Menes the Egyptians traced only the Followers of Horus and further back the gods, whilst the Babylonians made lists of the dynasties before 2800 B.C. with the names of the kings and the cities where they reigned. The only proof that they were imaginary is to be found in the fantastic numbers of years of the reigns ; careful investigation shows that beyond 2800 B.C. the Babylonians themselves only knew a few scattered names.

But they continued to divide the uniform flow of history by reading into it a recurring cycle of cause and effect : at the beginning Enlil-Marduk made creation possible and introduced the first period of prosperity in the world by overthrowing the powers of Chaos and establishing order. Then men incurred the wrath of the gods by sin, so that the first period of doom, the Flood, was inevitable ;

in vain the pious King Atrakhasis tried to avert it. Later Sharrukin put an end to the period of doom and introduced an era of prosperity; the chronicles elaborate the history of his reign: the goddess Ishtar raised him to the throne, though he was a gardener's son, because of his piety and wisdom; he was permitted to conquer the world; in the end the Deity deserted him, indeed, and he died in an age of insurrection.

There are historical elements in Sharru-kin's legend, such as the fact that Sharru-kin was known as the child of the sun-god of Sippar and the favourite of Ishtar of Akkad, and the chronicle of his reign, perhaps also the omens; these are mingled with mythical elements. The story of how Sharru-kin was raised to the throne is nothing but a variation of the sacred solar legend; the king becomes the fatherless sun-child who was exposed in a little boat and found and brought up by the gardener (Tammuz); he appears as a victorious ruler like the New Year's hero and dies miserably after a long period of worldwide power. But all of this was interwoven with the Babylonians' general philosophy of life: Sharru-kin is also Atrakhasis, the pious favourite of the gods, the historic example of the truth that the gods can exalt whom they will, that they exalt and bless the pious king and destroy the wicked.

The story of the Flood and the story of Sharru-kin provided Babylonian sages with an outline of the eras of doom and prosperity, enabling them to explain philosophically both the course of history and the lives of individuals. They used it again and again; when a dynasty fell, it had sinned, when another ascended the throne, it had proved its piety. The people were punished for the king's sins by periods of doom and rewarded for his piety by period of happiness. Thus the priests taught the kings and induced them to practice religion and show contrition, acting when the occasion arose. But they did not make a uniform study of their national history and elucidate it according to this theory; there their power of systematic thought broke down. The Jews were the first to develop that power.

## RELIGION

Like the Min-Egyptians, the Sumerians brought the Neolithic solar religion with them when they settled in the country, together with the solar god of the Kings of Nippur, later called Enlil, "the Lord of the Storm." Enlil's "sacred name" was Mun, possibly changed from an earlier "Men" or "Min". It may be that "En"

or "Lord" was an abbreviation of "Men", and "Min" is still traceable in *maneh*, the value of a bull in metal. Echoes of the god's bull-character still survive in the hymns addressed to him, but first and foremost he was a hero wielding terrible weapons, one a missile-hammer (?) and the other a net. Following Mun's example, all the great gods wore horns on their crowns, and all warrior gods were armed with "the sacred weapon" and the net. Seal engravings show us what Mun was like, though they bear the names of Gilgamesh and Enkidu. He was a naked giant with long hair and a long beard on his sun-like face (seen from the front), and he had formerly been half bull, half man; the terra-cotta figures of Enlil from Nippur have the same hair and beard. On the seals of Farah the traces of the phallus and the double-axe can still be discerned. The savage Enkidu as portrayed in the *Epic of Gilgamesh* must have resembled Mun; in the epic the two heroes still went out to battle armed with axes.

This sun-god was the New Year's victor who began his reign with storms and floods. He married an earth goddess and begot a child by her; at death he entered the mountain-side, and was thus the first incarnation of Tammuz (that is why later his ancestor, Enmesharra, the god of the Underworld, was a captive in the realm of the dead and yet the guardian of its gates); at the New Year he returned as a new sun-god, his own son.

Together with him we find his lover and wife, Nina or Nana; "Nin" later means "mistress". She was the goddess of sex in women and of motherhood, a cow as Mun was a bull. Her earliest human incarnation doubtless survives in Ninmakh, the queen of the gods, and particularly in Ninkharsag; this last-named goddess was the "lady of the mountain", just as Enlil was "lord of the mountain", and she too is portrayed full-face with a sun-like countenance, and is sometimes naked.

The youthful Enlil-Mun, the son and avenger of his father in primitive times, was Enurta the warrior, hunter, and fighter of dragons, who possessed the sacred weapons Sharur and Shargaz, and, since he was born amidst natural surroundings, had specially close relations with plants and animals.

Mun-Enlil must have been the dynastic god of the kings of Nippur; even after the fall of the dynasty he retained the power to confer sovereignty. His personality must have undergone modification in adaptation to a southern climate where the sun never dies and only vegetation perishes, personified by Tammuz. Politically the

other local gods must have thrust him into the position of *primus inter pares* as the power of the provincial princes grew. At last Babylonian civilization entered upon its first flowering-time and Nippur's domination was broken ; as civilization came to flower, speculative thought must have been stirred, transforming Mun into Enlil, one universal god amongst others.

Of all this we see only the final outcome, the first pantheon of great, immortal gods who had divided the world among themselves. Egypt possessed such a pantheon in the germ, but the personified divisions of the world remained pale abstractions. In Babylonia they were the great, living gods, lords of the various divisions of the universe.

First among them was Anu who personified the sky. He was the father and king of the gods, the god whose name embraced all the great gods in one, and who dwelt in the sky. But his activities were of less concern to men than to the gods and the universe as a whole. His little daughter Ishtar appealed to him when Gilgamesh scorned her, begging him to avenge her against the man. Anu was the god of gods. He alone could create the heavenly bull, the comet, who brought seven lean years. He, too, took thought for the West Wind, whose wings the man Adapa had crippled by his spells. He was the god of a universal order in the world of Nature. At the same time, within the scope of his own activities he was well-disposed towards mankind. He required Ishtar to ward off famine by storing grain before he created the heavenly bull, and he pardoned Adapa, whom he had meant to punish, when he recognized that he was no transgressor but a pious man ; indeed he resolved to make him immortal. In Anu something of the current idea of our " good God " first took shape, a reverend, wise, benevolent, and aged man with a starry mantle, who nevertheless is so busy governing the world that a mediator seems necessary.

Enlil occupied the second place in the pantheon, though originally he must have stood first and even later enjoyed equality with Anu ; he, too, was the father and king of the gods, and had been from the earliest times. Being the primeval god, he had endowed all the great gods with their horned crowns, their emblems of power, and their families. E-kur, his temple, became the general name for a temple ; the " mound-dwelling " or ziggurat tower was never absent from any sanctuary, nor was the chamber of destinies. All the gods, both great and mortal, are variations evolved from Enlil-Mun. He could no longer be called " Mun " or even " Min ", for that was reminiscent

of the brute ; he was called " Enlil ", " Lord of the Storm." He was the ruler of the world, the New Year's victor, the creator and orderer of the world, the guardian of world-order against every kind of rebel, against the powers of Chaos and transgressors. His division of the universe was the earth, his burial-mound became the earth-mountain and he lived at its summit, the earliest Olympus, with the great gods. It was only when he had covered all the mountain-tops with his Flood that the gods took refuge in Anu's sky. He sent the floods down from the mountains, both the beneficent inundation and the storm-flood that destroys. Upon the " mountain " (in Nippur) was the chamber where he decreed the destinies of men on New Year's day, inscribing them upon tablets of destiny and so making them irrevocable. The tablets of destiny, upon which none wrote but Enlil, became the emblem and amulet of supreme power over mankind. Thus Enlil was the first god of humanity ; he was a god of kings who established and maintained a régime at once divine and human, a world structure devoted to the service of the gods, and the State. He destroyed Tiamat, the dragon of Chaos, and created man. He destroyed man when man rose in rebellion. He conferred authority upon the kings and determined the lot of men. It was in him that the terrible avenger of sin, the King of Kings, embodied in our own God, first took shape, and likewise the God who directs the destinies of all men, by whose hand the book of fate is written and preserved. The notion of predestination emerged ; it was possible to predict the future.

A King of Kings, a lord who maintains order among men in a primitive world, readily fades into the distance and becomes an inhuman and murderous tyrant, especially when his own city has lost its dominant position and the priesthoods of other cities are free to practice rival cults and elevate their own gods.

A rival to Enlil arose, therefore, in Enki, the Lord of the Depths, at Eridu on the sea-coast. Plainly he was a childlike Her character. His name, Ea, might be interpreted as a corrupted form of " Her ", and Eridu, his city, as " Heridu ", the child of Har. This supposition is supported by the fact that his symbol was the " goat-fish ", that is the young solar bull with a fish's tail, or the sun dwelling in the sea and preparing to rise out of it. He is also represented in human form, as Oannes, half fish, half man, besides being half fish, half bull. He must have been differentiated from Mun at a very early date in the process of adapting the solar myth to local conditions in a southern country : in Eridu the sun-child became a fish-like being because

there the youthful, living sun rose out of the eastern sea. The great outburst of speculative thought round about 2800 B.C., of which Eridu must have been one of the chief centres, made Ea the lord of the third division of the world, the watery depths, the abyss beneath the earth's surface and the waters far below. Whilst Enlil sent storm-floods, Ea vitalized the plant world from beneath; he therefore became a gentle, fertilizing power, the father of the plant world (he had a sacred tree), the god of vegetation. Tammuz, who died and rose again, was called "Dumuzi-apsu", "beloved child of the watery depths," that is, of Ea. As a water-god Ea was pure and a cleanser from impurity; that is, he was the healer, the exorcising priest among the gods. As lord of the fertilizing floods he could save his servants from Enlil's storm-floods and cause new life to burgeon from the imprisoning seedpod, the ark, amongst men and animals and plants after the judgment. He took his place beside Enlil, therefore, as a wise counsellor and a benevolent god, the preserver and Saviour and refuge of his own.

The first three gods of the pantheon formed a triad. They supplemented one another as gods of the gods, of kings, of mankind, as guardians of the natural order, of the reign of morality and the State, and of human kindness. All three were creators and preservers of the universe, each represented one division of the world, so that they stood in juxtaposition. All three withdrew afterwards to the sky (Anu's heaven was the highest) and were leaders alike of the host of the stars and the hosts of men. All three helped to form the image of Deity, but Ea's part was the most attractive. When Khammurabi equipped his god Marduk from an ancient heritage, Anu, Enlil, and Ea each ceded their power to him in legal form; his commandment was to be "Anu", he assumed Enlil's role of victor over Tiamat, but as the son of Ea he became the saviour and refuge of mankind.

Speculative thought early added a second triad to the first: Nannar, Babbar, and Nana. Nannar or Sin, the god of Ur, also known as Enzu, Lord of Wisdom, rose to power beside Enlil, the primeval sun-god, as a moon-god and probably as Enlil's vizier, like Thoth in Egypt. He was "Enlil's first born, his strong calf". He came to equal Enlil in importance, for he was the Lightgiver, the bull, the ship, the lord of the marvellous monthly transfiguration of night and the void to light and abundance (the fruit that is its own begetter), the ruler of days and months and years (of time, that is, in place of the sun), and he who grants fatness in byre and fold (as he himself

waxes). Enlil's chief characteristics acquired in him a new and deeper meaning. Priestly speculation loved and exalted him as the Sage who displayed signs in the heavens, as the mysterious and peace-loving god. His province in the universe was the moon that he symbolized; the priests gave him precedence, as a father, over the sun, the ancient god of kings; he himself was a king with the horned cap of the full moon.

Babbar (Bar-Bar, Semitic Shamash), the sun-god, was the second great god of the heavenly bodies. Openly he took over nothing from Enlil's myths (except occasionally on seals the fight and the rescue of the woman), but he annexed all Enlil's characteristics as the sun, and many as a ruler. He was the sun by day running his daily race from the mountain in the east to the mountain in the west, returning by night through the mountain across the waters of death, back to the east—the radiant, immortal sun. He was the god who traversed the sky, seeing all things, illuminating all things; he was the judge who punished violence and perjury by giving power to the offenders' adversaries (not power based on violence); he established laws and oracles. He carried the key of heaven (the saw) and the sacred weapon, and the first halo radiated from his shoulders. He protected kings and heroes who suppressed wrong, and animals like the serpent. His city of Larsa in southern Babylonia did not play a great part as his dwelling-place, for he was enthroned in the sky; but his city of Sippar in northern Babylonia rose to power as the original home of Khammurabi's dynasty. Babbar might have supplanted Enlil altogether, as the god of kings; he even asserted his position as superior to Marduk.

Nana (Ishtar) of Erech was primarily the original sun-wife, the goddess of the earth and of sex, the harlot among the gods but likewise the true lover of Tammuz who followed her dead husband beneath the earth. As "the goddess of men and the deity of women", a goddess of fertility and the earth, she was a great power, but she was of the earth, almost mortal. She divided herself in two, and as the grim queen of the earth she received the Underworld for her kingdom (Ereshkigal, the serpent); as the lover of Tammuz she was the captive of her other self. She was a great goddess of heaven as the virgin, the "Virago", the "masculine woman", the "mistress in battle and combat" who protected heroes and overthrew kings; she was the first virgin goddess of the human race. The planet of Venus was her portion of the universe, represented as female when it appears as the evening star and male as the morning star. She was

the first star-maiden, "the star of the ocean." Ishtar became the general word for goddess among the Semites. Possibly her name survives in our "Ostara", and certainly in our word "star".

As the outcome of the first identification of the great gods with natural phenomena we have, therefore, three parts of the universe—the sky, the earth, and the depths—and three principal heavenly bodies—the moon, the sun, and Venus. If we like we may add a fourth part of the universe, namely the Underworld, with Ereshkigal (a variation of Nana-Ishtar) as its queen, and a seventh nature-god, Adad, the lord of the tempest and lightning (a variation of Enlil). But both belong to a more primitive method of partitioning the universe. The Underworld has nothing to do with cosmology, nor the tempest with the stellar regions.

As knowledge increased, the pantheon became identified with the stars. Anu, Enlil, and Ea were elevated to the sky and guided the constellations (lords of hosts), and four new planet gods were added to the three major heavenly bodies. These were Marduk—Jupiter, Nabu—Mercury, Nergal—Mars (also lord of the Underworld), and Enurta—Saturn. The seven great stars were associated with the then emerging seven-day week, though this was a late development, perhaps due to Greek influence. They are still the masters of our week-days.

A further step in the development of system associated the six great gods with numbers. Anu was connected with the basic number 60, Enlil with 50, Ea with 40, the moon-god with 30, the sun-god with 20, and the heavenly Ishtar with 15. She had to have a number exceeding the double of seven, for seven was unlucky and associated with the Underworld; the Underworld had seven gates, and fourteen demons followed its lord; the "unlucky seven" was of Babylonian origin. As numerical speculations continued, there came to be sixty "great" gods, eight *Igigi* or gods of heaven, and nine *Anunnaki* or gods of earth; or there were 300 *Anunnaki* of heaven and 600 *Anunnaki* of earth; or a total of 3,600 gods is even mentioned and enumerated in lists.

At the same time people reckoned the family and courtiers of each god, and even the forefathers of the first great triad (twenty-one couples for Anu, Enlil, and Ea). The Babylonians worked out these genealogies, reaching back to the powers of Chaos, and the families and court retinues, with religious care. In the general worship of the gods and in particular efforts to heal or cleanse, it was important always to discover the right intercessor, and to give to each his due

and something more. The family and court of a great god lived with him in the chief temple of his own city. They also gathered round him in heaven, but there apparently they were less numerous; it sometimes seems to have been assumed that the great gods assembled alone in the chamber of destinies, or each sat alone on his throne in heaven, or in the seven heavens. That was because they were believed to decree men's lots and were identified with the stars. As their surroundings on earth grew more elaborate, they grew more solitary and unique in heaven.

The association of gods with certain classes lost force; the kings had gods, but there were several, including Enlil and Shamash (afterwards Marduk). There were gods of various priestly activities; thus Shamash was the god of those who divine by examining the livers of sacrificial animals, Sin of the astrologers, Ea of the priests who cleansed and exorcized, Nabu of writing-rooms and libraries. But of professional associations of citizens we can trace no more than the relics; Shamash was the guardian of the knights, but also of the merchants (as the god of contracts and internal peace), whilst Ea protected the handicraft workers. Everyone in his universal human capacity served the god of his city or family; in death he turned to Tammuz or Ishtar, in sickness or trouble he sought to discover the offended god or the potential saviour. Men's minds were turning to such ideas as uniform divine causality, the priests' expert knowledge how to deal with the gods, and universal humanity. Class lost its importance, and instead of aspiring to belong to a particular god people conceived the general idea of piety.

The pictures of Babylonian gods resemble one another closely. All are presented in human form and are distinguished from men only by the divine crown and various emblems (symbols). Their garb changes with that of men, though only over very long periods. The emblems include the relics of animal images; Enlil is sometimes associated with a dragon (Tiamat; Labbu), the "goat-fish" belongs to Ea, a lion accompanies the virgin Ishtar, and Enurta has two lions or a vulture on his sceptre. But the animals are quite separate from the gods; they appear as bearers or footstools, companions or ornaments on the seat or the sceptre. There was a greater gulf between gods and animals than between men and animals. The Babylonians liked to imagine the evil spirits, jailers of the gods and their adversaries (devils) in animal form, as well as a few good demons; they sported with visual imagery. Indeed, man, far below the gods, was so sure of his superiority to the animals that he made

sport in fables with his resemblance to them, and posed the problem of the relation between brute-man and civilized man in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. Other emblems have reference to natural associations, such as Anu's and Ea's water of life, the solar star and rays, and the mountain for Shamash, for Sin and Ishtar the planet that they represent, and for the goddess of vegetation or of a mountain a branch or the actual mountain. Thus the pantheon was linked with Nature, yet at the same time the tendency towards unity was at work: soon every god gave the water of life and all had a star as a determinative after their names; only the solar aureole (the halo) had not yet become universal. Symbols of sovereignty form a third group of emblems; such are the cap, the fillet, the sceptre, weapons and chests (for an idol? or for the tablets of destiny?) These, too, naturally tended to become the common property of all the gods.

The symbols belonging to the several gods were various and well thought out; they provided a sufficiently marked distinction between the gods, whose human forms alone were too little differentiated. The gods were dignified, mature, bearded men, the goddesses were women, also in the prime of life; but they lacked the distinguishing marks, of age for instance, that we find in the Greek goddesses; human being, man, and woman, were the types that the Babylonian mind had fully grasped.

Nor did the delineation of character go much further, though in Babylonia, unlike Egypt, it attained a certain significance. Epic poetry portrayed Enlil, the strong creator and preserver of order in the world, ferocious in striking and somewhat impulsive, and Ea, the wise, cunning, prudent helper and saviour of his own devotees. Anu, enthroned in peace as ruler of the world, and Shamash, the judge and proclaimer of oracles who sees and knows all things, are variations in which the two principal types blend. The warrior maiden was an innovation beside the mother (known also to the Egyptians) and the lover; she was the first virgin goddess.

Just as the gods' external appearance grew more alike, so, too, their characters; Enlil the impulsive and Ea with his half-prophetic wisdom continued to be characters of epic poetry (the Flood; Adapa); in the pantheon they became divine. Every god was peace-loving, benevolent, a wise judge and inspirer of oracles, gracious in giving aid, stern in maintaining order; all knew the destinies of men and each one balanced his claims to the reward or punishment of his devotees against those of the other great gods by a process of mercantile, or sacerdotal, deliberation and negotiation. Atrakhasis

came before the whole assembly of gods as the intercessor for sinful men ; he succeeded in securing a preliminary warning in the form of plagues, instead of annihilation, and then the recognition of his right to be saved from the destroying Flood ; the Deity was loath to inflict a terrible judgment, he acted with all the solemnity of a holy judge ; he gladly showed mercy to the righteous, whereas in an earlier phase a savage guardian of law and order struck blindly and a clever lord saved his own servants by cunning.

Round about 2000 B.C. Babylonia had reached a stage of development at which the figure of Marduk emerges, the god of Babil and of the whole kingdom from the period of Khammurabi's dynasty onwards. At that time he was endowed anew with modern characteristics gathered from old tradition. Marduk's name means " son of the shining mountain " ; thus he was the youthful sun, the New Year's victor, destined to take Enlil's place ; he assumed Enlil's rôle of champion against Tiamat, as creator and ruler of the world ; he saved the gods and created the world. His warlike and creative activities justified his dominant position, but that was not enough. He had to be invested in legal form ; in solemn assembly sovereignty and omnipotence were made over to him, and the success of the transference was proved. He assumed Enlil's power, but not his rôle in the myth of the Flood, for that was a barbaric relic of the past. But he made a point of becoming the son of Ea, the pure and learned and succouring god. And that side of his character was further developed ; first and foremost he was the Merciful, the god with the ready ear who heard all supplicants, the Saviour. Sovereign deity, lord of gods and men, and likewise Father, wise and compassionate towards all sufferers : such was the new aspect of the great Deity, and it is closely akin to our own idea of God. He left judicial and oracular powers to Shamash. His region was the planet Jupiter, which first came to be regarded as a planet through his influence ; his number was 10 ; the learned men refused to give him Anu's position and number. His image was human ; a mantle spangled with starry figures, a feather crown (without horns) with rosettes and discs mark him as lord of the heavenly bodies ; he stands upon flowing water like Ea, towering up from the depths ; the reptile gryphon, child of Chaos, lies fettered beside him ; his symbol was the arrow-head or the hoe, a weapon and agricultural implement ; he wears besides the ring and staff and curved sword as marks of sovereignty. His son by his wife Sarpantium (the Silvery Radiant One and the Source of Offspring) was Nabu, the universal

scribe who recorded destinies and the decisions of the assembled gods ; as a scholar he was omniscient and he was lord of the planet Mercury, and guardian of learning and libraries.

Later speculative thought in Babylon centres upon Marduk and Nabu, for at that time the king's god no longer had the strong dynasty of Khammurabi behind him, and in consequence the learned priesthood throughout the rest of the country against him. Marduk first began to dissociate himself from his city ; he allowed himself to be captured by the Hittites or Elamites when he was angry with his city and returned when it served him in the person of a religious king. All the people served him—Elamites and Hittites as well as Assyrians and Babylonians—even when there was no powerful king reigning in Babylon. And he was the first to be expressly placed on an equality with all the great gods ; all of them became "Marduk", merely expressing different aspects of his personality. Nabu the scholar and teacher, son and vizier, became the mediator between men, especially kings and priests, and this one universal god.

Divine unity was, therefore, evolving in the Babylonian pantheon in image and essence ; corresponding with the first systematic partition of the universe amongst the great gods, we find a tendency to place the gods systematically on an equality for the first time. But the process was not carried to completion.

Whilst the great gods were exalted to the position of lords of the universe, prime causes of all things, and heavenly bodies, others were reduced to minor importance. A dividing line was drawn between gods and men, as equivalent to immortals and mortals. To be a god is to be great, a ruler, eternal, and mighty ; to be a man is to be small, servile, transitory, and feeble. This truth weighed upon men's minds with terrible solemnity and was ruthlessly thought out. The greatness and purity and might of the Deity towered vast above man, and he saw and contrasted his own misery and uncleanness and frailty.

"Dying gods" were impossible, a contradiction in terms, so Babylonian speculation perceived in its enthusiasm for exalting ideals and belittling men. The immediate consequence was that those divinities who had inherited the lot of death and resurrection from the ancient sun-god Mun and, in adaptation to the climate, had become gods of vegetation, lost power and influence ; they took the form of women and children beside the great gods. Ningishzida "queen of the upright wood" was the name of the one "dying god" in the pantheon who still had the dragon for his emblem, like Enlil ;

the other was Dumuzi-apsu, "beloved child of the watery depths" (Tammuz). They retained their festivals—birthday, marriage, death, and resurrection—but Tammuz died at the height of summer, stifled by the sun's heat, and the drought. They continued to be important gods of sex and family life, and no marriage or funeral was celebrated without Tammuz songs. The people loved them, too, for the people always incline to believe in a better world beyond the grave. But to serious, scholarly religious thought these divine figures no longer represented hopes, but only the processes of Nature. The other world was depicted in gloomy colours; it was "the place whence none return", where the grim Ereshkigal and Namtar, the doom of death, held sway, where even Ishtar could only enter naked, where she was made captive and given over to demons, and where heroes could hope for no more than a couch and pure water to drink. Everything there was dust; it covered the doors and bolts, it was in the mouth and throat, it prevailed eternally.

By the gulf of death was the parting of the ways of the great and the dying gods. But the latter separated again into two groups. Some still remained divine; Ishtar, simply representing a natural cycle, may even be called immortal, though strictly that applies to her only as the heavenly Ishtar; Nergal and Ereshkigal were also immortal as sovereigns of the Underworld, though theirs was a barren immortality. Tammuz was a human god, and his mortality was his leading characteristic; in him men eternally mourned their own transitory lives. But other dying gods became men, and so the demi-gods arose, the epic heroes; such were Gilgamesh and Etana, Enkidu (whose name, like Tammuz, means "child of the depths"), and Khumbaba. In Babylonia death, the dividing line between gods and men whence sprang heroes, still formed the whole philosophic substance of epic poetry.

The cult of the dead was of no importance in Babylonia. Provision was made for proper burial with the traditional funeral laments and rites, the indispensable garments, and a coffin. Nothing further would be of any use to the dead. If they were properly buried they were at rest and reached the Underworld, where they remained captive. Such had been man's irrevocable lot since the days of the Flood and Adapa. Perhaps at moments speculative thought derived hopes of a happier fate in the other world from the wisdom of the gods in *Gilgamesh*, just as the people found hope in the cult of Tammuz; but these hopes could not be taken seriously by scholarship. The solemn realization that men must die and remain dead had divided

all living beings into immortals and mortals, and for the first time men experienced selfless raptures over the glory and bliss of eternal Beings and drank to the dregs the deep agony of their own transitory lives, miserable and accursed ; a culture that bore such fruits could admit of no blissful life after death, hardly even a judgment of souls.

The unburied dead were demons, restless spirits who pursued the living. Only now did the spirits of the dead become dangerous ; they were not so in Egypt at all until a late date. Here, too, the Babylonians pursued a leading idea to its logical conclusion. The spirit of a dead man was fierce, for at best he had the kingdom of dust to look forward to ; for him there was no happiness, no life. No thought for his own well-being bound him to obey the gods ; he was hungry and full of wrath that he had not received what little he could demand. Thus he became malicious. But an unburied corpse is all corruption, carrion, uncleanness, an offence to gods and men. Here, too, lay danger, for sin and uncleanness were one and the same, and paved the way for the demons. They, however, were not for the most part restless souls but peculiar beings, of divine origin yet not kin to the gods like the seven sons of Enmesharra, a son of Enlil, or the other children of Chaos ; they were only creations of the gods, like the heavenly bull or the seven evil spirits and their sister Labartu. They were, therefore, servants of the gods, but were generally employed to torment sinners, and in accordance with the character required for that purpose they were ready to torment people without any command as soon as an offence against purity or an insult gave them power to do so. Good and evil demons were hybrids of men and animals. Here imagination busied itself with animal forms, creating demons of disease (with indications of the illness that they caused), and all manner of impure beings and tormentors. Babylonian fancy gave birth to few of the angels (cherubs and the like) and many of the devils of future ages. The Persians afterwards added the mutually exclusive and contrasting concepts of "good and evil from the earliest beginning", in which the ideas of heaven and hell reached their consummation.

Whenever a youthful nation evolves a great theoretical conception of the universe, it is the outcome of religious ferment, a revivalist movement. So, too, Babylonia's realization that the Deity is a universal God, immortal, eternal, the cause of all that happens in the world, that man is utterly insignificant in comparison, and that his lot is to submit and to serve and become dust when he dies, arose amongst religious zealots who exalted man primarily

by humbling him in the sight of God. There followed practical deductions from the doctrine, teaching man how to act rightly; here, as in Egypt, doubts arose. The *Epic of Gilgamesh* in its oldest form may be understood as an expression of the philosophy of *Gaudeamus*. There is almost verbal identity with the *Song of the Harper*. "The life that thou seekest thou wilt not yet find," so the "Veiled One" instructs Gilgamesh; "when the gods created man they decreed his death. Fill thy belly, therefore, dance and be merry, be clean and wear fine clothes, rejoice in thy wife and child." But this maxim of enjoying life did not survive in the form of a drinking-song in Babylonia; though it was the counsel of gods, it was erased from the epic as sinful. It was swept away by the great movement which made the service of the gods the whole aim of man's existence, a movement that must have been closely akin to the religious fervour of Cluny. Elaborated intellectually, it became the prevailing doctrine of the Babylonian priesthood, who taught that man's lot in life depended upon his "very wise" (*Atrakhasis*) or "sinful" behaviour towards the gods. The best men must have been one with God, whilst the majority lived in business relations with the gods. But there was no simple law governing the relation; what was required was to live in general and in particular in such a way that the gods were satisfied, and this could be done by perpetual consultation of omens and the careful avoidance of all impurity, by sacrifices and endowments. It was in Babylonia that impurity was first defined in detail, outwardly as dirt, then by process of transfer as disease or distress, and finally as equivalent to an offence against the gods, or sin. The fully developed practice of this type of piety and its practical success in life were open to attack at many points alike by pious and sacrilegious minds; there arose a more adroit scepticism than we find in Egypt, and a humbler enthusiasm, at once more conscious of dependence and bolder in its demand for a world in harmony with moral ideals.

The *Epic of Gilgamesh* settled the problem of death. Religious men in Babylonia could not, like the Man Weary of Life, take refuge in the hereafter; the gods had to prove their worth in this life, to punish sin and reward piety here. But that did not happen; whatever a man did was "right", that is good reasons could be adduced in support of every course—sensible reasons giving assurance that it was advantageous; there were pros and cons for every course, and every course might have this issue or that; there was no certainty of the success of a pious action; "it is all the same

whatever we do", says the *Dialogue between a Master and Serf*, in which Babylon gave utterance to a maturer scepticism than any known to Egypt.

It is good to eat, for it warms the heart ; it is equally good not to eat, for a man only grows hungry again. To rob (" to commit an evil deed ") is good, for it fills a man's pockets ; so too, it is good not to rob, for a man avoids hanging. Love makes us happy, but it also brings downfall and death. Sacrifices are loans which the gods repay ; if a man does not offer sacrifice, the gods run after him like dogs. It pays to benefit the country, but the evil-doer and the benefactor must both die. What, then, is good ?

The lamentations of religious men were different, less witty, less calculated to catch the applause of scoffers. If the *Dialogue between a Master and Serf* contains the germ of Solomon the Preacher, the *Dialogue of Balta-atrua with his Friend* contains the germ of Job's debate with his friends. Balta-atrua is an orphan and a pious man of low birth, who can boast that " more than any other man he has fixed his eyes upon God's throne and has looked to the goddess rather than to obeisance and prayer ". He has put his trust in the word which says that " a feeble man who prays to God is of more account than anyone else ". But instead of wealth the gods have sent him poverty, fools have turned against him ; they persecute and scorn him. He is utterly abandoned and wretched. He will exchange the old proverbs which say that the counsel and yoke of God give happiness and bread for new maxims of his own choosing : " The word of a highly-placed murderer is exalted, but the sinless and feeble are humiliated ; men will bear witness for an impudent fellow, but they persecute the just ; they fill the pockets of robbers, but the mighty empty the pockets of the poor ; power is given to the dishonest judge and the feeble are destroyed." This is the complaint of the Egyptian Man Weary of Life, but here it is an accusation of the Deity. It is in vain that the friend contradicts and defends the Deity ; he thinks that Balta-atrua must have sinned in his heart ; he is impulsive, and unjust to the gods because he is hungry ; their ways are dark, yet just at long last ; they tolerate much, but in the end they cast down the wicked. He tries to excuse many things by urging the weakness and instability of men who, in their wretched folly and blindness, emulate the success of murderers and robbers. Balta-atrua cries out, begging his friend to be merciful and cease speaking ; he prays the gods for succour ; they are great avengers of wrong, Enurta,

Ishtar, and Shamash ; but help must come immediately, without delay, for he is utterly cast down. This is the cry of despair, an agony of soul that sees no way of escape. Here the dialogue breaks off ; the only satisfying end would be an immediate reply from the Deity bringing help straightway. That is the solution in some songs of lamentation and penitence, giving assurance that the prayer is heard.

In the Babylonian phase of culture the only possibility of a philosophic solution of Balta-atrua's problem is through mysticism. The pious man must become even more pious ; the god of whom he has despaired he must find once more in rapturous surrender. That was not easy under the sway of a civilization which had devoted the chief of its speculative powers to the separation of God and man, but had not yet evolved from that separation the conception of divine unity. For Amos or Jesus all earthly sorrow vanished in the overwhelming and tranquilizing greatness of the One. In Babylonia, too, some great thinker and poet (like the Man Weary of Life in Egypt, but on a higher plane) must once have endeavoured to overcome all his doubts in the utter rapture of surrender. Perhaps his work is to be found in the best of the psalms of lamentation, a prayer in sickness known as the *Psalm of Innocence* : "I will praise the Lord of Truth." It may have been written soon after 2000 B.C. In this psalm, as with Bala-atrua, the gulf between gods and men is stressed. Men are ignorant, they err even when they mean for the best, the ways of God are hidden from their sight. Even if they turn all their thoughts to prayer and supplication and find their inmost delight in worshipping the gods, they are not sure that that is pleasing to their God. For what seems good to men is an abomination to God, what men despise is good in the sight of God. Man is nothing in the divine presence ; he who lives in the evening is dead by morning, he who but now rejoiced laments a moment later. In misfortune men are like corpses, in good fortune they think themselves gods and are yet utterly powerless, utterly foolish, incapable of sustaining their good fortune. But God is great and merciful and knows the perversity and insufficiency of men. He must bring succour at last to the man who trusts in him, if he approaches him humbly and prays for the forgiveness of sins of which he has no knowledge.

The Babylonian concept of sin was external and general ; there was no sharp distinction between impurity as dirt, as error, and as sin ; the particular meaning was revealed on each occasion.

Atonement, therefore, and the forgiveness of sins was also more of an external affair than it was with the Jews; people atoned for their inability to do right, which was due simply to the fact that they were not gods. But in spite of this external character of the notion of sin and atonement, a great advance had been made beyond the point of view of the Egyptian Man Weary of Life; even a sinless man was conscious of sin in the presence of God; he subdued his pride and abandoned his legal claim; he prayed and trusted, although there was no blissful hereafter.

That was the highest achievement of Babylonian religion; it was very near the Jewish monotheistic idea of the absolute separation of God and man, the simple formula of reward and punishment, and the final union of God and man embodied in the teaching of Jesus.

In Egypt we were able to define the nature and chronological sequence of the several religious movements. In Babylonia that is only possible in a very general and conjectural way. The source of most of our records is still Ashur-bani-pal's library (650 B.C.), and they consist of copies of undated older works, of which earlier originals, frequently Sumerian, are constantly being discovered. But it is probably safe to say that a first early religious movement about 2800 B.C. must have been the origin of Sumerian royal piety; a later movement about 2300 to 1800 B.C. (Gudea to Khammurabi) must have been responsible for the main philosophic achievements (from the Gilgamesh doctrine to the *Psalm of Innocence*); finally, the tendency towards monotheism and humility embodied in the Babylonian worship of Marduk must have gathered force in a final religious movement about 1100 to 600 B.C.

#### SUMMARY

Babylonia further elaborated the concrete survey of the universe on the intellectual side; a new concept of unity dawned once again above the multiplicity of experience. A pantheon of great universal gods divided the sky, the earth, the depths, and the principal heavenly bodies among themselves; they attained unity as the single cause of all that happened, and thence originated the germ of systematic world history. The world in its static aspect was brought within the scope of human perception through the science of lists. God and man were contrasted; eternal, wise, and benevolent gods ruled over mortal, dependent, feeble men, whose only wisdom was

the zealous service of the gods. A philosophy of divine sovereignty and of death was evolved, and out of it there arose a scepticism which attacked it at the very core, throwing doubt upon divine governance and justice; the doubts were overcome through humble submission to the wisdom and will of the gods. Babylonian mathematics advanced to the point of involution and extracting roots. With it was associated a new science of astronomy which charted the sky and observed the moon and planets accurately; a number of other sciences were born of the doctrine of divine causality, such as magic and the study of divination. New developments in the field of poetry were the divine and heroic epics, penitential psalms, fables, and proverbs. In architecture the church tower was invented and the temples partitioned inside. Thanks to the Babylonian love of theory, sculptors and artists, after brilliant beginnings, turned towards abstractions (demons), whilst religious influences narrowed their field of activity. Babylonian writing is more uniform (syllabic) than Egyptian; it reproduces the sounds more fully (vowels), and, is more abstract (no pictures). In numeration we find the beginnings of a method of varying the value of a figure according to its position, and an incipient sexagesimal system. A uniform system of measurement was invented for length and cubic capacity, and for time and weight. It fell to the Cretans and Jews to carry on the search for unity and advance further in the direction of monotheism, the former striking out new paths and the latter continuing on the road marked out by the Babylonians.

### C. CRETAN CIVILIZATION

Unfortunately the numerous written monuments discovered in Crete have not yet been deciphered, although the more recent are written with relatively few characters which must be closely akin to the alphabet. For our knowledge of the Cretan-Mycenacan civilizations, therefore, we are wholly dependent upon remains of buildings and works of art discovered by excavation, and upon the meagre information of neighbouring peoples. These only tell that Crete was known as Caphtor (according to the Jews) and its people as the Keftians (according to the Egyptians of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries), which very likely corresponds to the Japhet of the Old Testament list of peoples and the Greek Japetos ; further, that in the fourteenth century B.C. the kings of Achaia and Lesbos commanded the sea from the mainland (according to Hittite records) and that round about 1200 B.C. the Achaeans, Danaoi and Philistines, and the Siculi, Sardinians, and Etruscans appeared in Egypt as conquerors in two waves, but were repulsed. Early Crete is mirrored in Grecian memory in the cult of the Cretan Zeus and the myths of Minos and his sea-power, whilst memories of the Achaeans and Danaoi clung to the figure of Agamemnon in Mycenae. The kingdom of Alcinous is an echo of Cretan sea-power, and the Trojan expedition of Achaean.

The Cretan-Mycenacan remains found by excavation can be roughly dated with the help of Egyptian records. The earliest civilization proves to have come to flower after 2000 B.C. (the Kamares or Middle-Minoan civilization, individual in character and highly developed). In the plain of Messara, the chief agricultural centre, great palaces sprang up in Cnossus and Phaestus, and there were numerous towns and vast cupola tombs. About 1750 B.C. the palace of Cnossus was destroyed for the first time ; after 1600 B.C. all the palaces were destroyed together and then rebuilt.

This involved no break in the development of civilization. If conquerors from overseas invaded the island and gained mastery, they had already assimilated civilization, either on the mainland or as mercenaries in Crete itself. It was not till 1600 B.C. that Crete entered into active intercourse with Egypt. Embassies, or in other words trade missions, of the Keftians (or Late Minoans) made their

appearance in Egyptian records and brought their pottery for barter ; in Pharaoh's chancellory the scribes learned to write Keftian names, and there is some possibility that Keftian religion and art exercised an influence upon the reforms of Amenhetep IV. At any rate, between 1600 and 1400 B.C. powerful princes resided once more in the palaces of Cnossus and Phaestus, the cities flourished, and a new palace was added to the number at Hagia Triada. Crete was the centre of a maritime empire ; the only evidence of any change in its position is the rise of strong dynasties on the mainland after 1600 B.C. In Mycenae and Tiryns new fortresses rose up with halls of the northern type and magnificent tombs. These cities were subject to Cretan influence in religion and the externals of civilization, but from the outset they maintained a certain degree of independence. During the fifteenth century B.C., and more markedly in the fourteenth, the mainland was continually growing in wealth and importance, as we see from the great cupola tombs of which the finest belong to Mycenae and Orchomenus (fourteenth century B.C.). Clearly at that period the Achæan kings had won a predominant position. There was still no break in Cretan civilization, but it seems that foreign mercenaries, perhaps whole tribes, began to trickle in. It was not till 1200 B.C., during the tempestuous inroad of peoples which Mer-en-Ptah and Rameses III repulsed in Egypt, that Cretan civilization ended in barbarism. Then about 1100 B.C. the Dorians overthrew the last Achæan kingdom on the mainland and the last Philistine kingdom (the Pelasgian kingdom—Pulesati) in Crete. But in the *Odyssey* it is still recorded that Proto-Cretans and Pelasgians were settled in Crete side by side with the Dorians.

The immigrant peoples whose intermarriage with the indigenous inhabitants was the source of the earliest Cretan civilization must have appeared on the island about 2500–2400 B.C. A migration of peoples was going on about that time ; it set the " lords of Gutium " upon the throne in Babylonia and destroyed the Ancient Empire in Egypt a little later (in the Middle Empire spirals appeared on the scarabs). It may have introduced new blood into Crete. The immigrants came from the northern home of the solar religion, as is proved by the rising civilization which remained essentially the same as the Neolithic solar civilization, though on a much higher plane. These people were pre-Indo-Germans, tall, long-skulled, dark-haired, and dark-eyed. Their nearest kin may have been the makers of pottery decorated with spirals and winding patterns, who lived near the Danube. This rising civilization must have continued from about

1900 to 1400 B.C., so that one race would be sufficient to account for it.

About 1800 B.C. another great migration of peoples was in progress. It destroyed first Assyria then Babylonia and made an end of the Middle Empire in Egypt. Amongst these peoples were the first Indo-Germans, whose intermarriage with non-Indo-Germans produced the Hittites and Mitannians and the Hyksos. A wave of these peoples may have swept over the mainland from 1800 B.C. onwards, or earlier. The barbarians would have assimilated Cretan civilization and maintained the sea power of Crete from 1600 to 1400 B.C. Possibly there were already Pelasgians and Philistines in their midst. About 1400 B.C. there was an inroad of Achaeans from Thessaly, who may have pushed the Pelasgians and Philistines before them. The biggest waves of this new inundation of peoples identical in name made an end of the Cretan and Hittite Empire and finally swept on into Egypt about 1200 B.C. during the third great migration of peoples.

About 1300 B.C. the Philistines and Achaeans, heirs of an earlier civilization, had interbred and were ripe for new cultural achievements of their own. It may be that they left traces in the kingdom of Mycenae or of Gaza-Minoa. For the present we are compelled to treat Cretan civilization as a single whole. So regarded, the story is all too incomplete. It may be that some day it will be possible to trace a process of evolution, and the single cultural unit will fall into two or three distinct civilizations.

We know nothing of the Cretan constitution, or the growth of social classes. Without a powerful monarchy the great palaces could hardly have been built. There were scribes, but we cannot prove the existence of a scribe class. The whole impression received is of a civilization worldly and knightly in character: we cannot but attribute the cupola tombs of the period round about 1900 B.C. to wealthy families. The monuments do not bear witness to the existence of a priesthood, and there are no temples. A citizen class must, it would seem, have existed in the towns. Cretan culture in its prime rested upon command of the sea which was so absolute till right into the fourteenth century B.C. that the great capital cities with their palaces were still unfortified. Industry and commerce must have played an important part: especially pottery and metal-work had reached a high stage of development and were produced for export.

Cretan architecture is seen at its best in palaces and tombs. The Cretan palaces of Cnossus, Phaestus, and Hagia Triada are great

edifices built round extensive squares (central courtyards). Not only architecturally, but spiritually, these courtyards were plainly the centre of the edifice. Here, upon the paved floor with its inlaid paths for processions, the principal altars were raised for the worship of the sun under the open sky. There were no temples, but only sanctuaries on mountains and in caves and groves, and little chapels in the palaces and in a few houses, used more as repositories for ritual objects than for actual worship. The edifices round the court were built of hewn stone with panelling; they had several storeys, with light-shafts and staircase wells. The rooms were not usually large and pillars do not seem to have played an important part. But in Cnossus there is a pillared hall surrounded by columned chambers, and also a throne-room opening upon a columned terrace; pillars, also, appear sometimes to have embellished the doors of the chapels opening into the courtyard. Cretan pillars were of wood, so that they may have played a greater part in the upper storeys and galleries than on the ground-floor. They rose from a simple round base, grew thicker towards the top, and ended in an equally simple capital expressive of an almost abstract conception of the relation between pressure and the capacity for resistance. Grand stairways were an important feature in all palaces and must, like the courtyards, have played some part in the worship of the gods; they must have been the scene of processions and plays. The tombs of the first cultural prime (1900 B.C.) and again at a late period were burial mounds, but they took the characteristic form of the cupola tomb. At first they were very large—from 5 to 13 metres in diameter—and would seem to have been proportionately high. The domed cupola was a Cretan invention, but nothing has been preserved of the structure, so that there are no doors left standing. The tombs are set facing certain points of the compass, and it seems that other buildings adjoined them, possibly for the cult of the dead. During the golden age of Cretan civilization tombs seem to have played a less prominent part, but after 1600 B.C. a few more large ones made their appearance, besides a number of rock and small cupola tombs. Amongst the large ones is the royal tomb of Isopata with its pointed arches and domed roof, and its passage, entrance hall, and several chambers sunk in the earth.

Cretan architecture was fully equal to that of Egypt and Babylon, a great and original achievement. The solar sanctuaries of Neolithic days were set in the centre of the royal palaces, with places for sacrifice and festal celebrations; they were built of stone and adjoined the

throne-room and rooms for living and working in and keeping stores. The burial mounds developed into little cathedrals.

On the mainland architects of the same school were building fortresses from 1600 B.C. onwards, with the northern hall (megaron) as their centre and likewise a courtyard with a altar for solar worship. At a later date vaulted tombs re-appeared with gates and cupolas (some as much as sixteen metres in height), which proved that the architects were fully equal to the achievements of an earlier age. The only reason why they did not practise their art in Crete was that civilization of so high a type had grown too barbarous for barbarian influence both in the mainland men yielded to and in the erection of great introduction of the northern hall the coming of the barbarian tombs; and even in Crete, with gained ground once more after various embellishment of tombs

There are few remains of B.C. great plastic art. What is left Cretan painting and none of proof that "great" represent remarkable mural paintings is to represent types, was bold art, even where its purpose was a ritual procession bearing wack fresh problems. There is brown colour, as in Egypt ; , denoted as men by their reddish- with both feet planted on the bearing is strictly conventional, consistently in profile, even throun, but the figures are seen con- attitude is nevertheless eyes showing side-face, and their stiff beautiful, and combines a me of elasticity and vitality ; it is of natural trained athletes. Trd solemnity with the physique gay, flowery meadows and tre are remnants of landscapes with recognizable ; or a river rees and bushes, the species perfectly it, flying fish rising aborath a tree, bushes, a pond and an eel in ventured upon a skete the surface of the sea. The painter even religious edifice, the n of the heads of a crowd pressing round a

The numerous <sup>ancient</sup> ~~ancient~~ red and the women white. boldness, the same miniature works of art show the same freedom and much surer grasp, the sure touch in catching likeness to nature, and a In the lean, in of each separate movement and momentary picture. rounded figure, muscular, athletic bodies of the men, and the dainty waist and by of the women, both emphasized by the tightly laced open jackets; the men's aprons and the women's pleated skirts and freedom and, we still have types, but types which achieve perfect over the good individuality of movement, whether they are leaping goblets of galloping bull or gracefully dressing their hair. On the golden of Vaphio we have engraved with the utmost truth to nature

the animal courtship of bulls in the midst of a surrounding landscape, and the capture of a bull in the net is portrayed with the sheer delight of the sportsman. On a soapstone bowl there is a lifelike and amusing picture of a harvest procession of phallic peasants singing and laughing loudly, <sup>over the</sup> jester who has fallen down; whilst a little earthenware vessel has <sup>in it</sup> a vivid representation of an assault on a fortress.

Wonderfully natural figures which yet are severe in design, the heads of lions and bulls (vessels for <sup>sacred</sup> libations) in metal, a goddess in ivory and gold standing <sup>and</sup> taming snakes, and another more mobile who seems to be dancing, together with mother and flying fish in faience, all animals of all kinds with their young <sup>and</sup> every in the service of religion illustrate the arts of metal-work and pottery and social life.

There is a dagger with the representation of a lion-hunt by heavily armed warriors. We can tell from the exaggerated portrayal of the animals' supple movements that the artist. On another dagger are presented itself to the mind of the artist employed by knights in fowling. figures of hunting leopards in the reeds <sup>and</sup> perfection in Crete. Even the

The art of pottery first reached peak found in the cave of Kamares, Kamares vases, dated 1900 B.C. and first in technical and artistic merit. far surpass all earlier productions in white, yellow, orange, and red. Quite thin little vessels are painted in wavy lines then spirals and curves; upon a black ground, first with straight lines, all movement, yet strictly the patterns are gay and yet restrained. Plants (lilies) and low types of rhythmic. Two hundred years later <sup>these</sup> were painted on the vases, sea and land animals (polyps and snails) <sup>and</sup> yet restrained. Then light upon dark or vice-versa, natural and weighty ornamentation. The gradually naturalism gave place to gorgeous conventionalized plants (the palace style); brown and black <sup>on</sup> a yellow ground, growing continually stiffer and more meaningless until art withered and died.

Cretan pictorial and plastic art far surpassed that of the Egyptians at the height of and Babylonians, and approached that of Greeks and Athenians, like Greek, the archaic period. Though we may admit that Crete <sup>was</sup> stimulated and pre-ripened by the achievements of the Babylonians peoples, especially the Egyptians, whilst they and the Cretans had to create everything by their own unaided power, yet it is clear that we are advanced so far beyond either of the earlier peoples that the Cretans were compelled to assume even greater achievements in the adjacent fields of culture, in which it would have been harder to borrow.

undergo pre-ripening unless writing had been borrowed at the same time.

Hitherto the poetry and science of the Cretans have remained a closed book to us. Only when we can read their writing and understand their language shall we be able to ascertain whether the written documents that have been preserved contain material adequate for the study of these subjects. It seems to be probable, in view of the courtly, chivalrous, and social type of their civilization, that they had a heroic epic and love-songs. We might imagine adventures like those of Odysseus among the Cyclops and between Scylla and Charybdis, with the earliest version of the solar legend turned into a fairy-tale of the cannibal "Round-eye" in the mountain-side, and the risks experienced at sea from crags and whirlpools linked with it as a symbol of man's lot, showing how he is suspended for a while in mid air between one death and another; perhaps, too, there were such moving human scenes as the friendship of David and Jonathan. The stage upon which the sacred legend was presented in the form of mystery plays is preserved in the processional roads and grand stairways; we can see the people pressing round the sacred edifice and almost hear the phallic song and the jesters' quips at the harvest festival. Of course, there were hymns, too, in praise of the Giver of all Nature's abundance, and dirges for the dead god. As regards science, the monuments leave us altogether in the dark. We can only make out that the system of numeration was decimal, and that in religion the moon played a part as well as the sun, and perhaps also a great planet.

Cretan religion was without temples. The people worshipped in the open air at festal places of assembly, primarily in the courtyards that formed the centre of the palaces where altars were raised, and on the grand stairways which no palace lacked; then upon mountains, where a sacred precinct was marked off by a low boundary wall (Petsofas on the east coast of Crete), and in caves, like Juktas, where the Greeks still paid homage at the grave of Zeus, or Kamares on the southern slopes of Mount Ida. Only in one of these mountain caves, that of Zakro south-east of Cnossus, which is two-storeyed, is there an altar in the upper part.

Quantities of votive offerings have been found in the caves, miniature double-axes in copper as well as models of other weapons; vases with reliefs of bulls' heads, double-axes, and altars for offerings of fruit; sacrificial vessels, gems (seals), and models of parts of the human body (at Petsofas). In the palaces, too, bulls' heads and

double-axes played a leading part in the ritual of worship. The altars were "horned altars", that is they were crowned with symbols which can only be regarded as simplified bulls' heads. These "horns of consecration" recur again and again; they appear twice on the little bench altar in a chapel in Cnossus, twice in each of the three chambers of a painted sanctuary in Cnossus, and in groups of six, five, five on the roof of the building. The double-axe is associated with the bull's head. We find quantities of both stamped in clay on an altar table from Phaistus, together with double spirals. Holes in the horns of consecration on the bench altar seem meant for a double-axe to be affixed, just as there was a large double-axe set up in the cave at Zakro. We find bulls' heads on seals with the double-axe between the horns. But there are also examples of the double-axe without the bull's head; it appears as the stone-mason's mark in the pillared hall at Cnossus, or on seals in association with a goddess of vegetation or a flower, or erect and crowned with a dove on the sarcophagus of Hagia Triada; in all these last-named cases it is a two-fold double-axe and has, therefore, four blades.

The double spiral was another chief symbol of the palace religion; altar-tables of clay, each bearing four double spirals, were found on an altar in the central courtyard at Phaistus. Finally the column was one of this group of symbols; it grew thicker at the top and may represent a post, a tree, or the phallus. Whether it "grew out of" the horns of consecration in the fresco of the central sanctuary at Cnossus seems to me very doubtful, but at any rate it had some connection with the horns, as is proved by the seal of the mountain goddess; and it was sacred in Crete, too, as is proved by the miniature implements used in religious rites found at Cnossus, including three columns with birds perched upon them.

The principal god of the Cretans, therefore, was worshipped in the open air, in courtyards and mountain caves and on the mountain-sides. His chief symbols were the bull's head (simplified and transformed into the horned altar), the double-axe, and the column. He can be no other than the sun-god of Neolithic days. Only one symbol had been added, the double spiral; perhaps that was a sun-trap; perhaps it was a sea-wave, appropriate to a country in which the sun sank into the sea.

The Neolithic sun-god was called Min in Egypt among the immigrants, and he, too, was a god of the bull, the double-axe, and the phallus; in Babylonia the Sumerians called him Mun (or Min), and he again, was a god of the bull, the double-axe, and the mountains.

In Crete beyond all doubt he was also called Min, for the Greeks knew him in his heroic character as Minos, and in the labyrinth or "house of the double-axe" (labrys) as Cnossus dwelt the bull of Min (the Minotauros). Possibly his resemblance to the earliest Egyptian god goes further still; the ancient Egyptian Min dwelt at Kebti (Coptos), the Cretan in Capthor.

The sun-god Min was worshipped throughout Crete, in Cnossus, Phaestus, Palaikastro, and other places besides the capital, and associated with him were a number of female figures. We have already mentioned that the double-axe (as a two-fold double-axe) appeared in conjunction with a goddess of vegetation and a dove-goddess, and the column in conjunction with a mountain-goddess and a dove-goddess. Unlike the principal god, there were numerous images of female divinities as sacrificial offerings and on seals. But there do not seem to have been actual idols even of them, only votive figures. They, too, were worshipped without images and without temples. A princess would sacrifice to a goddess of vegetation or of the stars in an open grove, and the goddess seated beneath a tree would give her the flower of life. The devotee of a mountain-goddess would worship her in the open air at the foot of the mountain upon which she stood surrounded by her lions as if on a coat-of-arms. Out in the open the goddess of the double shield ("Pallas") hovered above the women who were praying to the goddess of vegetation; out in the open before a tomb stood the double-axes with the dove-goddess. Only the snake-goddess seems to have been worshipped somewhere underground. Woman, therefore, in Crete, was the warrior maiden, the fierce queen of battle, the lion-goddess; she was the lady of the mountain, the giver of plenty; the fruitful earth, the giver of life and beauty, the Great Mother. She was the Sombre One who descended into the night, the "dark dove" (Aphrodite), and the snake-goddess, queen of the Underworld and of death, but also the mother who gave birth to the sun in a cave; among the votive offerings in the same box snake-women were found and mother animals with their young.

"Cretan Zeus" (Asterios, the day-star), whom the Greeks still worshipped in Crete, was the son of Rhea, the great Mother Nature; he was born in the Dictæan Cave in Crete, where there was a Cretan sanctuary. He grew up hidden from the tyrant Cronos, who sought to devour him, and was suckled by the goat Amalthea. There is a Cretan seal representing the sun-child sucking in the cave. When he was grown up, he emerged and compelled his tyrannical father to

spit out "the stone" (the sun, the eye of Horus); he then castrated him and hurled him from his throne down to "hell". Zeus of Crete was the white bull that rose from the sea and originally carried Europa off to Crete when he found her gathering flowers. There he celebrated his "sacred nuptials" with her in a grove ("under the plane trees" by the banks of Lethaos near Gortyn in Hellenic days); the issue of the marriage were Minos and his dark brothers. The Greeks, moreover, were still aware that he died, for his grave was shown in the mountain cave and homage paid to it.

This was the fragment of the Cretan "sacred solar legend" which managed to survive in religious form, though it made severe demands on the credulity of the enlightened Greeks. Other fragments took the form of heroic myths among the Greeks, and so retained their vitality. Of Minos the myth relates that he was the son of the solar Zeus, a great founder of civilization, the first king and law-giver, even a kind of "creator" in his character of Deucalion's father. He won his throne by deposing his brother Sarpedon, the dark hero or bull, and wielded mighty power as the first great sea-king.

But all women betrayed him. His wife Pasiphaë ("the Solitary Shining One"), the daughter of the sun-god, committed adultery with a bull that rose from the sea and so gave birth to the bull-man, the Minotaur. His daughter Ariadne betrayed her father and her half-brother for the sake of Theseus, her beloved, who killed the brother in a sun-trap. At last Minos journeyed "westwards" where the daughters of Cocalus drowned him "in the bath" (the sea). But even in the Underworld he was still a ruler, the judge of the dead, together with his brother Rhadamanthus. It is easy to discern how the sacred legend was distorted, so that the marriage of the solar bull was turned into adultery and the destruction of a monster, and the descent into the sea became a betrayal. But the legend retained its main original features.

For clearly the principal god of the Cretans also "died"; he sank into the sea, entered the cave, went to the dove and the serpent. We can see that plainly from the part he played in the cult of the dead. The dove sat enthroned upon the pillar and upon double-axes before the tomb, and in one of the chapels among the votive offerings to the snake-goddess the oldest cross was found made of stone, the symbol of the dead sun-god. Moreover, the four-spoked solar wheel has been preserved upon a mould-stone from Palaikastro, and the cross upon a seal.

But even whilst they admitted the death of the sun-god, people

knew very well that he did not die but remained immortal. The Cretans were particularly fertile in the invention of exquisite natural symbols of immortality. With them a flower was something more than a useful herb, and a butterfly symbolized the renewal of life. The sun sinks into the ocean, but as the flying fish he rises above the water's surface; as the round polyp with its star-like rays, or as the mussel and snail in their strong houses, he lives in the sea. We find flying fish and mussels among the votive offerings to the snake-goddess, and all the symbolic creatures on the vases dating from the palmy days of Cretan civilization; these, like the vases of Kamares, were principally used for worship and sacrifice. In this connection, too, we note the emphasis laid in symbolism upon the oneness of the two halves of the year and of life and death: two double-axes in one are set up before the goddess of death and vegetation, two shields in one make up the shield of Pallas, two waves, one rising and one falling, together make the wave that symbolizes the year.

Perhaps this realization that the sun and Nature are immortal had something to do with the fact that in Crete the cult of the dead produced its greatest monuments, the cupola tombs, quite early (2000 B.C.) and quite late (1400 B.C.), and seems to have been without importance in the intervening period. At the beginning the Neolithic solar religion still held sway, and it required burial mounds from which the dead could emerge by day; at the end (after 1600 B.C.) the taste of the masses and the barbarians set the standard, and it was as rude and materialistic as in Neolithic days. In the intervening period, when Cretan culture was at its prime, people knew that a great tomb served no purpose; if man rose again, he was like the butterfly that leaves its cocoon in its own good time, or like the lily that comes again in the spring.

During this period when culture reached its prime a series of twenty-two symbols in the form of line-drawings must have been devised to sum up the Cretan solar religion in its perfection as a single whole by a strictly regulated system of numerical symbols. The series begins with a bull's head, followed by the ground-plan of a maze (the labyrinth) and the double-axe; then come a mound (pyramid) and tree, a standard with bull's horns, a bolt, a sign indicating "land", the four-spoked solar wheel, a fighting arm, a hand opened to give, and a shrub which in Egypt signified "year". After the first series of twelve, a second series of ten begins with water, a snake, and a withered tree; there follow the symbol of

female sexuality, a spear (or arrow), and the trident ; the symbol of male sexuality, a head, and a double mound or gate, lead on to the cross which ends the symbolic series.

We may read them as a litany to the living and dying sun-god, and interpret them in some such way as this : " Thou bull, great Father and Begetter (1), who dwellest in the heavenly mansion (2), and bearest the sacred weapon (3) ; who rulest the mound of earth (4), and makest it green (5) ; Great Victor over the powers of Chaos (6), who hast shut off the waters above from those below (7), hast established the festivals (8) and set the stars in the heavens (9) ; Warrior that fightest all evil things (10), Giver of all that is good (11), Giver of the harvest and the year (12).

" Thou who descendest into the sea (18) and vanishest into the earth where dwells the snake (14), and must suffer the drought (15) ; betrayed by the woman that thou didst love (16) and struck by the spear (or arrow) (17) ; Lord of the bladeless axe, the sceptre of the Underworld (18), castrated (19) and miserably beheaded (20) ; thou who didst sink behind the mountain and enter at the gate of the Underworld (21) ; thou whose symbol is the broken wheel, the cross (22).

" Thou art the Almighty, the Glorious, the Creator, Ruler, and Preserver of the World, and the Utterly Powerless and Wretched that didst suffer all misery of mankind, betrayal and death. Thou art always one and the same, always vanishing and returning again."

The numerical symbolism in the arrangement of the figures proves that all this and more besides was their purpose and meaning ; twelve signs, the complete, lucky number of the year, stand for the living god of Nature ; ten, the number which disastrously exceeds nine, stand for the dead god. What we have is a numerical theory in which twelve is the magic number, multiples of three are favourable and lucky, and those which exceed multiples of three are unfavourable and calamitous.

Consequently the chief symbols of the deity fall upon three and its multiples : the double-axe (3) and the horned standard (6), the solar wheel (9) and the symbol of the year (12), the sacred pillar (15) and the trident as sceptre of the realm of the dead (18) ; finally the mountain pass in which the sun vanishes and reappears, the gate through which it sets and rises (the descent into hell and the resurrection) (21).

At four and its multiples, on the other hand, we find symbols of the female divinities whom the god loves and makes fruitful, and

who betray and destroy him. These are the earth-mound, at once his kingdom and his grave (4), the earth's surface or the tilled land (8), and its fruit, the year's harvest (12); we have the symbol of female love (16, or 4 squared?) and that of the woman's murder of her lover, the severed head which belongs on this occasion to a god in human form (20).

The sevens complete the evil series. Upon 7 falls the bolt symbolizing the great deed by which order was established before the festivals were decreed, the dangerous feat of chaining the powers of Chaos and the primeval waters and disorder; 14 is the snake that lives underground; 21, being  $3 \times 7$ , has a double aspect, descent and re-emergence, just as 7 and 8 are respectively unlucky and lucky numbers.

To 13 the sea is assigned, the flood which seems at last to overpower the god, and which opens the series of death symbols.

That is certainly not all the secret meaning worked into this series of sacred symbols. But it is doubtless enough to prove that the arrangement of the series was due not to chance but to knowledge, a thoroughly systematic knowledge, moreover, inspired by a clear purpose, of which this was the consciously designed masterpiece.

I know of no other people except the Cretans capable of such an achievement a thousand years before Christ. The Egyptians and Babylonians are out of the question, and there are definite reasons for excluding the Phoenicians and Jews; they adjusted the series later to their own purposes and utterly distorted it. In Crete we find the artistic power which must be the counterpart of such a scientific feat, and the love of Nature essential to so exalted a religion of Nature. We find a god worshipped without images whose symbols were the bull and the double-axe, the pillar and the cross; and besides him female divinities were worshipped who stood for the earth and the plant world, life-giving motherhood and fierce destruction. In Cretan writings, moreover, we find all the symbols of our series in the same outline form. I think, therefore, that I am justified in regarding this series of sacred symbols as a Cretan product, although it is not yet possible to prove the fact definitely. We may certainly expect to find proof in Cretan writings when we can decipher them.

About 2500 B.C. a people from the home of Neolithic solar civilization penetrated into Crete, bringing with them the solar religion of the bull and a royal god known as "Min". The religion was adapted to the new country. The sea was given a place in it,

but in its main features it persisted unchanged to a remarkable degree. Yet in spite of the persistence of all its original features and forms, the newly evolving culture utterly transformed its inner character and raised it far above the Egyptian cults of Ra and Aten and the Babylonian religion of great world gods.

The Cretans were as well able to build stone temples to their god as the Egyptians, or to set up great images as the Babylonians. They did not do so because temples and images seemed to them unworthy of the great God of the universe. They worshipped him in Nature and only characterized him by representative symbols, just as the latter-day Babylonians began to prefer symbols to images. The great Lord of the universe could not be confined to any one city ; he was adored throughout the land, and only by preference in palaces and upon mountains. It was not till a late period of Babylonian history that Marduk broke away spiritually from the bondage of the city, whilst in Crete such freedom was a matter of course. It is true that Egyptian speculative thought dissociated Ra from the capital city, but he is a god, not *the* God, and his complete identification with one of the heavenly bodies placed him at a lower level than the Cretan Min. Even Aten was only the disc of the annual sun. The Cretan Min was the Lord of the universe, who had tamed the powers of Chaos and thrust the bolt between the waters to divide them, who had established festivals and set the stars in the sky like Enlil-Marduk in Babylonia ; he was, moreover, what Ra, Aten, and Marduk could not longer be, a god who had shared the human lot of terrible suffering and knew it from his own experience in mind and body ; for that reason he could be more of a saviour than Marduk and more human in his character of divine liberator than Aten, who only liberated the king.

As the one God, alone and without image, the Lord of the universe and the Creator, Min comes near to the Jewish Yahu, who, however, absolutely cast off all the symbolism of the bull, the human form, the axe and the cross, and was even more one and alone, for there was neither a goddess nor an enemy beside him who might prove dangerous.

But even the goddess beside Min—she was a female divinity in various symbolic shapes beside the one male god—was not equal to the god who was Lord, and in the last resort she was not a danger ; she was the earth, created by him, the power to love and to sin that gave him the opportunity of experiencing and understanding the whole destiny of Nature and of man ; she only killed him for a period

and she herself followed him in death. Here, again, Cretan religion approaches the higher faith of the Persians, with its eternal antithesis of light and dark, evil and good powers that wage an eternal war and can never be reconciled. But that conception, like Jewish monotheism was just beyond its grasp ; its bi-theism of man and woman, heaven and earth, was still too much fettered by the trammels of Nature.

In compensation it is free of the restrictions imposed upon the Jews and Persians by the force of their logically exclusive intellect. It teaches faith in a universal Deity who is at one and the same time Nature and man, Lord of the universe and a dying, suffering slave. Once again the gulf was bridged that divided immortal godhead from mortal man by bringing man as a natural creature close to the divine in Nature. The Lord of the universe experienced the spiritual agony of betrayal and the physical agony of being drowned, wounded, castrated, beheaded, and of dying, besides the joy of loving and being loved, of triumphing in a good cause and pronouncing judgment ; and this brought him close to man not only in the realm of Nature but in the human and moral sphere. In Crete the woman's betrayal was introduced into the sacred legend ; the emblems of shame and suffering in the sun-god's symbolism were increased till they almost equalled those of honour and glory in number : and all in order to bring the God of Nature near to men as a saviour. In Petsofas we see how everybody presented his diseased organ to the god, and in Kamares how peasants and princes offered him votive vases, each according to his means and his taste. Not only could man now rise spiritually to the Lord and Creator, but he might find consolation under spiritual and physical suffering in the knowledge of what the great God of the universe had suffered. Humanity received its due in all its wide extent and its loftiest heights. A Nature religion like this can provide the groundwork and stimulus for a plastic art springing from untrammelled observation and a deep love of Nature ; it allows of poetry rich with the strong notes of natural passion, love, and betrayal between man and woman. It is true that in the end woman cuts a poor figure ; social emancipation must have come to her first as the fruit of Nature-worship in a chivalrous society, but in the symbolism of the twenty-two signs there is no longer any question of love, only of betrayal. We discern a tendency towards priestly asceticism which menaced this loftiest form of Nature-monotheism or Nature-bitheism, even whilst it led to their consummation.

We do not know how this doctrine was reconciled in practice

with the death of man, except through the rapturous upward striving towards God's greatness and eternal resurrection and the visionary absorption in God's sorrows and sufferings. Men were conscious of the gulf that divided them from the gods; there were heroes who had originally been sun-gods but had afterwards become subject to the lot of man. The man who is depicted on a seal wrestling with two lions, like Gilgamesh, must doubtless have been a hero; so, too, must the man fighting a sea-dragon from a ship with the monster's head rising in menace above the ship's board. On the other hand the breach was concealed at once by the human aspect of the greatest god and man's exaltation to be one with Nature in her ordered living and dying and living anew. We cannot yet tell whether the finest spirits were content to be merged in the God of Nature whilst the masses looked for a physical resurrection—the dead were not burned. But in any case the Cretan solar religion which nearly touched the heights of Israel and Persia and yet retained the outward semblance of the original Neolithic cult, was the first religion of a higher type to revert to a popular character, satisfying both the learned and the masses with one faith and one ritual. The popular masses crowding round a sacred edifice in the Cnossus fresco present a very different picture from the priests and kings and officials in the Holy of Holies or the throne-room of Egyptian and Babylonian sanctuaries. We have here the awakening presentiment of what is meant by "the community of the people".

The series of twenty-two symbols derived from the Cretan worship of Min is the origin of our own alphabet <sup>1</sup> in the order in which the Phoenicians and Jews used it; it came to us by way of Greece and Rome, slightly augmented. The Cretans, therefore, invented the alphabet. It was their script, as hieroglyphs and cuneiform were of the Egyptians and Babylonians; each of these corresponds exactly to the general level of civilization.

On the Cretan monuments we can trace directly the transformation of picture-writing with a number of characters into pure phonetic writing with few; in the latest manuscripts we find all the characters of the alphabet which emerges complete in the ninth century in use among the Semites of Syria. In Crete, moreover, it was not forgotten that the alphabet was a Cretan invention, merely borrowed by the Phoenicians who afterwards disseminated its use. We know, too, who brought the alphabet to Palestine; it was the Philistines (Pelasgians;

<sup>1</sup> For further detail see my article on *Ursprung und Sinn unseres Alphabets* in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Leipzig, Kröner, 1924.

"Pulesati") who settled there about 1200 B.C., after their unsuccessful invasion of Egypt, and gave their name to the country.

The Philistines and Achaeans attacked Egypt together; and they it was, no doubt, who pushed into Crete from 1750 or 1400 B.C. onwards. We can trace the passage of the Pelasgians of northern Greece (Thessaly) as far as Crete in Greek records, and that of the Pulesati from Crete to "Palestine" in Jewish tradition. Similarly we find the Achaeans of northern Greece and Lesbos occupying Peleponnesus, probably rather later than the Philistines, and following in their wake. But the Philistines in Crete and the Achaeans in Orchomenus and Mycenae, adopted Cretan civilization, not a very difficult process, for all the personalities and rites of Cretan religion were closely akin to Neolithic religion. In Phaestus a disc was found with picture-writing, a votive offering to the sun-god which may have been actually presented by Philistines in Crete<sup>1</sup>; at least the warriors depicted in the pictographs look just like the Philistines as portrayed on Egyptian monuments. Later these "barbarians", for whom the Cretans devised a childish script with few characters, must have been altogether assimilated (more or less as the Ethiopians were when they ruled Egypt). The principal god of the Philistine city of Gaza in Palestine was a "Zeus" (i.e. Min) who "came from Crete", and his sacred legend was exactly the same as that of the Cretan Min, who was a sun-god, and was betrayed by the woman and castrated, and descended into a cavern; we know the story perfectly, for it is the story of Samson<sup>2</sup> (Shamash was the sun?) in the Old Testament. For a time the Philistines controlled the mines of Sinai, and it is therefore likely that they used the "Sinai writing" which is just the same as Cretan writing except that a few of the outline drawings have reverted to a more recognizable form, approximating to the hieroglyphs to which the Egyptian gods of the mines were accustomed. Finally the people of Judaea learned the alphabet from the Philistines, for David's ability to write, as well as his bodyguard (the Cretans and Philistines), doubtless dated from the time when he was a vassal

<sup>1</sup> If this supposition should prove true, we might deduce something further regarding the origin of the Philistines in a land of pile-buildings (on the Danube?). The Phaestus disc is especially interesting as a record of writing because the characters are stamped upon it. There are other examples of Cretan symbols stamped upon clay (the altar table of Phaestus); here the Cretans were using their experience in order to teach barbarians to write with ease. Thereby they did actually stumble upon the invention of printing, to which, indeed, men came near whenever they stamped with a seal.

<sup>2</sup> Clearly it was Samson who overcame the giant as a child (not David), just as he conquered death, i.e. found honey in the lion: possibly we have here a Cretan riddle.

of the Philistines. Since the Cretans could and did write, they must have had schools which doubtless centred in the palaces. Their ideal of culture must have been man in the image of God, educated by association with the magnificence of Nature and the glorious humanity of the Lord of the universe, taught the manners of courtly society, well-cared for physically and trained as an athlete. Since the simple script (even before it became a fully developed alphabet) was easier to learn than the picture and syllabic writing of older peoples, it was possible for a wider circle to learn both writing and athletic sports (bull-fighting, tilting at the ring, and so on).

#### SUMMARY

Of all the early peoples who used writing the Cretans made the greatest advance upon Neolithic solar civilization ; yet at the same time they remained in outward form nearest to the traditional beliefs. The distinction between god and man was drawn, but immediately obliterated by making the Deity human and exalting and liberating mankind through union with God. There arose a type of Nature-monotheism or bitheism (male and female) which approached near to the religion of the Jews and Persians. Cretan art was a fitting counterpart of their lofty religious beliefs ; their artists faced the problem of movement and reaped the fair harvest of their profound love of Nature. Their writing was the origin of our own alphabet, though without the vowel signs. We can form some idea of their poetry from the tense passion enshrined in the myth of their chief god, betrayed by his beloved, and their sad delight in heaping up symbols of suffering. Of their science we can judge from their vigorous speculation with numbers, as seen in the alphabet, and their free treatment of symbols and images as emblems representing the great incomprehensible powers of Nature. Their constitution must have been a paternal absolutism, limited by religious obligations. The Cretan philosophy of life touched the extreme limits of its type. Dogmatic tyranny might have stereotyped its highest achievements, but further development would have involved the destruction of its unity. Its influence upon later ages was, therefore, confined to its alphabet ; doubtless the symbolic meaning of that alphabet was understood by other nations, alike by those who repudiated and blotted out the symbolism, like the Phoenicians and Jews who could not tolerate a dying god of the universe, and by those who accepted it and introduced it once more into a higher faith, like the exponents of early evangelical Christianity.

### **BOOK III**

**THE CIVILIZATION OF THE EARLIEST PEOPLES TO BORROW  
AND PERFECT WRITING**



### BOOK III

#### THE CIVILIZATION OF THE EARLIEST PEOPLES TO BORROW AND PERFECT WRITING

THE peoples whom we are now going to consider have this in common that they not only brought with them one or more constituents of Neolithic civilization as the basis of their own, but also found a higher civilization already established in the land where they settled and intermarried and carried on the torch of creative achievement; they also assimilated higher civilization from their neighbours through trade or military subjection over a long period. Thus the Jews found ancient Babylonian and more recent Egyptian, Hittite, and Cretophilistine culture already established in Palestine; the Persians settled in Elamite territory, with the Babylonians as their nearest neighbours; the Greeks came into the land of the Achaeans and Cretans, close to Crete, and they were acquainted with Babylonian-Phoenician culture through the Phoenicians and through their own colonies with Babylonian-Persian, Egyptian, and Jewish culture. By borrowing from these they underwent pre-ripening. They took what the older civilizations had produced, especially the easily transmitted technical processes and knowledge that could be committed to memory, and used it as the basis of a more thorough and profound process of mental assimilation. Literary culture could, therefore, attain unity on a higher plane than in Neolithic days: men rose to the level of monotheism and monism. At the same period in India and China they rose to a monistic monotheism based upon older indigenous civilizations; unhappily we have no records of the higher civilizations there before the time of Yajnavalkya and Lao Tzu, Buddha and K'ung Fu Tzu (Confucius).

But the most important acquisition borrowed from older civilizations is the alphabet, which the Jews and Phoenicians adopted, and from them in turn the Greeks and Romans. It came to them as a simple series of characters with which all consonant sounds could be written. The art of reading and writing, which to the Egyptians and Babylonians involved years of strenuous labour so that a special class necessarily arose to master it, now became a simple task. It demanded little time and energy, and so left enough over for other

intellectual interests. When the religious meaning of the characters had been lost in the new, trite names given to them by the bourgeois Semites, all that remained was twenty-two phonetic signs which anyone could learn ; it was, therefore, now possible for culture to be disseminated on principle among the common people, to become democratic. To this very day we all stand upon the groundwork of this simple writing, with all its advantages ; and anyone who has ever seen anything of educational conditions in China and Japan, where ideographs are used, knows how great those advantages are.

Less pervasive in its influence, but still of sufficient importance, was the discovery of methods for the manufacture of iron and steel after 1500 B.C., probably in the realm of the Hittites south of the Black Sea. This meant that bronze implements and arms were replaced by others that were harder and more enduring, and so more useful. The peoples who flourished in the last thousand years before Christ inherited this advance in material civilization too.

In the first instance we shall consider the Jews, Persians, Greeks, and Romans. Afterwards, in a supplement, we will discuss the Indians and Chinese at length.

We must pass over the Phoenicians and Carthaginians, because we have too little knowledge of their cultural achievements. Of the Hittites we have more knowledge ; they were on a somewhat lower plane than the Egyptians, with an archaic monarchy, their own picture-writing, and a solar religion. But under Babylonian influence they became culturally a mere province of Babylonia and achieved nothing of importance themselves, just as the Philistines occupied the cultural position of a Cretan province and were later assimilated to Semitic civilization.

## A. JEWISH CIVILIZATION

At first sight it seems that we have fuller and more reliable records of Jewish civilization than of Egyptian and Babylonian. For we have the history of Jewry from the beginning of the world down to the rebuilding of Jerusalem after the Babylonian captivity, written by the Jews themselves and frequently verified by documentary evidence (the writings of the Prophets: Ezra, Nehemiah). But this "history of Jewry" is also the "Holy Scriptures", written as the basis of the Law and as proof of the doctrine of the unique power and influence of the Jewish universal God. The very fact that it begins before the creation of the world and tells so much and so romantically of the days before the Flood, when everything was destroyed, and of the prehistoric era in Israel, is of itself sufficient to prove that what we have here is not history but speculations on the philosophy of history which naturally dominated all the records even of the historical period proper. What mattered to these "historians" was not how things actually happened, but how events could be turned to account to prove the fundamental, supreme doctrine of their philosophy. We have already seen how the Babylonians' attitude of "either—or" led them to drop and transmute certain constituents of their civilization; it prevented the kings from describing their campaigns, made of Sargon the Ancient a pious gardener's son, and preserved none but sacerdotal learning. The Jews, and after them the Persians, Indians, and Chinese, were even more acute and capable of marking the contrasted "either—or", even more energetic in labours undertaken for the glory of God or of their ideals; and so the omissions and substitutions in the realm of fact grew more frequent and more emphatic, in an honest but fanatical zeal to reach "the truth". The Jews did away with plastic art in order that there might be no idols, and astronomy in order to prevent divination by omens. The Indians ceased to record history so that they might lose nothing of "the One that is precious". And the Chinese, in the spirit of Confucius, transformed their early history into a collection of examples of the ideal wisdom and humanity of their rulers. Not till we come to the Greeks do we escape from this fanaticism, so that there is room for an impartial account of the past and an appreciation of the totally divergent and contradictory opinions of philosophic opponents.

Jewish history is not "history" in a scholarly sense, but a purely imaginary structure erected in honour of the Jewish universal God. Nowhere have we genuine annals or chronicles or a scholarly study of such sources, but a selection of myths and romances, annals and chronicles, made in the sixth and fifth centuries B.C. in order to prove the reality of Yahu's power and methods and law (likewise the work of the sixth and fifth centuries). It is propaganda and an apologia in the grand style. Everything at variance with the holy purpose of this "recruiting for the Kingdom of God" was omitted or transformed, and much was interpolated to serve that purpose. Because the editors loved their home and because the task was beyond their powers, they left plentiful traces of the pious deception. We can still see that the fifth book of Moses is essentially the law proclaimed by Josiah (in 622 B.C.), that an image of Yahu stood in the temple till 597-586 B.C., that the "ark of the covenant" never existed, that Moses was a legendary figure, like Job, and that there were prophets of Yahu in Judah but not in Israel. But the editors did what they could to conceal these facts, even to the extent of distorting the words of the prophets.

Nevertheless, the writings contained in the Old Testament are among the greatest and most beautiful and fertile of human possessions. They contained all the treasure that Judaism contributed to human culture, and much that might have been lost to us but for this editing of the whole material for a special purpose. They contain the first great philosophy of history evolved by man.

But as a source for the historian they must be used with the utmost caution: there were never any "children" of Israel, no primitive monotheism, no Moses, no passage through the Red Sea, no law-giving upon Sinai. The prophet Amos was the creator of Jewish monotheism in the eighth century B.C., and if we want to know what existed before his time we must ask the Egyptians and Babylonians and, on the strength of their answers, pick out single stones from the mosaic of the Torah and the Books of Kings and recombine them without any hope that excavations in Palestine will yield much confirmation, for the land has few monuments and for five hundred years of Jewish orthodoxy destroyed everything that contradicted its own distortion of history so thoroughly that we cannot hope to find anything even in Samaria, much less any relics of the pre-prophetic era in Jerusalem, if they contradict the official version.

Amos came forward publicly as a "crier" or prophet about 760 B.C. in Bethel, far from his home at Tekoah in Judah. Jewish

monotheism is his creation, and he it was who sowed the seed of later Jewish historical interpretation; he was the first classic of a new cultural era. This is the first occasion upon which we can name and date with comparative accuracy the "first classic" poet and thinker of a new cultural era, from whom it derived its substance and character, and even give some account of his life. We do not know who laid the foundation of the Ra and Osiris doctrines in Egypt, nor who was the first to proclaim the existence of universal gods and their power of causality in Babylonia; we can only fix an approximate date between 2800 and 2700.

Here is a new circumstance, not due to the fact that the people of Judah wrote from the beginning (the Egyptians and Babylonians did that) but that they had a more personal outlook. Hitherto the names of poets, thinkers, and artists had been preserved only by chance. Names are now handed down to us and recorded because those who bore them were to be remembered as illustrious men. The Egyptians and Babylonians recorded the names of kings; to the Egyptians kings were gods, to the Babylonians types of humanity; moreover, events were dated according to the years of their reigns. The Egyptians also handed down the names of those who wrote Precepts, telling how they lived long, were viziers, and possessed riches, honour, and children; all that was proof of the value of their precepts, not of the force of their personality. The Babylonians, therefore, ceased to mention the names of those who wrote Precepts; there was no need, for their wisdom was of divine origin. But occasionally a priest was expressly named in Babylonian epic poetry as the author; his scholarship guaranteed the truth of "traditions of the days before the Flood".

Amos is the first human being whose name survived because of his outstanding human merit. After him the names of other prophets and their works were handed down, as well as those of scribes like Ezra and restorers of the holy city like Nehemiah. None of these were kings, but simple folk, and yet they deserved that their names should live like kings, and more so; in them personality and spiritual achievement was first esteemed. True, they were esteemed as the chosen of the Lord, his mouthpiece, his tools. Essentially, it is not different from the naming of kings and the writers of the Precepts, but elevated to a higher plane—and that is just the point. It does not involve the value set by the Greeks upon personality and achievement, but it is a step in that direction. We come in sight of the dividing line when divine wisdom, unless it is actual prophecy, is

gathered under the name of Moses (the Law), David (the Psalms), or Solomon (Proverbs)—at least under the name of human authors—and when for the rest poetry and learning remain anonymous (*Ruth* and *Job*).

#### RACIAL FORMATION AND POLITICAL HISTORY

Amos must have been born about 800 B.C. or rather later. The racial mixture, therefore, which resulted in his emergence as the first classic must have begun about 1800 B.C. in southern Palestine, in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem. To it we owe all the subsequent major and minor prophets till the time of the Exile and the authors of the Torah. The great civilization was "Judaic", the tribe of Judah must have given it its name. The tribe and kingdom of Israel contributed nothing to it.

About 1800 B.C. Palestine was surging with restless peoples. Since Aahmes ejected the Hyksos in 1580, the country had been ruled by the Egyptians. But ever since the fourteenth century a great Semitic migration—that of the Aramaeans and Chaldaeans—had been going on; among them were the tribes of Israel and Judah. At the same time the Hittites were pushing into the country from the north. In the reign of Amenhetep IV (about 1370 B.C.) we hear of the hard-fought battles of a King of Jerusalem, Abdi-Khiba, against the Habiru (Hebrews?). The king's name contains the name of a Hittite god. The kings of the Nineteenth Dynasty fought against a variety of Bedouin tribes in Palestine, but especially against the Hittites, whom Rameses II (1224–1258 B.C.) vanquished at Kadesh and forced to withdraw from the country. His son, Mer-en-Ptah, laid waste the territory of a tribe of "Isirel". About 1250 B.C., therefore, "Israel" was settled in the land, though without a city of its own; but we shall have to look for its "vineyards and fields" in the neighbourhood of Shiloh. In the course of the following century Egyptian power in Palestine collapsed after a duration of some four hundred years. The plains were ceded to the Philistines, who had been driven from the borders of Egypt by Rameses III and had been settled on the plains of Palestine since about 1180 B.C., where they soon established a great kingdom, controlling the mines of Sinai in the south and extending northwards and eastwards. They captured Shiloh and carried off the ark of the Israelites to Ashdod (about 1050 B.C.). Saul, a chieftain of the tribe of Benjamin, who had established his kingdom, fell in the war against them (about 1100 B.C.).

Their ally and vassal was David (about 1016 to 970 B.C.), who seems to have won independence through the fall of their empire.

The races, therefore, whose interbreeding may be the basis of the "kingdom of Judah" are as follows: the tribe of Judah, which gave its name to the kingdom and its people, and was certainly Aramaic, and other Aramaic tribes who pushed into the land about 1300; also the indigenous population of town and country, the offspring of earlier racial mixtures, near Jerusalem and further south; they spoke a Canaanite-Semitic dialect and provided the language of the new Judaic civilization (a Hyksos dialect crossed with northern elements); finally the Hittites and Egyptians, the former an important element especially in Jerusalem, the latter probably few in number (some would be mercenaries, Shardana, etc.). On the other hand, there was hardly any Philistine blood in the mixed race; the Philistines made their appearance at a late date and stayed for the most part on the plains.

Aramaic immigration infused new blood throughout Syria and Palestine and Mesopotamia, and new cultural life was stirring in all parts of Mesopotamia and Syria between 800 and 600 B.C. In Babylonia the monotheistic tendency in religious speculation gained force, and astronomical observations were recorded with greater regularity (the Chaldaeans). In Syria, Damascus rose to importance and resisted the Assyrians with a heroic determination that must have been inspired by religion; and Samaria followed in its footsteps. It seems that other city gods were exalted to the position of universal Lord by the prophets, like Marduk. It seems that piety, a firm faith in a divine dispensation, extended its hold upon the people of Damascus and Samaria as well as the Babylonians. But in Judah the mixture of races gave birth to a civilization which outstripped all earlier achievements; the human race entered upon a new phase. We cannot discover the physiological causes. Sometimes it seems that peculiarly favourable conditions for the most fruitful racial mixtures arise in a sleepy corner beyond the confines of the active world: it was in Upper Egypt, not in the Delta, that the first Egyptian race had its origin, the Jewish race emerged in Judah, not in Israel or Damascus, and Zoroaster's people had birth in Eastern Persia, not in a district nearer to Babylonia.

We know from Egyptian and Assyrian sources and pictures what the Bedouins were like who slowly penetrated the civilized provinces and invaded them from the desert. The civilized peoples regarded them as barbarians, always ready to plunder and rob when

they came peaceably to trade or graze, or invaded a district or city by force or arms in a moment of weakness. They were not uncivilized, for they, too, came from the homeland of Neolithic solar civilization, and their heritage from that primitive age embraced methods of cattle-breeding, a religion with ancient solar sanctuaries in the desert, a tribal fetish and tribal organization. But they were always hungry, always lurking in ambush, always ready to commit acts of violence, and averse to all regular work in town or country; they were, therefore, the very soul of lawlessness in the eyes alike of pious priestly citizens and of the peasants. The romantic tendency to see beauty and idealism in the natural piety and simplicity of the desert peoples was a product of the fanatical religion of the peasant devotees of Yahu at the end of the ninth century, if not of the actual prophecy of Amos; here we have an anticipation of Tacitus and his ideal of the morally pure Germans, or Rousseau's honest countryman; all three were equally unreal, equally the tendentious inventions of men disgusted with civilization. The authors of the Torah loved speculative classification, and so from these fantasies, exalted in Jewish poetry, sprang the children of Israel in the desert; neither poets nor authors of the Torah felt a few miracles more or less as a stumbling block. Of all the miracles of that primeval age, from the burning bush and the plagues to the passage through the Red Sea and the law-giving on Sinai, none can surely have seemed so marvellous to those who knew the Bedouins as these "ten tribes" and the fact that they could live for forty years in the desert without cattle and without plunder and robbery.

In the history of Palestine we come upon the tribe of Israel before the tribe of Judah. They seem to have crossed the Jordan and settled in the cultivated land round Shiloh. At the time of Pharaoh Mer-en-Ptah (1250 B.C.) they were growing vines and tilling the fields; but they had no city, only a chief settlement where their fetish stood; it bore their own name, Yishra-el, the god that fights. It may be that the shape of this fetish is likewise known to us—it is the original of the ark "Aaron", a stone in the form of an ark or a chest containing a picture or something of the kind. It is very possible that the citizens of Shiloh appealed to Pharaoh to help them, just as Jerusalem had called for the help of Amenhetep IV against the Habiru a hundred years earlier. The tribes in the vicinity of towns were constantly disturbing trade and menacing the cities. Mer-en-Ptah only gave temporary help; after his departure the tribe assembled once more and clearly succeeded in the end in capturing the city of

Shiloh. The "ark" was placed in the principal temple there. It crops up in the Philistine wars in 1050 B.C. as a sacred possession of the tribe of Ephraim, doubtless an offshoot of Israel; it was taken from them by the Philistines and carried off to Ashdod as a trophy of victory, where it must have remained.

The Egyptian bondage suffered by the tribe of Israel was, therefore, the devastation of their land in Palestine by Pharaoh Mer-en-Ptah, which may have ushered in a long period of Egyptian domination. The tribe was never in Egypt itself. The memory of this tribe and its "ark" found a place in the Old Testament because Jeroboam I, of the tribe of Ephraim, restored the old, forgotten tribal name when he founded a new kingdom of Israel (about 980 B.C.) and turned the ark into the "ark of a covenant" of cities and tribes.

The tribe of Judah<sup>1</sup> may have come to Palestine in the same century but by a totally different route from the tribe of Israel. They did not cross the Jordan, but came from the desert in the south. They must have split previously in the desert, as often happened when desert tribes grew too vigorously or when there were dissensions in the ruling house. In the eighth century we find an Aramaic tribe of Ya'udi in northern Syria near the city of Hamath, and the name of the god Yahu occurs there in the names of kings. But the god Yahu did not go with the offshoot, for his name is not in the tribal list of gods. He must, therefore, have proceeded to southern Palestine with the main body, where the tribe of Ya'udi (Judah) built him a sanctuary in a new settlement near Jerusalem which was named "the god of Judah", "Baal-Ya'udi."<sup>2</sup> As with Israel, the name of the god and the tribe were the same. We know, too, the appearance of the fetish Yahu; he was a snake. The "snake-stone" was the first thing consecrated to him in Baal-Judah. He himself continued his wanderings and David made him the chief god of Jerusalem. In the temple we find him worshipped once more as Nehushtan, the brazen serpent. King Hezekiah was the first to destroy this serpent idol, under prophetic influence. From the Assyrian source from which we derive our knowledge of the offshoot tribe of Judah in northern Syria we also learn with certainty of the Aramaic character of Judah at the time of the immigration and the pronunciation of their god's name; and this is confirmed by the Assyrian transcription of Judaic

<sup>1</sup> For further details see my book on *Kultur und Denken der Babylonier und Juden*. Leipzig, 1910 (Hinrichs).

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps Bethlehem?

royal names (Ahaz, Hezekiah), for cuneiform records vowels : the name of the god of Jerusalem must be pronounced Yahu, not Yahweh.

The tribe of Judah settled near Jerusalem, just as Israel settled near Shiloh. They, too, had no city for many years ; it was David who first gave them one. They must have lived for decades under nominal Egyptian rule ; perhaps they, too, like Israel, experienced an Egyptian bondage in their new homes, for the Pharaohs of the Nineteenth Dynasty may have given ear to Jerusalem's appeals for military aid, apparently ignored by Amenhetep IV. On the other hand it is possible that hostility to the Hittites led them to open the gates of Jerusalem to a predecessor of the tribe of Judah under the Habiru or Jebusites. At any rate, Judaic tradition knew nothing of " Egyptian captivity " and among the people the name of the leader who ejected the Hyksos, " Amos ", was thoroughly established and very common as a first name.

The history of Judah begins with David's establishment of the kingdom of Judah about 1020-1010 B.C. David came of the royal house of the tribe of Judah (his ancestor was Naason, the " snake-man "). But he began his career as the leader of a gang in the service of the Philistines on the south-west frontier. Gradually he established his power in the district of Hebron and became the recognized leader of his tribe, for whom he captured the city of Jerusalem. It was before the snake-god, Yahu, and not before the long-forgotten ark that David danced when it was brought to the temple in the future capital of the kingdom of Judah. In alliance with the Philistines he made an end of Saul's power and succeeded him as lord of Ephraim-Shiloh, as heartily detested by the Israelites as Saul of the tribe of Benjamin. Moab, Edom, and Ammon were also added to David's kingdom. First Ephraim and then Benjamin fought against the Philistines : David had the Kerethi and Pelethi (Cretans and Philistines) on his side as mercenaries. The legend which grew up during the Exile conceals this fact by making David the victor over the giant Goliath, thus transferring solar myths of the child's victory over the giant to him and the Philistines. Towards the end of his reign it seems that the Philistines' power collapsed of itself. At any rate David's son, Jedidiah, called Solomon ( " the fortunate " ), reigned independently from about 970 to 938 B.C., dividing up and administering his inherited kingdom of Judah on a strictly centralized system. He transformed the snake-fetish into a civilized god in human form and built him a new temple in the capital.

Shortly after his death Shashanq of Egypt came as liege lord and

transferred the predominant power in the province of Judah and Israel back to Israel. Jeroboam I then founded the kingdom of Israel with Shechem as its capital and Baal-Berith, the "god of the Covenant" as the national god. The capital changed once more. About 830 B.C. the mercenary king Omri built a new capital, Shemer or Samaria, and dedicated it to a new god, Siccuth, to whom the planet Saturn was sacred. But Israel continued to dominate the former territory of David's kingdom until they were led captive to the north in 722 B.C.

Jeroboam I's importance to Jewish historical philosophy was very great; the interpretation of history devised by his learned men in order to ensure the stability of his federal kingdom found its way into the Old Testament. Jeroboam was of the tribe of Ephraim and came from Shiloh, and he brought with him memories of how Israel's wanderings were guided by the ark "Aaron". Once there had been a tribe of Israel; now a kingdom of Israel was established and an Israelite nation invented, with genealogies tracing all manner of tribes to it as their source. First Ephraim's origin was correctly traced to Israel, then others followed for no better reason than that they were included in the kingdom of Israel. And the ark, the long lost tribal fetish, now became "the ark of the covenant", a chest in which the treaty uniting the cities and tribes of the kingdom was kept in the temple of the capital. The "federal god" must have been called Yishrael, and the priests of Israel were descended from the ark, regarded as a person; they were the sons of Aaron, just as the priests in the temple of Jerusalem were the sons of the snake, "Levi" (Leviathon), or Levites.

But besides Shiloh and the capital Shechem, Jeroboam's kingdom included Bethel. Here long ago a tribe called Jacob-el had appeared and vanished again; but either they or their kindred had a great history behind them; amongst the Hyksos who conquered Egypt there was a tribe of that name, and one Hyksos king was called Jacob-her "the god Jacob is content". That was a proud memory; the tribe of Jacob-el, with the god bearing its own name, had once ruled Egypt; he had been driven out by Aahmes in 1580 B.C. It may have been this actual tribe, or an early offshoot bearing the same name, which is mentioned a hundred years later by Thothmes III in his list of vanquished cities and fortresses (without a city); at any rate, the city of Bethel must have inherited the memory of Jacob's former glory when it subsequently opened its gates to the tribe of Jacob-el and their god, and that memory must have borne witness

to his great sanctity.<sup>1</sup> Jeroboam included this genuine tradition in the genealogy of his kingdom. "Jacob" became the equivalent of Israel, so that now Israel came to have been a power in Egypt, driven out by Pharaoh Aahmes and led through the desert to Palestine by Aaron. Joseph was associated with Jacob. Thothmes' list includes among the conquered tribes one Joshep-el. This tribe ended in Shechem, and their god Joseph was unquestionably a god of that city. As the god of Jeroboam's capital he could not, of course, be ignored, so that Joseph's tribe was identified with Ephraim (Jeroboam's own tribe) and Manasseh (the tribe inhabiting the country round Shechem). As the genealogy of the kingdom made Ephraim and Manasseh offshoots of Israel-Jacob, Joseph became the son of Jacob, and the year-myth of the temple of Shechem the story of that son.

So it was that the priests of Jeroboam I in his capital of Shechem invented the genealogy and the nucleus of Israel's later history to serve national ends. The god of the covenant was there, and the covenant, but the name of the god was Israel or Jacob, and the covenant was political in character. Israel-Jacob once lived in Egypt and was driven out; Aaron, the ark of the covenant, led the Israelite nation (which unlike the tribe and kingdom of Israel, never existed) into Palestine; here they occupied Shiloh, Shechem, and Bethel, and broke up into a number of tribes, including Ephraim and Manasseh, but likewise other alien tribes which happened to form part of the kingdom, such as Benjamin (with its memories of Saul), and more besides.

The history of David's kingdom with its centre of gravity in the north, in Shechem and Samaria, is even more insignificant than when the centre of gravity was Jerusalem. David was able to establish his kingdom because the Philistines protected him. Solomon was able to maintain it because the Philistines and Egyptians were weak. Jeroboam I won and held the throne because he had the protection of Shashanq of Egypt. As soon as one or other of the great Powers, Egypt or Assyria, grew strong only vassal States could exist in the land, subject to their favour. Everything depended upon taking sides with the victor in good time and adhering to him till the tables turned. This was essential to the success of the prophetic teaching, and the most skilful diplomacy

<sup>1</sup> Thus Jacob-el experienced a two-fold Egyptian bondage, when Aahmes drove them from Egypt in 1580, and when Thothmes III laid waste their territory in Palestine in 1480.

was bound to fail again and again in such a task. The mercenary general Omri became king of Israel in 890 B.C. by adhering to Damascus whilst Assyria was occupied elsewhere, though she advanced against him in a threatening manner. His son Ahab sought the support of Assyria against Damascus, and suffered for it when Assyria withdrew. In 843 B.C. Jehu overthrew the house of Omri, allying himself with Assyria; then Damascus in turn punished the new king. Under Jeroboam II there was an interval of peace (783-743 B.C.) because Assyria and Damascus were weak and Egypt was broken into independent nomes.

After the centre of gravity of David's kingdom had been shifted to the north, the memory survived of Jerusalem's former predominance, and that of her god Yahu. In course of time people grew accustomed to calling the kingdom Israel (there was time enough in the century and a half between 930 and 780 B.C.), and it was generally supposed that it had always been so called; but they did not grow accustomed to the fact that the house of David no longer reigned over Israel and that Yahu had become a god of secondary importance. It is true that the house of Omri worshipped him; Ahab married his daughter, Athaliah, to a son of the house of David, whilst both she and his son Jehoram bore Yahu names (among others). This, however, was merely regarded as attempted subjection in Judah and led to the rising of the Rechabite zealots for Yahu's glory and world dominion. A military commander or prince of David's tribe, Jehu, overthrew the house of Omri in 843 B.C. But he failed to capture Jerusalem, for Athaliah maintained her position there whilst Jehu remained in Samaria and adopted the Samaritan god. That was an apostasy which the Rechabites and their followers, as well as the priests of Yahu's temple, never forgave him and his house. Jehu and his successors did, indeed, tolerate the dynasty of David in Jerusalem and bore double names, being known in Jerusalem by their Yahu names and in Samaria by others; but that did not conciliate their opponents.

During the reign of Jeroboam II, the last successful ruler of Jehu's dynasty, Amos, the founder of Jewish prophecy, rose up from among the Rechabites. He believed in Yahu upon Zion as the only God, the universal God who had founded the kingdom of David, now called Israel. He was the God of the covenant, but not the political covenant of the northern kingdom; his was a moral and religious covenant with his people, and that people was now Israel, whom he had led out of Egypt, just as the legend of

Shechem related. Amos held that it was the duty of Jeroboam II to serve the God of Zion, the true God of the covenant; those that he worshipped elsewhere were idols who made men apostates, breakers of the covenant; Yahu would destroy them and their servants. Jeroboam II was a mild man. He told the prophet, who announced the coming judgment about 760 B.C. in the national sanctuary of Israel-Jacob at Bethel, that this was an alien sanctuary and he ought to proclaim Yahu's might in Jerusalem. But Amos caused his prophecy to be recorded in Judah. Forty years later, in 722, it was fulfilled. First Damascus (731) and then Samaria were destroyed and the people were led into captivity by the Assyrian Sharru-kenu.

Ahaz (the Assyrian form suggests Jehoahaz), King of Judah, had been the ally of the Assyrians in the last Samarian war, and thus secured for his son Hezekiah (Assyrian Khazakiau) (about 720 to 690 B.C.) long years of peace as a vassal of Assyria. Meanwhile, Egypt was gaining strength; about 713-701 B.C. the Ethiopians under Shabaka conquered the Delta and began to push on and invade Palestine. The great prophet at this period was Isaiah, the disciple of Amos. He demanded a policy of inaction, of perfect trust that Yahu would not abandon his city to any enemy. He had wished to forbid Ahaz to ally himself with Assyria against Samaria, and had been proved wrong. Now, on the death of Sharru-kenu in 705, he forbade Hezekiah to ally himself with Egypt, and he proved right. Sennacherib, the son of Sargon, came as an avenger, and Hezekiah had to buy immunity at a heavy price. The new treaty was already concluded when Sennacherib demanded as an additional concession that Jerusalem should admit an Assyrian garrison. That was the violation of a treaty, insulting to Yahu the Lord God, and Isaiah, inspired by holy wrath and faith in God, advised rejection; Yahu would lead the tyrant home with a ring in his nose. The king obeyed and the miracle happened; Sennacherib's army was destroyed by plague or some other disaster and the king fled to Ashur. This was the beginning of the revolutionary, prophetic era, following the first flowering-time of culture. Hezekiah himself destroyed the snake-image of Yahu, the Nehushtan, in the temple, though his image in a sitting posture remained. But in Levite circles, and doubtless among the people, too, the conviction spread that Yahu would make Jerusalem the centre of a world empire if he were worshipped righteously as the only God.

The immediate sequel, indeed, was the subjection of Palestine

once more, and afterwards of Egypt, by Esarhaddon. Hezekiah's son, Manasseh, was prompt to make peace with him and reigned undisturbed for some fifty years. Then troubled times returned. The inroad of the Cimmerians overthrew Assyria's dominion in Syria and Palestine; they swept past the city of Yahu and were flung back by Psemthek on the Egyptian frontier: old prophecies of Assyria's fall and new ones of the inroads of a people from the far north were fulfilled. Josiah, king of Judah, who came to the throne in 640 B.C. at the age of eight, allowed himself to be persuaded that he was the Messiah king, appointed to bring the kingdom of God to its consummation. In the course of alterations in the structure of the temple the Law that Yahu had given to his people in the desert was "discovered", the work of the prophetic party of reform. Josiah caused it to be read in the temple before all the people and pledged himself to observe it. The revolution had ascended the throne and ruled the land. Trusting in Yahu's help, Josiah marched in 608 B.C. against Pharaoh Nekau, who sought to conquer Palestine, and fell. But very soon, in 605, Nabu-kudurri-usur II (Nebuchadnezzar) of Babylonia appeared on the scene, vanquished Egypt, and snatched Palestine from its grip once more. In the chaos of these and the following years Jeremiah prophesied, wrestling with the "false prophets" who were leading the people astray and teaching them to be arrogant and secede from Babylon. He regarded Nabu-kudurri-usur II as the executor of God's judgment, and he proved right: in 597 B.C., the Messianic and priestly party departed to Babylonia, and in 586 the rest of the Yahu zealots followed them into Babylonian captivity. Jerusalem was utterly destroyed, and the image of Yahu was brought as a trophy to Marduk's temple in Babylon.

One hundred and eighty years after the first appearance of Amos the prophetic revolution was finished: the image of Yahu disappeared, all Israel had been led away, and a Yahu congregation in Babylonia replaced the Yahu State in Palestine. In exile they were permeated by the teachings of the prophet Ezekiel and of the authors of the Torah, the Book of the Law. This great work marks the beginning of the second flowering-time of Judaic culture, which now became "Jewish" culture.

The growth of a Jewish community in Babylon as the offspring of the kingdom of Judah was rendered possible in the first instance by the fact that the people were led into captivity in two separate companies, in 597 and 586 B.C. In the first company Jeconiah, the

Messiah of a future restoration, went into exile together with the cream of the priesthood and nobility and citizens of Jerusalem. Not only their common faith in Yahu and their common lot united the exiles, but also family and social ties at home and the hope that ultimately they might establish the kingdom of God in the still surviving city of Jerusalem. Nabu-kudurri-usur II had recently enlarged his capital and built new fortifications ; there and generally in Babylonia the exiles were received with a degree of respect that it is easier for a polytheistic religion to feel for alien gods and their worshippers than for monotheism. The Jews combined superior piety with superior business ability, and this must quickly have borne fruit amongst a closely united people in a land which was the centre of the world. When Jerusalem was destroyed in 586 B.C. the habit of cohesion was already formed and the foundation laid for the future prosperity of the community in Babylonia. During their sixty years of captivity (597 to 538-37 B.C.) they were united even more closely by their labours in framing the Law and by their growing influence and wealth. A successor of Nabu-kudurri-usur set Jeconiah free and treated him as a prince. Then came the long years of suspense and hope whilst Cyrus was sweeping victoriously across Hither Asia, and finally laying siege to Babylon. All through those years the community was welded more firmly than ever by the ecstatic visions of the second Isaiah, revealing the servant of God who bears the sins of the world and his assured exaltation. At last Babylon fell and prophecy was fulfilled in Marduk's city, a fact which can hardly have failed to impress the Babylonians. Cyrus allowed the restoration of the temple properties of Yahu (his worshippers did not care to recall the image) and the restoration of the temple and city of Jerusalem. In the year 538-7 B.C. the first "Jews" returned to Jerusalem from Babylonia. It was nearly a century later that Ezra was able to introduce the Law (the Torah) in the new Jewish capital (in 458 B.C.) and that the town was walled in and the inhabitants separated from their heathen neighbours by Nehemiah, the cupbearer of the Persian king Artaxerxes I, in 445 B.C.

The Old Testament suggests that the restoration of the city of God according to the prophet's word was the principal achievement of this period. Actually it was the outcome of numerous attempts to establish the kingdom of God amongst men with the means available to the Babylonian community, attempts which were frustrated again and again by human weaknesses. Meanwhile in 519 B.C., after the laying of the foundation-stone of the temple by the Messiah

Zerubbabel, an act which promptly assumed political significance, the Jewish community had the good fortune to lose the house of David through the intervention of the Persians, as they had lost the image of Yahu in 586. The new church had now only an ecclesiastical head, the High Priest. Under Nehemiah, governor for the Persians, the ecclesiastical State reached its consummation in 445, but in 400 the High Priest murdered his brother in the temple and after 350 a Messianic rising was attempted which led to a number of Jews being banished from Jerusalem to Hyrcania. Jerusalem, the place where the universal God came in contact with the world on earth, was and continued to be the centre of Jewish glory and pride in the earliest non-political world-wide community. It was the visible spiritual home of Judaism; yet it was here that every outbreak of atavism and spiritual malady occurred, and Jerusalem, like the image of Yahu and the house of David, had to disappear if the church was to live. But in the fourth and third centuries before Christ this sacerdotal State was approaching its first prime, supported by the resources of the faithful and of pilgrims.

Its successful establishment and its first prime, however, only represented the growth and prosperity of the earthly community that had founded it and now maintained it; that is the really important process in the centuries of Persian sovereignty. The Jewish religion was most closely akin to the Persian. It was easy to demonstrate to the Persian kings that the Jewish Law was "the wisdom of the God of Heaven", like their own Law of Ahura-Mazda; both were at one in their monotheism devoid of images. The Persian kings must have been pleased by the repudiation of all claims to political authority on the part of the Jewish communities, who readily paid their taxes; for political authority they awaited God's good time in an uncertain future. The Jews were well regarded by races other than the Persians as adherents of a religion which was not that of the oppressors, men who held Canaanite-Semitic books sacred and whose ideals comprised the most exalted Deity, the loftiest piety, and the most glorious prospects for believers. The simplicity and grandeur of their doctrine, which was the consummation of Babylonian religion, spoke in their favour, as well as the fervour of the believers, all personally concerned for their faith, the splendour of their distant temple, and the power and influence of their communities. In the centuries under consideration, therefore, the Jewish communities spread from Babylonia to all regions under the sway of Babylonian civilization; they crossed its frontiers and

gained a foothold in Egypt. About 350 B.C. the peaceful conquest of the civilized world for Yahu and his kingdom was in full swing.

About this time the vitality of the first Judaic racial mixture was exhausted. It had given birth to the great prophets of the first cultural flowering-time (Amos and Isaiah) and the revolutionary period (Jeremiah and Ezekiel), besides a number of nameless poets and scholars, followed by the exiled authors of the Torah and those who spread Jewish thought to all the civilized parts of the Persian Empire. About 300 B.C. Judaic culture was nearing the end of its second prime.

But meanwhile a new racial mixture was approaching its first prime. It also originated in Palestine, likewise in the north, and was probably initiated by the Assyrians' forcible removal of whole nations between 730 and 720 B.C., and carried on by the Cimmerian invasion and the inroads of Nabu-kudurri-usur II. After 200 B.C. this second Jewish race had reached maturity; from it sprang a new type of piety, that of the Pharisees, but likewise new revolutionary movements; Jesus rose from its midst, and to it the second destruction of Jerusalem was due.

Between 325 and 300 B.C. Alexander the Great shattered the Persian Empire and laid it bare to the inrush of Hellenism. That was the beginning of the struggle between Jews and Greeks for the mastery of the world. It was a struggle of philosophies and mercantile ability. Hitherto Judaism had made its way against older nations on a lower cultural level, having wisely postponed the struggle against the Persians, an imperial people of the same age as the Jews and possessed of a vigorous civilization. Now it had to assert itself and maintain its position against a people partly of the same age, partly younger, possessed of a more advanced civilization, an imperial people too, but eager to spread enlightenment. The Persians regarded Judaism as a monotheistic religion like their own, whilst to the Greeks it was superstition.

The Jews took up the challenge, conscious of the divine favour of the power of the united, universal church, and of their wealthy and influential congregations. At the time of Alexander and the Diadochi, Judaism flourished. The newly founded city of Alexandria soon had as powerful and influential a Jewish community as Babylon. Jerusalem, as well as all Palestine, Syria, and Asia Minor, profited by the westward move of the world's centre of gravity. During the third century B.C. the Holy Scriptures of the Jewish religion were translated into Greek (supposedly under Ptolemy II, 285-247

B.C., who also founded the museum and library at Alexandria), and this paved the way for the annexation to Yahu's kingdom of new regions, speaking an alien tongue. It seemed, too, that the new religious movement inspiring the second Jewish race, now culturally mature, would help in the struggle. When the Seleucid kings laid hands upon the temple, and its high priests, who were also farmers of taxes, betrayed it in 168 B.C., the first religious war in the world's history<sup>1</sup> broke out. Judas Maccabaeus rose in revolt, the "Pious" suffered martyrdom with rapture, and by 162 B.C. the imperial power of the Seleucid dynasty had bowed to the papal power of the Maccabees, whilst the church was cleansed and had recovered her sanctuary. This was the era which gave birth to the most fervent of the psalms and pilgrim songs, the most human and spontaneous love songs, and the *Book of Ruth*, and which in truth raised Judaism to something approaching the humanity of Greece.

But Hellenism retained its ascendancy. The Jewish church failed to win either the Hellenic populace—for it offered no hope of resurrection—or the educated who, in spite of their increasing tendency towards monotheistic piety, were still rationalists and a national ruling class. At the same time Judaism faced a period of spiritual transformation, for the revolutionary era of the new race had dawned. The church was shaken to its very foundations by sects believing in resurrection from the dead, Pharisees and Essenes, and by grossly materialistic Messianic movements aiming at the establishment of a political kingdom of God. The Maccabees, who had been worldly princes since 140 B.C., and after them the Idumeans (Herod, 41-4 B.C.) who ruled till 70 A.D., adopted Greek customs and ideas.

On the threshold of the second prime of this second Jewish culture stands Jesus of Nazareth, in whom Judaism found its fulfilment on a higher plane. Whilst the Jews of Alexandria were endeavouring to reconcile Greek philosophy and the Torah and to produce a Jewish counterpart to the work of Greek historians, whilst the Romans were destroying the Jewish ecclesiastical State (70 A.D.) amidst convulsions of Messianic nationalism, the disciples of Jesus were laying the foundations of Christianity and establishing a Jewish sect that was destined to conquer the Hellenic and Roman world, and shortly afterwards the East, with its gospel

<sup>1</sup> The world conquests of Darius in 521 did spread religious doctrine, but they did not properly constitute a "religious war", since the Persians never forced their faith upon others.

of love and its belief that men rose from the dead to dwell in the kingdom of God. Old-fashioned Judaism had been forced into the position of a merely scriptural religion without a temple, and withdrew to embittered seclusion. Nor did its second great offshoot, the sect of Mohammed with its fanaticism and faith in the resurrection, confer any benefit upon Judaism as such. The spiritual impetus of the second Jewish race ended in the apocalyptic books and the *Tahmud* (the *Mishnah*, completed in 218, and part of the *Gemara*) ; it was Christianity that reaped the benefit of its vital force embodied in the achievements of Peter and John and Paul. At this point its latest fruits mingle, in the third century A.D., with those of a new race. Following upon Alexander's campaign, the Greeks had been pouring eastwards since 380 B.C., and this new race was the consequence ; by 200 A.D. it had grown to maturity and gave birth to the Eastern Fathers of the Church and Neo-Platonists, the great jurists of the third century, and the domed edifices and mosaics of Byzantine art.

#### CONSTITUTION AND GROWTH OF SOCIAL CLASSES

Every civilized people, before they reach their first prime, pass through the stage of evolution of the people whom they are destined to outstrip on their own higher level of civilization. Jewish civilization before the appearance of Amos was, therefore, Babylonian in all essentials, with certain Egyptian elements. This means that the constitution and social structure of Jerusalem at the time of David and Solomon must have been roughly equivalent to those obtaining under the dynasty of Khammurabi. David was still in part a tribal king, although the tribe had long been settled, but without a city ; in part he was an absolutist military king by divine right. Solomon was in a small way what Khammurabi was on a grand scale, a representative of absolutism ; he looked for support to the national god who had chosen him, and to his governors and troops, and exercised a very personal dominion over a town population of priests and citizens and the remnants of his tribe in the country, guided by religion and custom and law. We have relics of a legal code drawn up, it would seem, after Khammurabi's model.

In the northern kingdom, Jeroboam I ruled upon more modern lines in the Babylonian sense. The kingdom of the covenant at Shechem, based upon a genealogy that was the fruit at once of religion and scholarship, corresponds to a typical attempt by an

astute and powerful prince at the Babylonian stage of evolution to win and weld together by means of religion a town population of priests and citizens, who in fact are unwilling to submit to any king, and rebellious tribal chiefs in the country owing allegiance to none but himself. The purely military monarchy of the Omri dynasty succeeded him, comparable in a small way with the great Assyrian kings; all the small subject powers hated the dynasty, but none could dispense with it because it maintained order. Here, again, is an exact parallel with Babylonia.

The classes in this pre-prophetic age were the same as in Babylon. The priests and citizens dominated the towns; in the country was a peasant population, perhaps rather less subject to the city lords than in Babylonia. In the mountains of Palestine remnants of all the earlier immigrant tribes, especially those of Aramaic blood, must have retained their freedom in small independent territories with an aristocracy of tribal chiefs. Very similar conditions must have obtained in contemporary Babylonia, permeated with Chaldaean blood. In Israel and Judah the relations with semi-nomad tribes on the borders of the desert must have been closer than in Babylonia; such were the Ammonites, Moabites, Edomites, and the tribes round Hebron.

When after Solomon's death Judah became a vassal of the northern kingdom there was less justification for the Babylonian type of cultural monarch after the model of Khammurabi. For the kings had only one city of Jerusalem, with its priests serving in the national sanctuary and its merchants; all the rest of the country was inhabited by a peasant population, still leading a half nomadic life in the south as shepherds, who occasionally tilled the soil. The dominant consideration was no longer the opposition of kings to citizen-priests and the need of a power to impose order upon the individualism of religious idealists and practical merchants. The opposition of town and country was far stronger. Both townsmen and country folk cherished the great memory of David's kingdom, and were powerfully influenced by it. Both were convinced that Yahu was the only powerful God and that he would rule the whole world. The townspeople believed it because he was their own God, the God of their city State, a point of view similar to that of the inhabitants of Bethel or Ashur; the country folk believed it because he was the one cultural God, the only God they knew, the possessor of a marvellous sanctuary upon Zion, approved in the time of David and Solomon, and brought to the city not long since from the desert

country. Both townsmen and countryfolk honoured the house of David, the townsmen as the dynasty of their city, the countryfolk as the hereditary royal house of Judah. Originally the hostility between town and country had been between the tribe of Judah and the city State of Judah, between the snake-stone and the temple of Zion. It broke out in Absalom's rising against David and in Adonijah's revolt against Solomon, and was suppressed by the kings. After that the tribe of Judah ceased to count for anything. But these struggles left their mark; when the north turned away from Yahu the countryfolk remembered that the god ought not, in fact, to be worshipped as an image in a temple; they thought that he had lost power by entering the city. In addition, there was social hostility to the city because its financial system was inflicting distress upon the countryside, whether the merchants evicted peasants and established slavery or merely bought rural produce as cheap as possible and sold it as dear as possible, on capitalist principles.

Out of these conditions in ninth century Judah, before the time of Amos, grew the first spiritual movement on a higher plane than was ever reached by Babylonia. It was a religious movement among the southern tribes, and found a prophet in Jehonadab ben Rechab. The "dragon tribe" of Rechabites was not the ancient tribe of Judah with its snake-stone, but it must have had a very close connection with the snake-god, Yahu. At first the movement was a fanatical cult of Yahu directed against the apostate house of Omri, and their efforts to swallow up the house of David. Jehonabad ben Rechab stood beside Jehu in his chariot when the house of Omri was overthrown in Samaria and the sovereignty of the God Yahu was to be restored over the north. In the end the *coup* failed. When Jehu, the general, was master of Samaria he, too, turned apostate and Athaliah asserted her claims in Jerusalem. But the religious movement lived on among the tribe of the Rechabites, which soon presented a strange spectacle. They were still a tribe, like other half nomad shepherd tribes, but at the same time they were a sect, led by a chief who was the founder of their religion. They were a host of peaceful shepherds who took up arms in their fanatical zeal for the glory of their God, Yahu, but did not hold the captured city of Samaria like other conquering tribes. They created an ideal past for Judah in the desert under the guidance of Yahu, an ideal framed in his likeness, of equality, asceticism, piety, and peaceful communion with Nature under the rule of a God who had neither temple nor graven image. Something new and personal was stirring here;

from the fanatical cult of Yahu which first found expression in the political field, and from disgust with an early phase of city capitalism, sprang a yearning for a loftier worship of God and conditions of life based upon natural righteousness. Just as the Romans set up the morally pure Germans as an ideal, and the eighteenth century the "honest countryman", so the rural Judeans idealized the "pious nomad shepherd tribe". A youthful and fertile impulse of piety clung to the idea of original universal equality and communion with God in the desert. The form of tribal organization, which in any case was in process of disintegration in consequence of settlement or partial settlement, came to be regarded as a communal organization of faith and aspiration. That is how the ideal of the "children of Israel" in the desert arose in response to the people's desires.

We cannot tell exactly when and how the tribe of Rechab became the sect of Rechabites. All that we know of Jehonadab ben Rechab is his political activities, and our knowledge of the sect's social ideals dates from a much later period, long after Amos. It may be, therefore, that the sect was strongly influenced by prophecy. Unquestionably the spirit which gave birth to the prophecy of Amos was very closely akin to the fanatical worship of Yahu that inspired the founder of the Rechabite sect, and to the general mood of the sect at a later period. We have no proof that Amos was a Rechabite, but his teaching is inspired by the same religious movement.

Amos created a new ideal of humanity. The beloved of God was no longer the king, distinguished by his royal birth or his elevation to the throne, like the Egyptian kings of the Eighteenth Dynasty or the Babylonian rulers of the Sargonid dynasty or the era of Gudea. Nor is he the priest whose learning and purity seems to mark him out as the chosen one, nor the merchant approved by the fruits of his peaceful industry. He is any human creature whom God holds worthy to be his mouthpiece, any human creature who gives ear to God's word and obeys it, who knows and worships the righteous and unimagined Ruler of all nations. Amos owned herds in Tekoah, Isaiah probably came of the citizen class in Jerusalem, Jeremiah was the son of a priest in a Jewish country district, and Ezekiel was the first to be a priest in the temple of Yahu upon Zion. But Yahu spoke through them all; all were God's chosen ones. The ideal of the divine favourite was democratized; it was no longer reserved for a particular class, neither of birth nor education nor wealth. Anyone might become the beloved of Yahu, anyone whom he commanded to speak, anyone who listened to his word and took it to heart. In the end it

made no difference in the ranks of this new aristocracy of divine favourites whether a man were a king or a priest, a merchant or a peasant or serf.

In the first instance, indeed, Amos appealed to the old ruling classes in Judah, the king and priests and merchants of Jerusalem, Samaria, Shechem, and Bethel, who were the representatives of the children of Israel, Yahu's Chosen People. He held out to the kings of David's house the prospect of world sovereignty, and to the priests of Yahu's temple that of being the priesthood of the chief sanctuary on earth. But they did not listen to him. Of the kings and priests in Samaria he demanded the abandonment of their idolatry, but was coolly and calmly sent about his business. Isaiah was the first prophet to gain a hearing from the king of Judah; he drew a picture of the Messianic glory awaiting a scion of David's house; he was able to point to Israel led away into captivity and Sennacherib's fall as proofs of divine inspiration and power. A prophetic party sprang up at court and in the ranks of the priesthood and at last remodelled the Jewish constitution; seventy years later, about 680 B.C., the descendants of David (Zephaniah) and the priests were prophets, and King Josiah became the Messianic ruler in 623-4.

This was a new type of monarchy. It is true that in Egypt Amenhetep IV had come forward as the founder of the religion of his god Aten and of the universal rule of peace, but his monotheistic worship of Nature was all too naturalistic, devoid of moral and social idealism, and all too narrowly confined to the king himself, setting him free to live according to Nature. It is true that in Babylon a monarchy arose which aimed at establishing an era of peace and prosperity for the people in the name of the royal god, Marduk, which subjected itself to a code of civil and criminal law and obeyed the guidance of omens, but it stopped short of full monotheism and rested content with a civil code and the sacerdotal arts of divination and purification. Josiah aspired to be the Messiah, the chosen king of the one universal God; like Amenhetep IV he stood near to Yahu as his beloved and a scion of the house of David, needing no priestly mediation; but he aspired at the same time to be an instrument for the salvation of mankind and the establishment of God's kingdom on a religious, moral, and social basis. He no longer felt himself bound by civil and sacerdotal law, but by the constitution of God's kingdom; every man had the right to admonish him regarding that covenant, and it was binding alike upon himself and his people.

It was the first time that a State was founded upon law in this

most far-reaching sense. The rights and duties of all concerned were embodied in a covenant with God, recorded in writing and deposited in the temple, solemnly acknowledged and ratified by the king and all the people. The first constitutional State, religious in character at this stage, had come into being.

It is true that the covenant "with God" was really nonsense, God cannot be a party to treaties, and consequently the covenant amounted on his side to a commandment, and the fulfilment of certain promises (the kingdom of God) was made dependent upon obedience to it. Only the king and his people were really bound by their obligation towards God. There is no word of constitutional rights and duties as between the king and his people, but they are contained in the germ in certain stipulations.

Unfortunately the only record that we have of Josiah's Law in the Old Testament (the Fifth Book of Moses) is a much revised version dating from the period of Exile. In reality the king's position must have been quite different. The chief commandment is that there should be only one God and one sanctuary throughout the land; the priests were restricted to the Temple and so lost in numbers and influence upon the country population. Jeremiah testifies to the commandment that Hebrew slaves should be set free, but it does not appear in *Deuteronomy*. Other humane commandments touching usury and the protection of widows and orphans must have been more emphatic. These were incipient human rights, confined at first to the Judeans, just as man's obligations were instilled towards the one righteous God of the universe who also, of course, imposed duties on the king towards his people, on the creditor towards the debtor, and on the Jew towards his fellow Jews.

The Messianic monarchy did not endure. It collapsed in the fourteenth year of the new era (608 B.C.) and was never revived. There were, indeed, later Messianic Pretenders of the house of David. In 519 B.C. Zerubbabel attempted a *coup* during the period of confusion when Darius usurped the Persian throne. The Persians overthrew him, and it is probable that the communities in Babylonia were not greatly distressed. They had long become altogether democratic; none but Yahu could be king.

In the eyes of Ezekiel, the priestly prophet whose influence was strongest in framing the Law during the Exile and cherishing the ideal of a restored temple and city of God, mankind was already one in the presence of the one God, and fell into two groups, the righteous and the sinners. The simple law which governed the world was this :

he who obeys the word of Yahu prospers, and he who departs from it suffers adversity. That involved a thorough-going democracy of the righteous ; kings were superfluous, and priests, too, as a matter of fact. Only the Book, the Word of Yahu, was indispensable.

But when the new Law was framed in the Exile, though the monarchy was cast aside, the Temple priesthood seemed indispensable in view of the promise, based upon a revised version of pre-Exile material—prophecy, legislation, and history—that Jerusalem and the Temple should be restored. The Torah knows nothing of any primeval kings except Pharaoh of the hardened heart ; the *Books of Kings* are zealous in demonstrating the wickedness even of the most glorious rulers ; and the moral of the parable of Jotham is that no decent creature will let himself be made king, but only a useless object like the bramble. True, it was only after Zerubbabel's overthrow that this was finally recorded in writing. The priests, on the other hand, did play a certain part in historical events beside the prophets, but more as priests by the grace of God in the sanctuary, like Samuel, than consecrated and learned Levites, like Zadok. And in particular the Law took a broad view of their service in the restored Temple.

Thus the priestly caste survived the Exile and outlived the house of David, even in the form of the hereditary Levite caste. But it was enfeebled and its power was broken, partly because it was confined to the one sanctuary in Jerusalem. Lacking relatives and colleagues among the people, it lost touch with the citizen class. In Jerusalem it repeatedly formed part of the ruling class in association with the wealthy citizens ; but the congregations whose offerings maintained the Temple kept a jealous watch and prevented any political pacts ; and the most jealous watch of all was kept by the priests' successors in the congregations, namely the scribes.

The first universal church, that of the Jews, was a scriptural church with a sacramental centre and a priestly aristocracy in the Temple. But the Pope and Cardinals of the ecclesiastical State at Jerusalem lacked the priests who should have been their tools in the congregations and might have made the priestly representative of the righteous an earthly sovereign. The priests were not called upon to interpret the Book, but only to offer sacrifice. It was lay scholars who interpreted the Scriptures—no priest could misuse them in order to gain earthly power. When the High Priest's authority as Chief Justice seemed to threaten some such development, the scribes and the pious in Jerusalem promptly intervened.

The first scribe was Ezra, who brought the Torah to Jerusalem in 458 B.C. and introduced it as the Law. Until the point at which God's Word thus reached its canonical completion as the rule and guide of right conduct among the Jews the leaders and directors of the people had been patriarchs and prophets, or men of God. From that time onwards they were interpreters of God's Word, men learned in the Scriptures.

They rapidly formed a new class ; we know that they underwent an apprenticeship, but they do not seem to have received consecration, nor were they necessarily distinct from the merchants and handicraftsmen. It was possible to be learned in the Scriptures besides being a merchant or farmer. The distinction arose because a scribe of repute was soon fully occupied with the public interpretation of the Scriptures in the synagogue, and with teaching, and particularly with leading and judging the community, for judgments must conform to the Word of God. To them, also, was committed the cure of souls, the removal of individual doubts and scruples.

The scribes and merchants formed the new Jewish city aristocracy just like the priests and merchants in Babylonia ; but spiritually, they were more united because the Scriptures were common property ; all had the duty of knowing them and the means of studying them thoroughly. For the first time people received instruction in the sense of universal education ; the first national schools, common to the whole people, sprang up. It is true that education consisted solely in the knowledge of the Holy Scriptures amongst a community of believers in Yahu, and the national schools only incidentally taught reading, writing, and arithmetic ; pupils were taught in the main to obey definite commandments, often very narrow in character, and to question the scribes. But the Scriptures contained a philosophy of life which had a bearing upon all problems, and there was no restriction upon the studies open to all ; in principle everybody was supposed to know the Scriptures, to judge for himself, and act in accordance with his convictions.

Thus far the first Jewish race evolved. They developed an ecclesiastical State in which a hereditary priestly caste confined to a particular locality offered sacrifice on behalf of a world-wide community—a number of scattered congregations in Hither Asia and Egypt dominated by a city aristocracy of scribes and merchants and maintaining the ecclesiastical State by their taxes ; over it all God ruling as king, and as the source of worldly authority, a tolerant great king, regarded as the least of a choice of evils, and maintaining

order and freedom of speech and trade in order that taxes might be levied. Such was the outcome of this first experiment in democracy and humanity and the unfolding of individuality. At bottom it involved the isolation of individuals as separate atoms; as human beings they stood singly before God with their individual claims and individual piety, free to think and act within the limits circumscribed by the law, united only by their opposition to the heathen. Compelled to live in a heathen military State, they were themselves without a State; that is, they could live a freer and more ideal life than other people in their own communities just because those others gave the Jews security for a civic life and humane activities, for order and commerce and worship in the Temple, under the protection of an earthly State—a gift for which they received no thanks. No greater calamity could befall Judaism than the conversion of the great kings or the heathen world, for the Jews, whether they were inspired by a universally human and Messianic outlook or by a primitive form of capitalism and free thought, were quite incapable of establishing and maintaining State organization; they were too critical for monarchy and too immature for a republic.

From the religious movement of the second Jewish race in its first prime sprang the dynastic High Priesthood of the Maccabees and the new "class" of the Pious, or Asidaeans, afterwards Pharisees. This class movement took place within the ecclesiastical State and adopted its outward forms. The new princes, whose existence would have been impossible elsewhere, were likewise Popes and High Priests, and the masses, who rose to a new importance, formed a religious party, almost a sect. The whole future development of the democracy was bound by religious restrictions. The Sanhedrim or High Council, half Government, half Supreme Court, under the presidency of the High Priest, was a religious authority. The parties in it—the Conservatives and Democrats, the Sadducee priests and the Scribes and Pharisees—were based upon religious differences. And the Zealot party was religious through and through; it succeeded in establishing the nationalist domination of the masses in town and country, a system of mob rule.

At first the Asidaeans consisted of large groups throughout the country who were in revolt against the oppression of the Seleucid kings and the apostasy of their own High Priests. But from the very beginning the movement was opposed to the rationalism of the scribes and in general to the city aristocracy in the communities.

It was an irrational movement, and its adherents believed in dying for their faith. For the first time the battle-cry was raised : " The church is suffering persecution ! " For the first time defenceless masses suffered martyrdom, turning their ecstatic gaze to a heaven opened to receive them.

It was this new democracy that supported the Maccabees. They ventured to get rid of the dynasty of the High Priest, convinced that there was no great risk involved in the violation of sacerdotal rights. It was impossible to establish a worldly dynasty straight-way ; the whole city and the countryside would have risen in revolt, if only because taxes and pilgrimages from other lands had ceased. But nobody mourned for the house of Zadok in the office of High Priest. Nor was the imperial papacy of the Maccabees mourned at a later date. Herod introduced a regular interchange of the office of High Priest among the Levite families : it ceased to be hereditary or a lifelong appointment, whilst Herod maintained his own position as guardian of the church and drew profit from it.

The governing body in the ecclesiastical State was now the Sanhedrim, comprising after 70 B.C. not only the Sadducees or priestly and aristocratic party of the Maccabee princes, and the scribes, but also the Pharisees. The Asidaeans had become the party of the urban masses, recognized in the central church government and consequently in all the congregations.

They demanded literal obedience to the Law without learned jugglery, and claimed that men's position and influence should depend on their piety, not on birth or possessions. The city aristocracy of scholars and merchants was forced to permit their ascent and to tolerate mystic other-worldly hopes in the interpretation of the Scriptures. Judaism was evolving from a civic-aristocratic religion, dominated by the educated classes, to a civic-democratic religion of the masses, inculcating belief in a future life. At this juncture it gave birth to the doctrine of Jesus, the doctrine of a loving, provident Father as God, and of man as the child of God who finds his heaven on earth in God and the love of his neighbour ; it was a wholly unpolitical doctrine, but it had thrown off all scholarly and capitalist elements.

At the same time, however, the mass movement became political. In the ecclesiastical State the Sanhedrim fell under the control of a nationalist mob. The scribes ceased to exercise any influence and the Zealots took the place of the Pharisees ; the Sadducees resisted, but were swept away by the assault of the masses. The High Priest

was now chosen by the thoroughly democratic and thoroughly fanatical method of drawing lots; by divine accident, that is. A social and political revolution occurred and Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus (A.D. 70), after a struggle by the inhabitants in defence of their Law (a ritual law, however), their Temple (Babylonian), and their walls.

But at the same time the new sect of Christians was established, based upon the teaching of Jesus. It preached the resurrection, for which the Pharisees had hoped, but preached it in a form unacceptable to Judaism. The Messiah, it was said, had come, had been crucified, and had risen again; he was the Son of God, a second God in heaven. For this doctrine the disciples died, as formerly the Asidaeans had died for their one God; and a Pharisee who had persecuted them consummated their doctrine and spread it in the Graeco-Roman world. Thus it was that Judaism became a religion of the masses—in the form of Christianity.

In consequence of outward events—the loss of their State and Temple and divine image and then, after the restoration of the Temple, the loss of the royal house of David, and lastly a second loss of the Temple with all its sacerdotal properties for purification and sacrifice—Judaism was so fortunate as to become a purely scriptural church (a church of synagogues), a peaceful civic democracy which adopted the forms of a theocracy governed by considerations of law and popular well-being, with the God Yahu as king of a world-wide community. It went far towards the realization of the great prophet's ideal of one God with one universal law of right conduct confronting one pious community whose members were equal, rational, and peace-loving. It was the misfortune of Judaism that its last and greatest prophet, Jesus, in whom it attained its religious and human consummation, opposed it through His disciples. After the impassioned conflicts within the pale of Judaism which resulted in the severance of Christianity, the Jewish world community isolated itself. It emerged from the period of persecution of Christians and Jews senile and dominated by the scribes.

### RELIGION

When we were considering Stone Age civilization we had to start with implements and the acquisition of fire, when considering the Egyptians we began with plastic and pictorial art and writing, the means by which they assimilated experience in visual-theoretical

form. When we came to the Babylonians it was already difficult to place their religion and philosophy at the end of our description as its consummation and crown. In the case of the Jews we must put it at the beginning, directly after their political history and constitution. For theirs was the first human civilization which aspired once more to unity and attained it, this time in a supreme concept though one which assumed the personal form of Deity ; and only in the light of that unity can we give an account of their civilization. Their survey of the universe was not yet fully scientific ; it was still religious rather than philosophic. But theory was powerful enough to demand the ideal scientific form, that of scientific, systematic deduction.

Like all other important systems of belief, Jewish religion started from Neolithic ideas. The tribal gods of the Canaanite and Aramaic desert tribes were the descendants of the solar bull god of Neolithic days, just like Min of Coptos and Mun of Nippur. In Arabic districts there must have been more local sanctuaries where the gods who were worshipped may be recognized as this same sun-god by their names and emblems ; such was the god Athtar of the Minaeans in southern Arabia, whose emblems were two solar discs, the upper one bearing horns. The fact is proved, too, by the widespread mountain and fire worship. These solar cults must, indeed, have been adapted to the country, and subject to cultural influences from Babylonia and Egypt. The worship of the moon and planets and the lunar month must have penetrated from Babylonia, and nomads found the lunar year more convenient than the agricultural year. Tammuz, the god of vegetation, who dies in the height of summer and is recalled to life by the autumn rains, was undoubtedly their chief pastoral god. The tribal fetishes, which were doubtless attached to the principal local sanctuaries in the desert as in later Arabic times, must also have shown traits of the solar cult ; certain names of tribes and gods, such as Yishra-el (the Warrior), Yishak-el (he who laughs), Jephthah-el (he who opens), may have echoed the memory of the great sun-god who opens the gates of the heavens in order to run his course, who mocks at men and is accustomed to prevail in battle. We may, too, connect a fetish like the snake of Ya'udi with the earth-snake of the solar myth. But in a general way the relation of the tribal fetishes to the gods of the mountain sanctuaries must have been that of the sun-worshippers' totem animals in the north to the sun-god.

When the people pushed forward into the cultivated land these tribal fetishes were established in village strongholds, and then,

if fortune were favourable, in the temple of a conquered city. In the cultivated districts there were likewise mountain sanctuaries where sun-worship had survived; we hear of circles of stone, like Gilgal, the principal sanctuary of the tribe of Benjamin, where Saul's kingdom had its origin. They must have served to determine the beginning of peasants' solar year, as in the North. But the city temples were the most important, and they were doubtless under the influence of Babylonian culture, even in the districts under Egyptian sovereignty. Omri's god in the newly established Samaria was a planet god, like Marduk, and even in the reign of Manasseh we observe the zeal with which the kings of Judah copied all the innovations of Assyrian metropolitan piety in honour of their own city god. There may have been a few bull idols; in Babylon, too, the lords of the year and the harvest, such as Enlil, were still occasionally referred to as bulls in the hymns. For the most part the city gods were represented in human form. The Jewish authors of the Torah are guilty of a pious lie when they speak contemptuously of heathen gods in Palestine and even in Phoenicia as bulls or calves. What they emphasized thus with conventional malice was believed by later generations who read the *Pentateuch*.

Among others the tribal fetish of Judah, the snake Yahu Nehushtan (the brazen serpent), was brought by David from the serpent's rock in Baal-Ya'ud to the Temple in Jerusalem. Here it was transformed in accordance with Babylonian ideas and endowed with the human shape and the divine nature by its priesthood, the snake tribe (called after the image of the snake, but in a different form, for the real snake-man, Nahshon, bearing the actual name of Nahushtan, was the ancestor of the royal house?) or Levites (leviathan—snake or dragon). At the time of Solomon, Yahu must have become a national and city god, altogether on the Babylonian model.

The great Babylonian gods were variations of the Neolithic sun-god, but they rapidly grew to be something more and became immortal gods of the universe and the stars, so that the appearance they presented was almost devoid of Neolithic traits. Yahu, coming from the desert as a tribal fetish, had few solar traits, and his assimilation to the Babylonian type did not add many, whilst the evolution of Judaism was such as to rob him altogether of his visible shape and his mythology and attempt to erase from the page of history his Babylonian image in the Temple. It is not surprising, therefore, that Yahu hardly retained any association with the prehistoric

solar religion : he remained only the Creator and Lord of the Flood, God the ruler and God the just judge ; all the rest was swept away. And even these characteristics he did not inherit direct from the Neolithic sun-god, but through the medium of Enlil-Marduk. Thanks to its own history and the achievements of the prophets and the labours of the authors of the Torah, the Jewish idea of God is the furthest removed from the Neolithic idea ; it was the first really exalted idea of God in human history. The sacred legend of the solar religion lived on only in the heroic romances of Moses and Samson, Joseph and David, and came to be part of the history of Israel.

In spite of the strenuous efforts of the authors of the Torah to "purify" the pre-prophetic idea of Yahu, the idea of a Babylonian national and city god in Solomon's Temple, we are nevertheless able to reconstruct it. Just like Enlil-Marduk, Yahu was the New Year's victor, the Creator of the universe, the King whose hands the ruler of Judah clasped at every New Year's festival. He conquered the dragon of Chaos, after exchanging abuse with him, as Marduk had done. He married—there was one Asherah, a variation of Ishtar, in the Temple, besides accommodation for the women consecrated to her service, the Temple prostitutes who wove for her. And just as in Babylon right down to the Persian era Marduk would seem to have died annually and risen again in the popular ritual but not according to learned doctrine, so Yahu appeared in the character of Tammuz ; he died and Ezekiel heard the unwelcome sounds of lamentation for him in the Temple upon Zion in the early days of the Exile. In general, Yahu, as the sole city god of the southern kingdom, seems to have united in his own person all the characteristics that were distributed amongst the great gods in Babylonia : he was Lord of Heaven like Anu, Lord of Hosts—that is, of all the constellations—like Anu-Enlil-Ea ; he was a sun-god in whose honour the kings of Judah had placed sun-steeds and sun-chariots in the Temple. Before him stood the candlestick of the planets, with seven branches, the abyss (Apsu, the brazen sea), and the shew-bread (as a god of harvest). The Temple cannot have lacked either a ziggurat or a chamber of destinies. One thing only was certainly never to be found in the Temple before the Exile : the ark of Israel. It was lost at Ashdod, and nothing could be clumsier than the attempt of the learned men in the Torah to represent it as having been brought back by David, the friend of the Philistines, and to substitute it for Nehushtan when the God of Judah was installed in the Temple.

Nor was the God of the Covenant, Baal-berith, ever in Jerusalem; he remained in Shechem, where Jeroboam I had created him.

On the other hand there was unquestionably an image of Yahu in the Temple, still clearly traceable in the traditions; there may also have been one of his consort.<sup>1</sup> Ezekiel speaks openly of the "image of jealousy" in the Temple. Moreover, the passage in *Amos* (ix, 1), where Yahu, standing upon the altar, commands the prophet to "cut them in the head" "that the posts may shake" can only be a summons to destroy the idol. The pillar Jachin with ninety-six pommels round the head is the image of Yahu with a halo of stars, and the pillar Boaz perhaps the image of his consort akin to Bau (a mother-goddess of fertility). In spite of the clumsy efforts of the exiled editors of the prophetic books and *Books of Kings*, we can detect the true facts, as we can likewise in Isaiah's vision, which positively describes Yahu's image in the Temple in a Babylonian god's mantle, enthroned, with serpents on the throne in the Babylonian manner (the seraphim against whom Nehushtan was later to be set up); the vision only intensifies and exalts the whole to something vast and immense.

It was in contrast with this seated image that Hezekiah destroyed the animal image of Yahu as unworthy, at the instigation of Isaiah. It was the one image in the land in the one sanctuary that survived Josiah's reform. Ezekiel in his vision saw it still standing in the Temple between 597 and 586 B.C. It was this image (or pair of images) and not the ark, that migrated to Babylon in 586 B.C. and was placed in Marduk's temple, where we lose sight of it. We can trace the evolution of prophecy, which demanded a cult without idols even through the mouth of Amos. First the animal image was done away with in 703 B.C., then all the other idols in the country were destroyed, leaving a monotheistic faith with a single image (622 B.C.), until finally the happy misfortune of the destruction in 586 B.C. removed this last image, the abomination of the prophets, from the Temple. A pious deception among the exiled people was free to deny its existence and wipe out all traces of it.

The creator of the Jewish philosophy of life, the first great poet-thinker in Judah, was Amos of Tekoah, not Moses who, as we shall demonstrate, was nothing but the pious invention of a later age. Nor was it one of the "major" prophets, such as Isaiah, for they were all disciples and successors of Amos. Amos was the first and greatest prophet; the world as seen by Jewish idealism,

<sup>1</sup> See my essay on *Das Jahubild im Tempel*. Memnon, 1911.

with all its new and characteristic features, was his vision and creation; he was greater than all who came after him, with the single exception of Jesus of Nazareth.

Amos (his name was that of the Egyptian conqueror of the Hyksos) was the owner of herds and a farmer, in so far as that was possible in Tekoah, in the land of the southern tribes. All that we know of his life is that Yahu forced him to leave his herds and serve him, and that once he came forward publicly as a prophet (about 760 B.C.) in the national sanctuary at Bethel and proclaimed the fall of Israel. He was turned away to Jerusalem and the city god whom he served. He went, loudly protesting that he was no "crier" given to ecstasies and aiming at personal gain or revolt, and cursed the High Priest who had turned him away. We are told nothing further of his life; none of his prophecies were fulfilled in his lifetime, no miracle of Yahu bore witness in his favour. He died unheard. Because he had no outward adventures, because his prophecies remained unfulfilled during his lifetime and no miracles occurred, because he was neither exalted nor persecuted, he was unfitted for the heroic part of the founder of Yahu's religion in a romantic mythology. There was, besides, his own assertion that he had only come to restore the primeval desert religion in all its purity. Monotheism, like monism, is addicted to static concepts, to a belief in the eternally unchanging and valid, and the expression of this tendency in history is an appeal to a primeval truth established from the beginning.

Amos was a prophet. He knew that God spoke through him. He saw God standing upon the altar in the Temple and heard him roaring from Zion; he was irresistibly impelled to speak the words that God put in his mouth and to tell what God showed him in parables. There had been prophets before him in Babylonia and Palestine who foretold the future without the learned paraphernalia of the priests. They were known as ecstasies, *Nebiim*, Criers. Amos declared emphatically that he had nothing in common with them; he was not an ecstatic, but a reasonable, peaceable man, possessed by the awful and blessed consciousness that he was the mouthpiece of God, who knew by direct inspiration what God, the essence of wisdom and righteousness, must necessarily do with the apostate people. He proclaimed his knowledge and wrote it down so that it could not be forgotten. He knew that it must come

to pass. Naturally he did not produce a clear, systematic sequence of ideas. We have to deduce his premises and his new philosophy of life from repeated announcements of the coming disaster, from parables and visions. His main principles emerge piecemeal, almost incidentally, but refashioned time and again. Amos himself only proclaims their grandeur and significance in outbursts of emotion as he stands trembling before the Lord of the Universe, pleading for the sinful people like Noah-Uta-napishtim and convinced again and again that no pleading may find favour. Amos was merely a man, "an herdsman and a dresser of sycamore-trees" in the sight of God; he was neither king nor priest. It was God's grace that made him a personality, not his own creative talent. He was a prophet, not a philosopher. But within those limits he was the first free personality, the first thinker-poet of the human race who earned a name and an individual destiny.

In the centre of his new philosophy of life was the new idea of the Deity. It fell to the Babylonians to set a gulf between deity and humanity, to make an end of the childish idea of the Egyptians and still simpler peoples that the two were on an equality. The Babylonians believed that man dies and remains dead whilst God lives for ever, that man, even as a king, is weak and foolish, dependent and servile, whilst God is strong and wise, and sovereign. There was no bridge across the gulf; even in death no funeral rites, nor any spell nor confession of sin, could make men gods. Amos made the gulf even wider, and proceeded to the utmost lengths. God was all, and beside him not only man but the whole world was petty and insignificant. It was an excess of grace that any creature should be permitted to know and proclaim God. But man has that power, and Israel, as mediator, must use it. That was the uttermost possibility of approach to God; there was none greater. But it did restore contact between God and man. Whilst God was so exalted that beside him the whole world faded away, man won a privileged position as that part of the world that can know God and serve him by righteousness. The childish heathen Egyptians thought they could become one with God in death; the learned heathen Babylonians recognized the distinction between God and man, but God was still too closely linked with Nature and they were still too much concerned with petty sensual desires for prosperity and offspring. Amos fully realized the gulf dividing the Creator from his creatures, but he also realized the joy of knowing the Creator in his might, and wisdom and holiness. From the humblest realization

of the gulf dividing God from man there blossoms the pride of realization, from the most resolute separation a feeling of nearness to God, a mystic sense not of oneness but of gazing upon God and following in his footsteps. Man exalts God infinitely far above himself, and behold, he too has grown and stands before God, made in his likeness, endowed with reason and morality, free because he recognizes God's wisdom and righteousness and deduces thence his own duty to be wise and righteous.

God is one God, single and alone ; there can be no other beside him, but only his creation, dust that he has made and endowed with life, humble before him and strong in his might, or opposing him in a senseless and futile revolt. God fashioned the mountains and made the wind, he made an upper chamber of the heavens and rested its vault upon the earth ; he summoned the waters of the sea and created the stars. When he touches the earth it melts and rises and falls on all sides, like the Nile in Egypt. He is the Lord of Nature who turns the dark night into day and darkens the day at night-time ; he is the Lord of the nations. He brought the Philistines from Crete and the Aramaeans from Kir. He led Israel out of Egypt, and destroyed the Amorites before them, whose height was like the height of the cedars and who were as strong as the oaks. He chastises the people with famine and plague. No misfortune comes but by his will.

Such a supreme God could not be an image, a piece of metal or stone fashioned by the hands of men ; it was blasphemy so to abase him. He had no material form, he could not be sun or planet, storm-wind or the breath of life. Amos, it is true, saw and heard and felt him, but only in spirit, and when he represented him as striding across mountains or standing upon the altar, that was only a symbol of his greatness or his desire to be worshipped at the altar and not in the Temple image. Naturally he had no earthly needs ; he neither ate nor drank, and sacrificial feasts and processions were an abomination to him. He had no dwelling-place ; his city of Jerusalem and his Temple were merely symbols of Israel's position as the Chosen People. He was everywhere—not in heaven nor in hell, not on the mountains nor in the sea was his dwelling, but his hand reached the wicked in all those places.

Nor was his spirit human. He loved and hated, indeed, yet not from impulse and whim like men, but as the outcome of a free and holy zeal for wisdom and righteousness. It was God's will that men should know him by their reason and should serve him in holiness and righteousness ; it was his will that mankind should see and

worship him in truth, and that peace and justice should prevail on earth. And because of his holy will, he revealed and circumscribed himself.

When the world was young he chose one people before all others, Israel. He worked special miracles with them, led them out of Egypt through the desert, destroyed the gigantic Amorites before them, made his dwelling in their midst upon Zion, accepted a temple and a ritual of worship, and only required that the people should serve him truly as the one God, without idols, without sacrificial display and orgies, by leading holy lives. "Take away from me the noise of thy songs; for I will not hear the melody of the viols. But let judgment roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream." Revelling and usury, luxury and cheating, the ill-treatment of widows and orphans and those of small account, and acts of violence were to cease. For Israel's example was to convert the surrounding nations so that they should come and worship in the Temple.

But Israel turned apostate and was guilty of polytheism and idolatry and every sin, wherefore the Lord was obliged to chastise it again and again so that it might amend. He sent Amos to proclaim all his commandments once more so that the people might turn and repent. Amos, however, saw that they would not repent; the curse would be fulfilled to the utmost and after the plagues the people would be led captive to a life of misery. He pleaded for the people, he hoped for the grace of God, which could not fail in its effect, although ingratitude embittered him in the course of time (just because Israel was the Chosen People it must be punished with double severity). And Yahu was not bound to Israel like an idol to his city which housed him and fed him and paid him honour. Amos procured a postponement; but in the distance he saw the coming judgment and clung in vain to the hopeful vision of a prosperous era to follow afterwards.

That was the Jewish philosophy of life as Amos first shaped it in prophecies of disaster, wherein all the notes are first sounded that characterize the great poetry of the Psalms, the mighty utterance of a vital religious impulse. One God created the world; he, the Uncreated, stood contrasted with all created things (the fundamental contrast was now "created and uncreated", not "mortal and immortal"); he was the very essence of all power in Nature and in history (the Almighty), the sole cause of all that happened, the essence of all wisdom (omniscient), truth, and righteousness. He was omnipresent; the concept of omnipresence was foreshadowed in

numerous images of his immensity, his progress across the loftiest mountains, his being nowhere yet active everywhere. Great was his loving-kindness ; he granted the people his revelations so that all nations might be converted. Although in truth he did not need them for his happiness (as the Babylonian city god had done up to a certain point) he was resolved to unite all nations peacefully in his kingdom.

So it was that beside the one God there appeared one Chosen People as the germ of a united human race, the kingdom of God upon earth. The link between the two was the prophet, the chosen messenger of God (not a king or priest). Man, the people, the individual, acquired a worth because they had been chosen (and because they gave ear and acted righteously). And the relation between God and his people was governed by a law, the necessary outcome of God's nature and will. God was bound by it, but only because his nature and his holy will was its source ; and it provided the people with a sure guide for their conduct. If they committed the one sin of apostasy, they would suffer even to annihilation, for God was essentially just and could tolerate no sin. If they gave ear and were converted, God's will would be fulfilled in them and they would stand first among the nations and convert them, enjoying honour and prosperity before all men in a peaceful world gathered around Zion. The kingdom would come.

Thus everything that the people and the individual Jew needed to know was summed up and unified ; everything could be explained by the nature of the one God and his relation to Judah and to mankind.

In this creative remoulding of Judaic-Israelite-Babylonian religion, only fragments survived of the Neolithic solar religion (the Creation, the Flood, the periods of disaster, and prosperity—longer periods taking the place of the New Year—the solar features of Yahu's image), and only fragments were borrowed from the national religion of Jeroboam I ("Israel" as the name of the people in the desert ; the journey out of Egypt—all transferred to Yahu of Jerusalem). All these fragments were exalted by religious speculation and re-interpreted. Naturally there was nothing in the prophecy of Amos about Moses and the law-giving in the desert, nor about the ark of the covenant. It was a century and a half later that the name of Moses first appeared, in *Jeremiah*, but not as a law-giver, and the Law "from the desert" is mentioned as being discovered by Josiah. It was not till the time of the Exile that the ark of the covenant could

be discovered.<sup>1</sup> Yahu's image in the Temple was also a troublesome survival as well as the whole political and religious condition of Judah and Israel. It was the result of apostasy, said Amos, but every child in Israel and Judah, to say nothing of the educated, knew better: Amos was an innovator, ruthless beyond measure, who attacked blasphemously all that was sacred and established and was only treated with forbearance because his innovations were so unacceptable, even in Judah, that nobody could take them seriously. For the first time all things were attacked from the ideal point of view of what ought to be, in the name of the Deity and in reference to a purely imaginary primeval era, with all the power of conviction possessed by one who was himself convinced so that all the yearning for happiness in the souls of the rulers and the oppressed people was unloosed. Amos was the first great revolutionary in human history.

A few disciples gave ear to his teaching, but they only indicated their adherence to his ideas by the choice of their names (Amos had another name for daily use). Isaiah called himself "the Son of Amoz"; he may have expressed his discipleship thereby and an editor in exile would later have effaced his meaning by the change of a letter. The recognition of individual character had not gone far enough for Amos to be honoured as a genius; he was worthy of attention only as God's mouthpiece. So, too, his disciples obtained their sanction not from their relation to him, but because of Yahu's call; they, like their master, were prophets through whom Yahu spoke.

Micah the Morasthite ("who is like Yahu?") and Isaiah ("Yahu helps") were disciples of Amos. The former was a countryman from the south, like Amos, an impassioned preacher of Yahu's greatness in the words of Amos, as his name declares. The latter seems to have come of a city family; he was more closely bound up with Jerusalem, as his home, than was Amos; his was a creative spirit, and after the judgment had been fulfilled against Israel in 722 B.C. he would gladly have taken every blessing by storm for Judah.

Isaiah was the first professional prophet, not as a *nabi*, but as understood by Amos. Amos himself laid stress upon the fact that he was only "an herdman and a dresser of sycamore trees", and a prophet because of a temporary call. Isaiah developed what Amos had foreshadowed and what he had taught. Besides his symbolic

<sup>1</sup> Naturally the editors of the Prophetic Books in exile introduced their mythology by means of small interpolations (e.g. *Micah* vi, 9), just as they blotted out the struggle of Amos against Yahu's image in the temple and the very existence of the image.

name there was his elaborate vision of God's summons, and the brief prophecies and parables swelled to mighty exhortations. But the doctrine became gentler and more homelike, more in character with Jerusalem. Just as in the vision of Isaiah's calling God adopts features of the image in the Temple, so the Messiah is to be a prince of the house of David, closely linked with Judah's glory. All was still on a grand scale, but it was more humanly familiar, and we hear the note of consolation sounded in the Psalms and the human, caressing warmth of the *Song of Songs*. As the alluring herald of the glory of David's house and of Jerusalem, Isaiah won support for the new teaching in Judah's capital after its truth had been proved by Israel's captivity in 722 B.C. and Sennacherib's defeat in 703. At least the animal image of Yahu was done away with and a prophetic party was formed.

Josiah's Law (623-2 B.C.) was the outcome of the development set in motion by Isaiah. It was a revolution from above profiting the house of David and the Levites. Its achievement was one image, one sanctuary, a reform of the ritual of worship, and the beginnings of social reform. Thenceforward there was a covenant between Yahu and the people, a law alleged to have been brought with the people from the desert. But Moses was not yet associated with it; to Jeremiah he was only a righteous man, like Job.

Jeremiah ("Yahu casts away"), the son of a priest from Anathoth (that is, one of the sanctuaries that were abolished in 622 B.C.), was the most personal of the Jewish prophets. We know a great deal about his sufferings when Jerusalem fell; at times we can follow his spiritual strivings almost from day to day, his despairing struggle between God's stern command and his longing yet to see judgment averted from his people. At this point the psychology of the Deity and of his instrument was elaborated: God was supernaturally great and without material form, yet at the same time human and natural in his omnipotence and holiness. The covenant in the desert, the worship of Yahu in Shiloh, the choice of Jerusalem as the second dwelling-place of God, were all embodied in the history of Israel. Its sins explained the vicissitudes it had suffered since the days of Amos.

Jeremiah proved right. Yahu cast away, Jerusalem fell in 586 B.C. and the image in the Temple was carried off. Ezekiel ("El gives strength"; the general name for God replaced the local name which now became "sacred" and so was not to be uttered), a high-born Levite who had been led into captivity with Jeconiah in 597 B.C.

and had settled in Babylonia, carried prophecy critically and systematically to its consummation. He supplied dates to his historical record (by an era based upon the finding of the Law in 622 B.C.), he fabricated a "great" vision of his own calling and Yahu's plan, which was proved by the history of Israel since Noah and Abraham. He announced the revitalization of the dead nation and the New Jerusalem. He declared the principle upon which Yahu's deeds rested: the righteous prosper, the sinner is overtaken by misfortune.

One last great prophet, once more called Isaiah ("Yahu helps") accompanied the campaigns of Cyrus in Hither Asia, the siege of Babylon, and its fall, by his mighty utterances of comfort and promise to Israel, the servant of God that bears the sin of the world, but shall soon receive his reward of salvation and sovereignty over the whole world. With him the great prophetic era closed.

In order to be effective, the new knowledge of God and the world attained by Amos had to be adapted to reality and developed. That was the achievement of the great prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, and Ezekiel. Isaiah's and Jeremiah's prophecies of 703 and 586 were immediately fulfilled. At the same time Isaiah founded a prophetic party and made the interests of the house of David, the Levites, and the nationalists serve his idea. Jeremiah transformed the teaching of Amos into something more personal, and more learned and logical. Ezekiel established a record of the national history, explained in every detail and chronologically exact, and deduced from it a sure rule of right conduct for every individual. All three, the great preacher and patriot, the suffering servant of a God at once human and yet awful in his holiness, and the powerful logician and builder of systems, contributed to the creation of the new universal law.

In Neolithic days the sun's yearly course had been the first visible example of natural law to be grasped; it had been translated into imagery and myth and all manner of conclusions based upon analogy had been drawn from it. Amongst the Egyptians and Babylonians this had developed into a doctrine of man's interest in serving God. The Babylonians drew a sharp distinction between gods and men, representing the gods as mighty and immortal but benevolent, and men as altogether dependent and transitory. Between the two a legal relation subsisted based upon a covenant to the effect that the gods had made the earth in order that men might serve them, that prayer and sacrifice and processions might please and exalt them, and that omens and all manner of blessings or curses might guide, reward,

and punish men ; thus both gods and men would benefit. This legal relation based upon a covenant implied something in the nature of a law proclaimed by the gods and acknowledged like the Code of Khammurabi, to be obeyed by men in their own interests, and this view occasionally found expression (Balta-atrua). But the right of the stronger was always on the side of God in a covenant lacking definite form, and man was in the wrong. Even if he revolted for once, he could only claim divine help for the moment in his individual case ; if Balta-atrua were saved from ruin, he was content. Amos discerned as the essence of godhead uniform Being, the supreme concept in a system of static concepts, and uniform power and causality, the supreme concept of flux and the passage of events. All that is, is God the Creator or his creation ; all that happens is the work of God. But for all their superhuman character, these supreme concepts remained human. Events were explained by God's righteousness and were of interest only in so far as they could be so explained and brought into relation with morality. The processes of Nature were regarded with indifference except in so far as they showed forth God's supernatural greatness. The notion of law began to emerge in general outline ; all that happens is inevitable, so Amos taught, for a mighty world force works in all things, of necessity, according to its own eternally unchanging nature. But that was not natural law, for God freely created the world and could destroy it ; he had prescribed its course and naturally he could interrupt it by miracles. It was only moral law, for God was still bound in his actions as a moral being (except for a remnant of procrastinating mercy) ; he was bound to punish a sinful people and reward the righteous. There is still something Babylonian in his notion of the one inescapable law, something of the augur's indifference to the settled course of Nature, and something of the commercial-juridical outlook characteristic of royal decrees, the commands of a superior power, law as Khammurabi understood it. Nevertheless, the intellectual advance was immense and came near to the pure concept of natural law and the demand for obedience to moral law.

The great prophets were faced with the task of demonstrating the nature of God in its influence upon human life and deducing the law that governs God's actions. The prophecies of Amos concerning Israel's apostasy and inevitable captivity evolved into a philosophy of history designed to explain all Israel's vicissitudes from the Flood till the return from Exile, as the result of election and apostasy, especially the events between 760 and 580 B.C. The demand

of Amos that the people should amend their ways evolved into a Law that ordained worship of the one God without images and contained moral rules of social conduct. At first it made concessions to the Levites and the image worshipped in their sanctuary, and in 622 B.C. it was codified. Finally Ezekiel formally proclaimed the personal responsibility of all individuals for their sins and the personal claim of all individuals to the reward of piety.

Upon this foundation the exiled authors of the Torah and the *Books of Kings* set to work. They were anonymous but very able scholars who gave the Holy Scriptures of Judaism and the future world community their first rounding off between 550 and 450 B.C.

Their work was the primeval history of the world and the people of Israel, the romantic and miraculous picture of the Exodus from Egypt, the journey through the desert, and the entry into Canaan, designed to prove that Yahu was the God of Israel, the God who had worked the mightiest miracles. There follows the history of Israel, or in other words a flawless proof, in the nature of a legal document, that Yahu had always acted according to his plan of rewarding piety and punishing apostasy and had announced all coming events beforehand through his prophets, and that alike the people and their leaders and kings had inclined to apostasy and were therefore punished by God, as they had previously been exalted.

Their work, too, was the Law, the elaborate rules for the constitution of the kingdom of God and his future non-idolatrous worship (for the image of Yahu had been cleared away by the Chaldaeans) in the Temple through the Levites, and the equally elaborate rules governing the lives of the priests and the whole people (purification and sanctification, with no clear distinction separating ritual from social and moral conduct). The whole was attributed to the period of wandering in the desert, especially the external methods of separation from the heathen which were characteristic of the exiled church; such were the rule of circumcision (adopted by Judah from Egypt in the period of subjection, 1580 to 1180 B.C.) and the observation of the Sabbath (an innovation of the period of Exile intended to emphasize the enlightenment which turned the unlucky seventh day of the heathen into a day consecrated to the honour of God).

The supreme achievement in summing up the Law is embodied in the decalogue, the Ten Commandments. There, too, an unlucky number is explained away and transformed into a sacred number. The injunction to worship Yahu alone without graven images and without taking his name in vain (oaths and curses), to keep the

Sabbath day holy and to honour father and mother is the positive, commanding half of the decalogue; the prohibition of murder, adultery, theft, bearing false witness, and coveting a neighbour's possessions is the negative, forbidding half. The first half gives expression to a pure conception of the divine and the general demand for a natural, moral family relation; the second half expresses in negative form a general system of human morality upon the same natural basis of family life. These were great logical and ethical achievements, nor are they impaired by the fact that the prohibition of idolatry destroyed the arts, and that the moral rules laid down are of quite general human import and pay no heed to the State and the nation. If man was to ascend he had to discover man before he could reach the higher plane upon which he was a citizen and a member of the national community. The prohibition of swearing (taking oaths), of bearing false witness, and of coveting a neighbour's possessions was a blow directed straight at the capitalist spirit of commerce and greed which the prophets had combatted.

Naturally when the great new philosophy of life put forward by Amos was adapted to reality, to the desires of the house of David and the Levites by Isaiah's party up to 622 B.C., and to the needs of a world-wide community in Babylon by Ezekiel's successors between 550 and 450 B.C., the result was a certain tendency to shallowness and triteness; but that is the price of all mass influence. Isaiah is associated with the externalizing influence of the nationalists, Ezekiel with that of the priests and citizens who tended to adopt Babylonian customs. Nevertheless, the original grandeur of the movement remained in all its force and vigour in the Holy Scriptures. The Jewish universal church, as it now developed between the fifth and third centuries B.C., was a great achievement, even when the Temple was still standing and the purely scriptural church was yet unrealized; it was unique and new; it appeared within the orbit of Babylonian culture bringing salvation and fulfilment to the upper classes. In Yahu the great gods attained perfect unity, as essence and cause, and a simple Law took the place of the ceaseless consultation of oracles and acts of purification. God and the Law dominated men's lives, and even the mediation of the priests was restricted to very few occasions and receded into the distance. In every sphere we observe a reasoned process of simplification, of liberation from forms and superstitions, and a loftier humanity and morality. It was especially noticeable in the ritual of worship which was simple and grand even in the Temple; in the synagogues it came to consist of a plain reading

of the Scriptures with a sermon and singing. Judaism would surely have dominated the Assyro-Persian world empire, if the Persians had not brought with them an equally lofty religion, and if the empire had not been overthrown by the Greeks and their more advanced civilization.

Amos was the child of the Rechabite religious movement,<sup>1</sup> which was followed by a rational development of his doctrine down to Josiah's law-giving. A second religious revival began with Jeremiah and continued till the close of the Exile. It found expression in the labours of the scribes who had undertaken the interpretation of the Scriptures in the congregations since the days of Ezra (458 B.C.) and so came to be the new servants of God. They read the Scriptures aloud, translated them as God's linguists (for Hebrew was then a dead language), interpreted them to the congregation as preachers, to the individual members as pastors and judges (God's jurists), and to their pupils great and small as teachers; thus they kept the Scriptures in harmony with the peoples' lives, with their demand for guidance in right conduct, according at once with the dictates of reason and the promise of God. Theirs was no easy task, for Judaism, as the first rational world religion, was proud of its ability to convince all doubters. Everyone was to have free access to the Scriptures, everyone was to be convinced.

Jewish scepticism, whether in the individual soul or in the form of scientific doubt, attacked the fundamental law of just rewards for the righteous and for sinners which Ezekiel had proclaimed as the certain rule of every individual lot.<sup>2</sup> So long as the Law applied only to the people as a whole, it could be proved with the help of a few bold distortions of history. The whole system of historical interpretation adopted by the authors of canon law served the sole purpose of

<sup>1</sup> It is always religious movements that usher in the first prime of a new civilization and dominate the first century of its second prime, besides its end sometimes. Whenever a new class comes to the fore, it rises out of such a movement. Thus the Egyptians demonstrably went through a religious revival between 2550 and 2450 B.C. (the IVth and Vth Dynasties; first culture, second prime), then again between 2800 and 2200 B.C. (second culture, first prime), and between 1880 and 1280 B.C. (third culture, second prime). So also in Babylonia in 2800 B.C. (first culture, first prime), and 2800 B.C. (second culture, first prime). It is not till we come to Judah that we have plentiful material of known date recording all such movements.

<sup>2</sup> The *Gaudeamus* philosophy lay far behind. We hear only occasional echoes of it in the heathen materialism which said: "Let us eat and drink, for to-morrow we die." The Jews lived in a world of loftier thought, in the idealism of their ecstatic love of God, though they knew that they must die without the hope of resurrection.

proving it. If again and again the kingdom failed to come, it was due to the nations' (the High Priests') repeated offences against God, and, after all, the nation was immortal and could wait. But the validity of the law in relation to individuals was another matter, and this was what Ezekiel had claimed, and was bound to claim if the Jewish religion was to count with the individual and to serve as a guide to right conduct. Here inevitably it must often prove that the righteous suffered misfortune and the sinner prospered, not momentarily but permanently. And here there could be no waiting, for death ended all. The scribes, who were called upon everywhere to reconcile the Law with daily life, were bound very soon to come up against this difficulty. They took refuge in the demonstration that here some commandment must have been overlooked and there another misunderstood, in learned logic and legal hair-splitting, and wove a web of interpretations around the Torah which at best was not altogether simple, so that righteousness, as they understood it, came to depend altogether upon formalities and interpretations. Judaism began to resemble the Babylonian system; instead of the great, free view of God and man adopted by Amos, a narrow system of calculation and purification arose, a dependence upon scholarship arrogantly and prosaically controlled by a caste of laymen; only they were no longer priests.

Nevertheless the formula of rewards and punishments could not escape investigation; it was the consequence of God's inmost being, his universal justice. To undermine it was to expose the whole doctrine to doubt. The fruits of this questioning spirit were the *Book of Job* and *Ecclesiastes*, the Book of Solomon the Preacher. These were the two chief sceptical works in the domain of Jewish culture.

Job was a righteous man and yet he suffered. The romance of Job, the framework of the book and its oldest part, explains his sufferings as a trial, which God allows and for which he compensates by restoring to the tried and righteous man all that he had and more besides. That is fairly close to Babylonian scepticism, though on a higher plane in that the problem is posed in a more general fashion (it is the story-teller who assures us of Job's innocence, and not the hero, who might deceive himself) and God's right to test piety to the utmost is humbly acknowledged. Job's argument with his friends goes further; in it Job is more individual in character, he complains and accuses, though not till his friends call him a sinner. The keener logic and the loftier idea of God put the

hero in the position of the accused, who must clear himself and others who are righteous like him of the suspicion of guilt. And his defence necessarily becomes an accusation against God. In the end the subject of discussion is not the sufferings of the righteous man, his losses and maladies, but God's holiness ; man, who has made God his ideal, the essence of all that is sublime, the sole treasure of man, demands that he be righteous and holy, and prove himself so in his visible government. That is much more than Balta-atrua asked, whose trouble is solved if the gods will intervene and help him in his distress, his material and spiritual misery caused by murderers and robbers. Job wants to retain his ideal of divine worth not his house and his honour ; God must render account, if he is indeed God and no devil ; the problem is posed on quite a general, metaphysical basis ; it is a question of the supreme value in life. For that reason it contains a tragic element, not merely in the form of the debate between several persons (not two only), or dialectical inquiry, but at the very heart of the philosophy propounded. There was nothing tragic about the Babylonians ; God may help Balta-atrua or not, he is none the less God, for power is his. The Jews demanded that God should justify himself ; otherwise this infinitely exalted Being is not God, but a hard, capricious superman, possessing power without any moral sanction ; with such a God the world is worthless, utterly worthless, since God is the essence of worth.

The *Book of Job* finds no answer to his question. That it was pronounced to be inspired is proof not only of freedom of thought among the Jews in the period of struggle against the Greeks, and of their universal sense of doubt, but also of their sure conviction that such doubt can only glorify God and exalt him. Solomon the Preacher thought a solution of the problem impossible ; nevertheless, he clung to his faith. God's image was not destroyed, it could be preserved and shown to be ideal, though absolute proof was beyond human powers. But the thinker was overcome with profound gloom ; his values were undermined ; what remained ?

"All is vanity," all wisdom, all earthly values are empty ; all action is uncertain, and men must be pliant and find a way somewhere between excessive piety and excessive wickedness ; and man perishes like the beasts. This is the Jewish companion piece to the Babylonian *Dialogue between a Master and Serf*. Babylon teaches by concrete example that adequate reasons can be found for every course of action ; Judaism is plunged in gloom at disappointed hopes that the highest ideals may find justification, despairing of man's

ability to know with certainty and to act justly, feeling abased to the level of the beasts which also win through, but are spared the torment of thought.

At this point the new (third) religious movement started, ushering in the first flowering time of the second Jewish race. Rationalism was bankrupt and had confessed as much ; it was succeeded by an irrational philosophy of life. The High Priests, who were tax-farmers under the Seleucids, betrayed their sacred trust as guardians of the Temple ; the jugglery and cunning of the scribes failed either to protect the church or to satisfy daily spiritual needs. Then the people rose, the Asidaeans, the new Pious sect ; they fought and died for their faith and saved the Temple and the philosophy of Judaism. And God, who had turned away from the rest, was with them as he had been with their fathers ; he performed miracles and did not fail.

The Pharisees (derived from "*parash*", to split or divide), or Separatists, rose up as a Jewish party from the ranks of the Asidaeans, as did also the actual sects, such as the Essenes. Theoretically they were faced with the old problem of righteousness, the conduct that confers blessedness ; they did not, however, grapple with it in a formal, juridical spirit, but emotionally. What was needful was to live a holy life, to serve God simply and sincerely, and God would accomplish all things. The Pharisees taught that the law must be obeyed literally in daily life, without cunning interpretation. The Essenes taught men to withdraw from the world, to abjure trade, to live a life of monastic asceticism, to eat their bread in the sweat of their brow as tillers of the soil, and so to avoid temptation to sin. And both held that God must not be called to account for his actions, for man is not capable of judging. The living God is almighty. If piety and sin are not justly rewarded in life, God can make good through death and after death by recalling the righteous to life and gathering them to himself and leaving the sinners among the dead, or, if he recalls them to life, consigning them to a place of punishment.

The Jewish sectaries introduced the hope of immortality and everlasting life in the kingdom of God into Judaism. That was how their irrational philosophy overcame doubt and opened the way for the universal church to win over the masses among the heathen. Texts were soon found in the Scriptures capable of supporting the new hope, although their interpretation was very bold and not very scholarly. For in this matter the new school was flatly opposed to the beliefs of the prophets and orthodox teachers ; it broke away

from one of the fundamental doctrines of classical Judaism which taught that man dies and does not rise again. Perhaps the reason why the Preacher was included among the canonical books was that he laid stress upon this Jewish principle in opposition to the sects ; and the sects retorted by proving their power, interpolating into his writing an allusion to the spirit's return to God.

The solution of Job's problem provided by the sects by their encouragement of hopes of a resurrection was alluring and satisfying to romanticists and to the masses, but it was not founded upon the Scriptures and could not, therefore, satisfy the serious thinkers of Judaism. The solution of Job's problem, the theodicy, the salvation of God as the sole value in life, was of necessity the fruit of the new piety, but without new fabrications, founded upon the spirit of the prophets and an examination of the divine doctrine of the basis of the Torah. Jesus of Nazareth discovered it, and in so doing brought about the final consummation of Judaism and its supersession.

Of the life of Jesus we have only a late and distorted account, representing him as the God worshipped by the Christian communities. But it contains so many exploded statements, shown to be mythical by their own mutual contradictions, that it is possible to extract an historical kernel. The teaching of Jesus is preserved fairly pure in the Sermon on the Mount, a collection of genuine sayings of the Master. It is by this collection that we must test the genuineness of other sayings of the Evangelists. The Sermon on the Mount bears the stamp of a very great and independent thinker ; if we follow it to its final conclusions, it forms a complete and rounded intellectual achievement ; all the parts confirm one another and form a united whole, a solution of Job's problem in harmony with the Scriptures and the intellect, with which the contemporaries of Jesus were so widely concerned. And that is the best proof that Jesus actually lived, and lived at this period and no other.

Jesus (Jehoshua, also transliterated by the Greeks as Joses (Joshua) as well as Jesos) was born in Nazareth in Galilee (the myth attempted to transfer him to Bethlehem in Judah), the son of a man called Joseph, who was probably a carpenter, and his wife Miriam. Several brothers and sisters are mentioned. Jesus was probably not the eldest son, as he must have been according to the myth of the virgin birth by the Holy Spirit, and also the Davidic myth which made him a crown prince ; most likely he was the second son, for in the list of brothers and sisters a Joses follows James, and that is

equivalent to Jesus. It is hardly probable that two brothers would have the same name. James, the first-born, succeeded Jesus as head of the church. Jesus grew up in a Jewish community, received instruction in the synagogue, and learned his father's craft, by which he must have lived until he could support himself by his success as a teacher. It is very possible that he was a disciple of John the Baptist for a time; indeed he must have been acquainted with the sects. But he was no ecstatic visionary. He went about teaching in Galilee and Nazareth without success; then a few disciples gathered round him. They misunderstood his clear statements about the spiritual kingdom of God and were partly responsible for his arraignment and execution as a political Messiah under Pontius Pilate and Caiaphas. He died on the cross with a cry of despair. The teaching of Jesus was intended to be handed on by word of mouth to everyone as saving wisdom that was simple and within the understanding of all. Two scriptural commandments and one or two commandments rendered stricter, a few newly coined sayings, brief and picturesque, a prayer, the Beatitudes, and a few parables—that is all. The high intellectual level finds expression in the brevity, clarity, and richness of these sayings and parables, and in the rounded completeness of the whole work.

In his theoretical solution of Job's problem<sup>1</sup> Jesus started from the essence of Judaism as understood by Amos, the concept of God. God is infinitely great and glorious, his almighty power not only moves the nations but acts as a matter of course in the smallest details; not a sparrow falls from the roof, not a hair from a man's head, except by his will; he directs everything on earth, and he, too, leads men into temptation. Man stands surrounded by this omnipotent motive force and is utterly powerless to intervene; it is quite impossible for him to investigate its machinery; and yet he is not forsaken, for God, mighty and incomprehensible, is not only the essence of omnipotence but also of love; he is a Father to all his creatures, even to birds and flowers, but most of all to men, who are much more than sparrows and lilies because they alone can understand their loving Father as being his children. This divine love transforms Omnipotence into Providence, always striving for the best, though not in the primitive sense in which man can regard himself as the centre of the divine plan and make claims and demand a prosperous life as commonly understood; Providence means that the loving Father has eternally predestined

<sup>1</sup> See my pamphlet on *Jesus als Philosoph*. Kröner, Leipzig, 1924.

his kingdom for all men, in the sense of perfect blessedness on earth in spite of all sufferings and vexations. The kingdom of God is a spiritual state of enduring bliss ; consciousness of God's fatherhood ; assurance that God's almighty Providence and love will let no evil come near his child ; the desire to imitate God who loves all creatures and gives to all without desert the necessities of life and his grace ; the will to approach him by active love of neighbours, forgiveness of others' trespasses, requital of evil with good ; the endeavour to extend God's kingdom to others and ultimately over the whole earth as the reign of love and peace and blessedness. Man cannot, of course, really do anything to help forward God's plan, but he can show that he understands it and accedes to it with thankfulness and enthusiasm, that he would like to be good, to be God's beloved child. But God alone will establish the kingdom in his own time.

To love God with all our hearts and all our souls and to love our neighbours as ourselves, that, in the words of Law, is the whole of the Law and the prophets. Men must pray only that God's will be done and that his kingdom may come, or at most to be saved from temptation and given their daily bread. But even this interferes in the workings of Providence, who knows best in his wisdom when to tempt for the child's well-being, and whose love will not refuse to the child the necessities of life granted to animals and plants. The demand for miracles is altogether wanton and foolish. God can perform them, of course, but he has no need of them ; he who is not convinced by the daily miracles of his omnipotence and providence will not be converted by any miraculous transfiguration ; and no child of God will dream of healing diseases that God sends for his own purposes. Accordingly we find that when Jesus worked miracles against his will, as in the case of Peter's mother-in-law and the woman with an issue of blood, he stipulated that they should be kept secret, and when he met with repeated demands for miracles he grew angry.

All men are summoned to the kingdom of God, for God is the Father of all. But some reach it more easily, some with greater difficulty. There are happy natures whose simplicity, gentleness, pity, purity of heart, and love of peace lead them aright ; there are the eager who hunger and thirst after righteousness, and the mourners whose hearts are wrung by the world's misery ; their yearning makes them ready for admission to God's kingdom. First and foremost there are the children, whose blissful trust in their parents and simple desire to please them foreshadows their relation with God as his children. But it is hard for the scribes and Pharisees, the arrogant and self-

righteous who know the "truth", and for the rich and powerful to find the one thing needful that gives blessedness. For God has predestined this kingdom for all and invited all to enter into it; but he does not interfere in each man's freedom to pass by his salvation and the kingdom.

So the scepticism of Job and the Preacher was overcome in accordance with the Scriptures: the righteous, the child of God, must be well off, for he has the best of all possessions, the kingdom of God, beside which all evils—illness, childlessness, poverty, and early death—are as nothing. However short his life, however severe his sufferings, he is blissful in God and in his works of love. The sinner, alienated from God, is unfortunate; beside all the trumpery of this world—health, riches, power, offspring, and long life—he loses the best of all: the kingdom of God. God is justified and justice reigns on earth, even without the assumption of a resurrection which is, of course, within God's power, but not revealed by him; without the outward consummation of the kingdom, moreover, which will come some day, though in God's own time. But not only is God justified, he is shown to be a Father who has made man's road to the kingdom easy. The legalist Judaism of the scribes with its many commandments, sacrifices, acts of purification, and interpretations, is replaced by the simple commandment of love. The asceticism of the sects is unnecessary. Even the notions of the "righteous" and the "sinner", with their implications of duty and menace, have become meaningless: there are simply children of God, who have understood and found the Father, and poor creatures who are seeking him, but not in the right way, or have not yet seen that blessedness awaits them in him.

That is how Jesus perfected and exalted the prophetic doctrine into a blessed, mystic doctrine of God's fatherhood. Though its extent is known to be infinite, the gulf is closed between godhead and humanity, through trusting love of God and works of love towards our neighbours, through the will to be like our Father and worthy of him, though we are fully aware of his unattainable goodness and perfection. In God every man finds his own worth as God's child, and his inmost blessedness; through God he is free of all the bonds of superstition and formalism, a perfect man made in the image of God; his humanity may belong to the realm of Nature (for Nature is the work of God), but in his righteousness he freely copies the Father. Only one of the limitations of Judaism survived; a relation subsisted between God and every individual, and a relation between God

and mankind (not the church or congregation), but none between God and the State or nation. We have the concept of man and God, but no further differentiation of humanity.

The disciples, and first and foremost Simon Peter, the most gifted of them all, had doubtless gone to Jerusalem with their Master expecting that now he would establish the kingdom of God; there followed his arrest and trial and execution. It seemed that all was over, and the little community were faint-hearted, remained in concealment, and began to fall asunder. Thereupon the dead Master appeared to Mary Magdalene, and now the "meaning" of his Messianic mission became clear to one at least, to Peter: to those who believed in him Jesus brought the kingdom of God as resurrection to share a life of blessedness with him after death.

Peter made Jesus a God, worshipped by a congregation with James, the elder brother of Jesus, as its outward head. Paul visited these two later as heads of the congregation. John, the favourite of Jesus because of the loving devotion and the active zeal of his discipleship, must have stayed in the background. Peter glorified the figure of Jesus and threw light on the Master's words—all in accordance with his new perception. He created a sect and held it together through persecutions which the scribes and Pharisees were soon zealous to inflict. For this sect menaced the Law, brought the belief in the resurrection into ill-repute, and, most important of all, threw doubts on the monotheistic doctrine that was the foundation-stones of Judaism. But the members of the new sect died for their faith; the days of the Asidaeans returned and in the end persecution failed.

One of the most zealous of the persecutors was Saul, a carpet-weaver and the son of a rich Jewish family of Tarsus in Cilicia. As a young man he had come to Jerusalem, where he had identified himself with the strict Pharisaical school which combined stern obedience to the Law and belief in the resurrection. His hatred of Peter's sect sprang from a burning desire for assured faith. He, at whose feet the witnesses had laid their clothes when Stephen was stoned, must have been deeply impressed by the confidence of the first martyrs. On a journey to Damascus the impression grew so intense as to take the form of a vision in which Jesus appeared to him and so proved his resurrection and divinity. After his conversion he withdrew to Arabia in order to follow his experience to its conclusion alone with God, and not with men of flesh and blood. Not until he was ready (after three years) did he come to Jerusalem for

a fortnight in order to present himself to Peter and James. Then he began missionary activities under the name of Paul—"the Insignificant" in Greek—far from Palestine, in Damascus, Antioch, Iconium, and, after he had exempted his proselytes from circumcision in Philippi and Thessalonica, and finally in Corinth and Athens. When he returned to Jerusalem he was arrested and, when he appealed to his rights as a Roman citizen, was taken to Rome, where he was kept in not very strict custody; he taught there, and is said to have been beheaded in the end (A.D. 67).

All that Paul knew of the teachings of Jesus was what he heard in the trials of Peter's followers. There are, therefore, hardly any of the Master's own words in his Epistles. The Son of God and the Messiah, the second God risen from the dead, the break-up of the Law—these were of prime importance to him, and continued to be so; in addition, the commandment of love and an occasional word about marriage. Paul's problem was, after he had been convinced by the evidence of his own eyes that Jesus the Anointed (the Messiah) had returned to life and was God, to explain how God could have given his Son as a sacrifice. He, too, found the solution in God's love and in the Scriptures: Adam's disobedience and apostasy from God alienated all mankind from God, as Adam's offspring, and made them frail to do right and subject to mortality. God had to allow it, for Adam was free and had been warned. But he pitied the children of men, who were powerless to free themselves from sin, who did evil against their own will, who yearned to be cleansed from sin and yet had fallen a prey to death, the wages of sin. He could not intervene directly for he, being perfect, pure, and good, had no relation to his opposite. God, therefore, began to educate mankind, revealing Adam's fall to the Jews and also giving them the Law so that they might learn why they died, what sin was, and that their own strength was insufficient to raise them once more to a state of innocence, that is, immortality (in Babylon sin was equivalent to death). Then he created the "second Adam" by allowing His own Son to be born as a man so that he, by his own free act in his elemental might as the Son of God, might be faithful and obedient unto death and pave the way to purity and immortality. "Wherefore as by one man sin entered into the world, and death by sin; and so death passed upon all men, for that all have sinned." "For as in Adam all die, even so in Christ shall all be made alive." Hitherto all men had been stamped with the image of Adam and were clay, mortal as was he, the first man. After the appearance of the Mediator

those who were of good will and sought salvation might bear the image of Christ, the Heavenly One, the second Man, and might die and rise again as he had done. For that purpose no Law was required, for God had sent Abraham as a sign, who knew no law but whose faith was counted unto him for righteousness. All that was needed was sure faith in the Saviour and humble hope that his merit, not their own, would cleanse them, and love of him moving them to follow him in a life all love of God and their neighbours, all renunciation of earthly joys and yearning towards his sacrificial death. Then in their souls too the second Man would drive out the first, for they would experience the great mystery of transfiguration through the Eternal. After Christ, the First-born, and after those who followed him when he was present on earth, they would at last inherit the kingdom when he handed it over to his Father, after annihilating all authority and all force.

Jesus and Paul developed Judaism creatively in the direction of Hellenism. But Jesus simplified its essence by teaching monotheism in its last and profoundest form, the union of the individual with the divine Father through a blissful trust in His omnipotence and love, the union of all mankind through works of love, and the natural fatherhood of God towards His earthly creation. Paul, on the other hand, only simplified and individualized the structure of the Jewish philosophy of history, bridging irrationally, by means of romantic speculation full of miracles, blood, and passion, the rational gulf between good and evil, eternity and death. With Jesus everything is simple, natural, joy-giving, and His mysticism teaches a serenely active life in God. With Paul everything is greatly involved, although expressed in clear formulas; the whole tendency is to spur man's will in opposition to Nature, to breed fanaticism. His mysticism teaches men to despise reason, to crucify the flesh, and to force the impossible transfiguration in spite of all by passionate determination, by battling for the faith, by asceticism, faith, and yearning. Jesus achieved the consummation of the human element in Judaism for mature humanity, Paul achieved the consummation of the Pharisaic doctrine as a doctrine of sacrifice, purification, and resurrection. To the lofty concept of God and humanity enshrined in Judaism he added "Christ", the God of the dead, the mystery of sacrifice, and the will incited and directed towards the other world and yet towards revolution; and it was through this that sectarian Judaism, in the form of Christianity, was enabled to conquer the world of antiquity.

Paul's doctrine dominates the Gospel account of Jesus' life. His idea of purification gave a new meaning to the baptism of Jesus (if it was a fact; Jesus himself never baptised); his idea of sacrifice inspired the Last Supper and determined Christ's attitude in the matter of the Passion. But most important was the fusion at this point (about 100 A.D.) of Jesus, as a dying God who rises again, with the Neolithic sun-god. He became fatherless, begotten of the Holy Ghost; he was born and lay in a manger with the animals like Tammuz, was persecuted by the wicked Herod as the future king, and had to be saved by flight; when the time was ripe he rode as a triumphant hero upon a young animal into the capital, was greeted with green boughs, drove his Father's enemies out of the Temple, was anointed for marriage, celebrated the marriage feast, and was betrayed in the grove by night through a kiss; he was captured, humiliated, and put to death on the cross (the ancient solar symbol) in his youth and innocence. He died upon the mountain and the sun was darkened. He was buried in the mountain-side and Nature withered and died (the fig-tree). Mary Magdalene (Ishtar) sought for him and met the risen Lord who now ascended to heaven. Thus the sacred solar legend, adapted to the man Jesus seen by Peter and Paul as the founder of Christianity, found its way back into sectarian Judaism and Christianity. For the rest, the Gospels quote scriptural evidence of Christian, Messianic truth, just as the Torah and the historical books of Judaism adduce proof of the truth of Judaic monotheism. Christ is proved to be the divine Saviour by every means, by the witnesses of God and the Devil, and of his servants the prophets, by miracles that reveal him as the Lord of Nature having power over disease, by Jewish prophecies and his own predictions of his fate, by identification with the sun-hero and the declarations of those who saw him risen and touched him. In the Passion (the accessories of martyrdom) most of the alphabetic symbols appear, and they belong of old to the solar legend: the hammer (Gimel, or the double-axe) and the mountain (Daleth, or Golgotha), the tree (He, or the branches at the entry into Jerusalem), and the House of God (Beth, or the Temple), the nail (Vau, the bull standard), the gag (Zain, or the bolt), the ladder (Cheth, or the earth), the crown of thorns (Teth, or the wheel), the fighting arm (Jod, Peter), the open hand (Caph, on the cross), the mock sceptre (Lamed, or the bush), the pillory (Samech), the spear (Pe), the scourge (Tzade), the sponge on the reed (Koph), the vinegar (Mem, or water), the handkerchief with the head (Resh), and the cross (Taw). The

characters which seem to be missing can easily be supplied : in place of the bull (Aleph) is Christ himself as the Lamb, in place of the snake (Nun) is Satan, and in place of the treacherous woman (Ayin) is Judas "Isharioth", in whose origin, nowhere to be traced, we hear an echo of Ishtar. It seems to me beyond question that a systematic process of identification must have gone on.

With the entry of the Evangelists we have, perhaps, already passed beyond the second Jewish racial mixture. At any rate we cannot prove that they belonged to it; they may even have been of the Hellenic-Oriental race that matured from the second century onwards. On the other hand the authors of the *Apocrypha*, and the single Jewish philosopher Philo of Alexandria, were of Jewish blood. Neither are very important in an account of Jewish religion on as small a scale as the present one. Philo attempted to make the Torah acceptable to the Greeks as philosophy by means of the Jewish logical method of equivalents, harmonizing the two; he only succeeded in showing that he was an apologist, but no philosopher. The Apocryphal books portray Judaism isolating itself from the "heathen"; they present a fanatical glorification of religious murder by women—indirectly in *Esther* and directly in *Judith*—the miraculous transfiguration of the boy Daniel, and apocalyptic visions of Yahu's coming universal kingdom. Not till we come to Spinoza's philosophy do we find Jewish culture, with the infusion of fresh blood, ripe to beget a monistic mysticism and humanity.

#### LITERATURE

Jewish poetry, like Jewish religion, sprang from the soil of the Rechabite religious movement. Amos and Isaiah, the two first prophets, were the first classical poets of Judaism, and the first classical thinkers. The Jews' great achievement was their unified theory of the universe, the doctrine of the one God, one people, one Law, one sin, one thing needful. So, too, their whole culture appeared as one in the single creative mind of Amos, who was at once the founder of a religion, a thinker, poet, moralist, and statesman. It is doubtless no accident that all great civilizations which attained or surpassed the Jewish level originated in a single classic creative mind overstepping previous limits. We have now entered the realm of personalities and of a unified theory of the universe (monotheism and monism).

Naturally the poetic power of Amos and Isaiah finds expression in their prophecies and not in separate poetical works, which could have meant nothing to them ; one thing only was needful, a knowledge of the true God, of his relation to Israel, and of his intentions ; all else was worthless and evil. But in prophecy the image and essence of the Deity was brought to light, and the outcome was the new hymnology of the Psalms, praising God and giving utterance to men's feelings in his presence, and the nucleus of the new literature of Proverbs. Individual scenes were elaborated—the vision in which a prophet received the call, or the terrors of the Judgment, or the joys of the kingdom of Peace. Graphic parables were worked out in fuller detail than in Babylonia. All literature, or nearly all, assumed the metrical form of long lines with a pause in the middle, a form which continued dominant, as it had been in Babylonia. This Jewish poetry welled up from the profoundest depths of emotion, from ecstasy and humility in the presence of God, from indignation and burning love of the people, from rapture and fear ; it was moulded by a power of emotional expression and vision, a mastery of language and vitality of versification beyond anything that Babylon attained. Prophecy, in which culture found its uniform mould, was all in all, the sole form of poetry appreciated in Judah, the sole form that seemed to merit a written record of name and text. No other poetry can match it in elemental force—it was the fruit of theoretical vision and practical interest (passionate yearning and anxiety on behalf of the people)—nor in the sympathy that it stirs. So long as there were true prophets, down to the time of the second Isaiah (550 B.C.) all great poetry that won appreciation took the form of prophecy ; the prophets were the first psalmists and proverb writers. It was only at a later date that psalms and proverbs came to be distinct from prophecy as the works of nameless minstrels and sages ; there was a certain justification for their anonymity, for they were only developing the gift of the prophets, though in a creative, individual manner.

Nevertheless, there was Jewish poetry even before the Exile ; it was in a sense independent of prophecy and yet bore the stamp of more than Babylonian powers. The religious movement from which the prophecy of Amos sprang, the loftier powers of vision and emotion, must have found creative expression between 750 and 550 B.C. in other Jews beside the great prophets. In the reign of Hezekiah, and especially of Manasseh, all manner of works of art, visual and oral, must have been produced in honour of Yahu and Judah

but not yet in correct prophetic form. Not till the Law was discovered in 622 B.C. did the prophetic spirit become dominant, not till the Exile did the narrow outlook of the prophets' disciples and the authors of the Law prevail.

We must seek in the Torah and the historical books for the remnants of pre-Exile narrative poetry; there they have been transformed into "history". All that was not included has been lost. A few titles of pre-Exile anthologies have been preserved: there was a *Book of the Upright* from which Joshua's command to the sun and moon, David's lament for Saul and Jonathan, and possibly Solomon's consecration of the Temple are quoted, a *Book of the Wars of Yahu*, and others. The first-named is plainly an adaptation of history, legend, and romance (or epics?) intended to glorify Yahu. Saul, who had nothing to do with Judah, is endowed with a son who bears a Yahu name and is represented as David's friend, and the imaginary popular leader Jehoshua fights imaginary battles. The prevailing spirit, on the other hand, is religious (the heroes who fight are Yahu's) but the dominant mood is one of free and chivalrous courage. I should attribute the book, which was in metrical form, to the reign of Manasseh.

Until the creative period (760 B.C.) narrative poetry in Judah must have been Babylonian in form and substance. There was a New Year and a Flood epic, transferred to Yahu, and there were laments in the cult of Tammuz. Fragments of the divine epics have been preserved and Ezekiel mentions "weeping for Tammuz". Even in the eighth and seventh centuries the form was still Babylonian, with long lines. There were actual heroic epics, as is proved by quotations from the *Book of the Upright*.

The principal epic poem of Judah must have been the song of Saul, Jonathan, and David; its subject matter still moves us as something great and powerful in the wretchedly distorted form of the *First Book of Samuel*, and David's lament preserves the original simple, moving verses. It is a heroic epic in which historical figures are extolled: Saul who overcame the Philistines, Jonathan who forced a pass single-handed, David who founded the kingdom of Judah. The history is not quite genuine; Saul's victories are made to redound to the glory of Yahu and David is given a share in them. But the essence, Saul's rise and his fall in battle against the Philistines, remains. We can clearly discern the connection between the story and the solar myth: the sun-hero is Jonathan who ascends the mountain alone, the friend of David who dies young and glorious;

David's lament has verbal echoes of the lament of Gilgamesh for Enkidu. It is not this, however, that give the poem its fine quality, but the fact that the heroic figures live. There is the passionate, gloomy Saul who goes to fight for freedom in a mood of ecstasy, who threatens his son like a raving madman and hurls his spear at David, whose jealousy persecutes David, who is assured by the words of the dead of his own death and goes calmly to his last fight; there is the radiant Jonathan who stands by his friend against his father, who helps him to flee and weeps at parting; and there is the youthful David who, indeed, suffers somewhat from a too generous endowment of bravery (Goliath, taken from the solar myth). Saul is the first full-blooded human character in the annals of poetry, the forefather of Agamemnon and Hagen. The human conflict within his soul (age against youth, jealousy against heroism) and in Jonathan's, who places his friends above his father, is deeply moving. And the descriptions of scenery occasionally harmonize with the incidents recounted. In Babylonia there was a Khammurabi epic; the *Epic of Gilgamesh* attained grandeur in its treatment of the problem of the agony of death, but this is something more. These heroes go to battle on foot, and flee through the country on foot like Gilgamesh, but they are more individual, more richly endowed with character and associations than he. His sorrow no longer affects them, but only hovers as a mood of mournful joy at transitory greatness over a scene of human passion and faithful friendship. The book might have been written as early as the reign of Hezekiah, when Israel was led into captivity and the mythology of the northern kingdom had lost its lord—a heritage that fell to Judah's lot.

So too the sacred legend of the sun-god of the Gaza-Minoan Philistines had lost its lord since the Philistines had been assimilated to the Semites and their gods had been assimilated to those of Babylon. As Samson (the sun), the son of Manoah, the Philistines' god, was turned into a hero of Judah and a servant of Yahu. There may have been an epic of his deeds and sufferings in which the sacred legend appeared in two versions, one civilized and one primitive, as in the *Epic of Gilgamesh*. Instead of profound meditation on a problem we find the strong man juggling with riddles and lists based upon the symbolism of the New Year's fight (the lion) and the conquest of death (in the "eater" death, the honey of the resurrection). In like manner the fable of the eagle is linked with the story of Etana, but more clumsily. In the story of Samson the human

interest is less vital than in the epic of Saul ; the hero is strong and he is in love, and rather ludicrously innocuous.

Under the influence of Rechabite ideals of primitive Judah leading a pastoral life of peaceful piety, the stories of Jacob and Joseph were transformed into Judaic patriarchal romances, bourgeois epics in prose. With the fall of Israel these myths, too, were deprived of their lord, and were then ascribed to Yahu and re-written in the medium of a higher culture. Bethel became an ancient sanctuary of Yahu, as Amos had assumed. We have a fragment of a bourgeois *Odyssey* in the romance of the subterfuges of Jacob the "supplanter", who deceived his brother and father and father-in-law and was yet rich and happy because he always managed to keep the Deity on his side (he kept Laban's teraphim by theft) and was cunning and adaptable. The romance of Joseph's dreams, how his brothers envied him, how he was sold into Egypt, how Potiphar's wife menaced his life, how he was exalted and reunited with his family after his brothers had suffered a merciful punishment and had fully repented, stresses the element of pathos in these wonderful adventures. It is long since that traces of the solar myth were discovered in the story of Joseph—the number of the brothers is that of the months, the hero is cast into the pit and into prison by treachery, and rises to royal power ; he journeys westwards, to Egypt, to a life of misery. But Jacob's eastward journey, too, was originally the solar course of the young god who had not yet grown to a mature hero and had to make up by cunning for his lack of strength. These heroic figures became bourgeois and human, the one a chaste and pious youth, easily affected, attached to his family, yet a good steward to Pharaoh, and the other a good business man, pious, wily, supple (he, too, is easily affected), well able to profit by his mother's love and his father's blindness, by deceiving Laban and by his knowledge of the natural world. A love story of faithful service unites Jacob with the beautiful Rachel, who is as cunning and supple as himself.

Jewish literature for the most part takes the form of the romance, a human, bourgeois narrative in prose which allows of no hero but the prophet, God's mouthpiece, and the righteous man, God's favourite. And the substance of these romances, with their moving human features and their stern religious zeal, is every kind of heroic piety in men and women, virtuous and sinful love, all manner of vicissitudes explained as the result of righteousness and sin. Abraham is ready to sacrifice his son to the Lord, Jephthah's daughter dies to fulfil her father's vow, Abraham's faithful servant

woos Rebecca at the well on behalf of Isaac, and pious King David gains Uriah's wife for himself.

The prophetic romances form a separate group, the earliest also probably originating with the Rechabites. It is the story of Elijah, whose doctrine is embodied in his name, like Isaiah's and Micah's. It must, therefore, date from the seventh century, after Isaiah. "Elijah," "Yahu alone is God"—this truth is proved by a king's destiny, but especially by miracles beyond measure—the prophet is fed by ravens, a cruse of oil is perpetually full, he raises the dead and has a vision of God's own person on Horeb, ascends to heaven and passes through the Jordan (Elisha, a double of Elijah).

The romance of Moses, a product of the Exile, was the offspring of this miraculous figure and of the sacred solar legend, which had ceased to play any part in Jewish religion but was all the more important in its influence upon narrative poetry. Moses was the first "founder of a religion" whose life was fashioned from the solar myth. If we subtract what originated in the myth, and what the story owes to the Aaron myth of Shechem, to the story of Atrakhasis, and to the demand for an act of law-giving in the desert, nothing remains. For, unlike Jesus, he never actually lived. No relic of personal existence attaches to his figure, no characteristic teaching; the whole thing is a myth—and Amos.

There were no personal records of Moses, neither of his parentage, his brothers and sisters, his wives, nor his children, neither of his birthplace nor his grave. That alone proves that he never lived, for in these matters the Judaeans were accurate, especially in the case of the founder of their religion. Moses is not a name, but a mutilated form of the Egyptian Aahmes (Amos—an echo of the real founder?); "Ah," the heathen god's name has been removed, and the remainder "mes", Egyptian "born", has been distorted. In the Old Testament "Moses" is interpreted as meaning "drawn out of the water". The name was justified by transferring Moses to Egypt (whence he was to depart) and representing him as having been born under strange circumstances and drawn out of the water. He had to be a Levite, for Yahu and the Levites were inseparably linked. But the Levites had an established genealogy in which his name did not appear; his father and mother, therefore, were anonymous Levites. One version tries to substitute Moses for Levi by making Levi's son, Gershon, his son. He is the brother of Aaron, the personified ark, the hero of Jeroboam I's myth of the Exodus from Egypt, and Miriam is his sister. He married twice: Zipporah (who had

two fathers) and an unnamed Egyptian woman. His son was Levi's son.

His life was that of the sun-hero, but rearranged to suit the established facts that "Israel" had come from Egypt through the desert and had received Josiah's law in the desert. There was probably an older version of the myth, but still dating from the Exile, according to which Aaron, the actual ark, led the Exodus; to it may belong the slaying of the overseer, the flight into the wilderness, and certainly the covenant upon Mount Hor, the return with the three miracles of the rod, and the departure and death upon Hor.

To Moses belongs the secret birth overshadowed by the king's threat (with the peculiar feature of exposure in the ark), childhood and youth as an unrecognized prince, the struggle with Pharaoh who is first afflicted with the seven plagues of Atrakhisis and then destroyed in the Red Sea (an exaggerated version of Elisha's passage through Jordan); then the ascent of Sinai as the people's leader, the betrayal by Aaron and Miriam (not seriously punished), and finally death upon Mount Nebo.

The story of Moses is that of Aaron enhanced, more interesting in every detail, more marvellous, grander, as seven plagues are more than three miracles, and Mount Sinai higher than Mount Hor. Then the two stories became confused and Moses borrowed some incidents from Aaron. Neither could be allowed to enter Canaan, for there was no grave there bearing their names.

In view of these facts it is easy to understand why we do not find Moses' name in the *Books of Amos* and *Isaiah* (and only in one later passage in *Micah*); Jeremiah, too, knows Moses only as a righteous man of the earliest times, not as the founder of a religion. The romance of Moses (subsequent to the story of Aaron) was not invented till the Exile, or even later. It is in vain that scholars try to define "the monotheism of Moses" more closely, since it is established that the Law came into being in the period between 628 and 458 B.C. There are authentic sayings of Jesus, but none of Moses; he is an utterly lifeless figment of the imagination, even to his very name. Amos was the founder of the Jewish religion.

There are seven romances by Jewish poets that were not revised and embodied in the Torah and the historical books but remained separate; two because they were regarded as prophetic books and the others because at the time when they were written that part of the canon to which they would have belonged was already complete. One of them, the *Romance of Job* (which must be distinguished from

the *Argument of Job*) belongs to the first Judaic phase of culture ; its subject is the theodicy : God is justified as against Job who bears his trial patiently and proves his piety, and can therefore be rewarded ; the just man who stands the test receives in compensation all that he has lost many times over.

The other six romances belong to the second Jewish phase of culture ; love romances and love songs now reached their consummation. In the *Book of Ruth*, Jewish poetry is most unforced, natural, and humanly lovely, and purest in its artistic power, and yet the book is still concerned with the Jewish problem of God's relation to man. The story is pure fiction, as is proved by the symbolic names (Ruth means "friend" and Naomi "gracious") of all the characters except Boaz, David's ancestor, through whom the time and place of the action are determined in order to give authority to its moral lesson. It is a rural idyll of simple, pious, natural folk living in Bethlehem in the days of the Judges ; it is a matter of course to them to live in the spirit of the Law, for their own nature is in harmony with it. There is a Judaism of the spirit that is above all legal forms. If a man, or a woman, acts justly and does what is right through love and faithfulness, then he is a Jew, even though he were born in Moab and know nothing of the Law.

*Esther* and *Judith* are also women's romances. Even in the first phase of culture women had come to be regarded as human beings, and now like men they were recognized as personalities, as servants of God, as tools for his loftiest purposes. They defended their faith and propagated it with the natural means to their hand and more besides. The nucleus of *Esther* is the subject of the Babylonian New Year's play of Marduk's victory over Humban, the god of the Elamites, and his marriage with Ishtar. Just as the Philistine god of Gaza was turned into the Jewish hero Samson, so the Babylonian god was turned into Mordecai, the pious Jew, and Ishtar into his cousin Esther, also of course a pious Jewess. By her beauty she won Ahasuerus, the Persian king (Artaxerxes) and managed to turn the persecution of the Jews, planned by Haman, into a bloody persecution of the heathen. Judith's original was Jael, who lived in the days of the Judges, and drove a nail into King Sisera's temples as he slept. But she was a stern follower of the Law, unshakable in her piety and therefore absolutely confident even when all the men lost courage. Without eating unclean food, without lying more than was unavoidable, without sacrificing her chastity, she made the heathen Holofernes drunk, struck off his head whilst she uttered a prayer,

and then lived happily to the age of a hundred and five. And she was "Judith", the Jewess, as was fitting. Times had changed since *Ruth* was written. Judaism was waging a desperate defensive war against the Greeks.

Akin to the *Romance of Job*, with its problem of requital, are those of Jonah the Prophet and Tobit the righteous man. Jonah is the hero of the oldest romance, portraying a prophet somewhat after the manner of Jeremiah, who flees from his God and then does what he is commanded, yet continues to remonstrate with him; the book belongs to the same period as *Ruth*, though it is greatly inferior. After the extraordinary proof of God's omnipotence by means of the whale adventure, in which an ancient symbol of death and resurrection from the solar myth appears in a new form, the equally extraordinary proof follows of God's right to pardon what he has bred with labour and care. The petty bourgeois counterpart to this theodicy is the story of Tobit, the pious youth who cures his pious father from blindness and rescues his pious cousin from the demon Asmodeus by means of a natural medicine procured from a fish, but the gift of the angel Raphael himself. God saves the righteous, he sends his archangel to every man, and speaks and acts through natural agencies, through Jonah's whale and Tobit's fish in the Tigris.

The true prophet of this era of defensive struggle was Daniel, an interpreter of dreams like Joseph (who was likewise small of stature and pious); Daniel, however, did not interpret the dreams of a rational Pharaoh, but of the oppressor who kept the people in fetters; Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar, the Babylonian kings of the captivity, are punished. "God is judge" is the meaning of "Daniel", and so the symbols of resurrection with which the people consoled themselves in Babylonia, the fiery furnace and the den of lions, the hewn tree that is saved, and the great image with feet of clay, were turned to dreams and miracles, foretelling ruin to every profaner of the Temple. The Lord worked through weaklings, through women and youths, and so the miracles were made even more thrilling.

The nucleus of the *Book of Tobit* is an Egyptian tale of marvels and the interpretation of dreams are Babylonian. In the *Book of Job* "Satan" appears, and in *Tobit* an archangel, both of Persian origin. Judaism was becoming irrational and fanatical and growing to resemble other eastern religions, such as the Egyptian doctrines of resurrection and the apocalyptic speculations of Persia.

In lyric poetry, too, the Jews attained the fullest freedom and

the loftiest heights (*Ruth*) in the second cultural phase. The religious movement which ushered in that phase gave birth to the most beautiful psalms in the church's hymnal, and, as it faded into worldliness, to the most beautiful love songs in the collection of marriage songs. We have only fragments and indications of an extensive lyric literature before the Exile. After 760 B.C. the Babylonian hymns to Yahu, hymns of praise and psalms of lamentation, must have been more fully developed in the Temple. The *Book of the Upright* must have contained battle songs and songs of victory and lamentation for fallen heroes (besides the lament for Saul and Jonathan). Miriam's song of triumph, on the other hand, is a psalm of later date. The prophets mention love songs and drinking songs, and also weeping for Tammuz. Some of this may have found its way into the collections of psalms and love songs, but much must have been lost. The loss is not serious, for the great lyric poetry of pre-Exile days is preserved in its full compass in the works of the great prophets; standing upon their shoulders, the post-Exile composers of psalms and love songs must greatly have excelled their predecessors.

In form the psalms and love songs are somewhere between Babylonian and Greek lyric poetry. The long line is divided into two, rarely into three, but there is great variety in the number of syllables in the two parts. We find all variations with anything from two to four syllables ( $2 + 2$ ;  $3 + 2$ ;  $3 + 4$ ; etc.). The stressed syllables are counted (accentual rhythm), but no account is taken of long and short syllables (quantity). The Babylonian parallelism of the two parts now became really important, and initial and final refrains are a favourite device.

In the *Psalms*, which were collected in the church hymnal and attributed to the authorship of David (150 Psalms in five books), the lyric poetry of the prophets had attained an independent existence. Not a single note in them but was struck by the great prophets in all its force; but all are echoed with an individual richness and warmth by the new poets. The Babylonian forms of ritual song, praising and exalting the Deity, and of penitential and mourning psalm, praying the Deity for succour in distress, are distinctly preserved and separated, but the substance of the Jewish songs is as much loftier and more personal as the prophets' concept of God was loftier and their piety more personal than that of the Babylonians.

In the *Psalms*, which extol the glory of God, he stands high above Nature. God created the world and the Psalmist follows the

Creation story in his survey of great parts of it ; God preserves the world and provides for it (civ) ; all that he has created, the heavens and the stars, the animals and plants, are to praise and thank the Lord (cxlviii), for he is good and his mercy is everlasting (c). The heavens declare his glory, day and night extol him, the sun praises him, which is as a bridegroom coming out of his chamber, and rejoiceth as a strong man to run his race (xix). The Babylonian idea of the stars only serves here to exalt God above all else : day and night and the mightiest of the heavenly bodies are only his creatures, thankful and joyous men in his presence (the sun himself is a hero). Naturally this conception raises man, too, for he becomes the highest creature in the natural world, the brother of suns and angels who, like himself, understand and magnify the glory of God. He becomes part of the great universal oneness in the presence of God, the Creator ; he, like the universe, is called upon to praise and thank God, and in the same manner. By the grace of Yahu he has domination over the world of creation (viii) : the round world, the animals and plants, are given to him. A sense of greatness stirs akin to the Greek consciousness of the grandeur of man, but it is still rooted in the grace of God. The world is Yahu's and he rules it ; when Israel went out of Egypt the sea fled (cxiv), Jordan was driven back and the mountains skipped (cxiv). He is the glorious king, the lord of all history (cv and cvi), the God who has chosen Israel as the medium of his historical revelation, so that all peoples may know and glorify him (cxvii) and he may be king over all the peoples (xlvii) when he appears as a judge (xcvii) at whose presence the hills melt like wax. God is all, he alone is great above Nature and all the peoples ; but Nature and the peoples are one before him in the man who knows him, praises him, and thanks him. Where the worship and honour of God has become the sole aim of creation, the sole meaning of existence (in a more exalted sense than Babylon knew : God does not desire sacrifice, but only to be known as great and good and the one God), lifeless Nature must become unimportant, whilst man is the centre of the universe and of divine providence. And humanity must stand alone, unique in the knowledge of God.

God is the dwelling-place of man (of the Jews, as the germ of a new humanity of believers) in all generations (xc). He was God before the earth and the world were formed, and will outlast both. He is all and man that perishes is nothing at all ; and yet this Eternal, Immense, Angry yet Merciful Being is man's sole refuge and hope, whether as a people or an individual, in every trouble.

In their fundamental ideas the *Psalter* (and the songs of lamentation for the anniversary of Jerusalem's fall) are the exact counterpart of the Babylonian psalms of lamentation and thanksgiving in national and personal distress. But far more numerous than the penitential psalms of the troubled Maccabee period, which lament the people's condemnation and pray humbly for salvation, are the psalms of vengeance and the songs of victory, which were doubtless often written in prophetic anticipation. Yahu must arise and scatter his enemies (lxviii). It is in vain that the princes and peoples rage against him and his Anointed (ii). He is the Shepherd of Israel that has brought the vine out of Egypt and planted it (lxxx), the refuge of Jacob (xlvi), the victor over all peoples. The prayers of individuals in sickness and persecution had grown at once more contrite and more confident, men's sense of sin and penitence had become more personal and profound in the presence of the divine purity, and yet there was greater trust in his grace without the possibility of deserving it. A wholly new note was the spiritual distress of the man whose zeal for God had brought loneliness and shame upon him (lxix), and the triumphant song of the personal victor over his traducers, who felt his own justification to be the justification of his Lord (xviii). Nameless individuals rose to personality through Jeremiah's spiritual agony and Job's philosophic grief. The fervent, humble general confession of the fifty-first Psalm emerged from a penitential psalm in sickness; naming no sins, it embraces all, from the sin in which man is conceived and born onwards. It is all sin against the one God alone, and it can be removed only through his mercy and help. It is not enough to know our transgression and have it always before our eyes, nor to offer a broken and contrite heart instead of sacrifice; God, who can do all things, must give the sinner a clean heart and a right spirit. From these spiritual depths grew the trust of Jesus in God the Father; the soul's longing for a Saviour ("As the hart panteth after the water brooks, so panteth my soul after thee") when we have no peace and are overcome with sorrow at the doubters' mockery (xlii); the strong faith in Yahu, the Shepherd, who will not let his people want and is a rod and a staff in the valley of the shadow (xxiii); the comfort of waiting upon God (lxii); and thanksgiving to the Saviour who inclined to one waiting patiently and brought him up out of the horrible pit (xl). All this is summed up in Psalm ciii, which calls upon men to bless the Lord, who forgives all iniquities and heals all diseases, whose mercy towards them that fear him is as high as the heaven above the earth, and who

pities as a father his children. In place of the anxious search of the Babylonians for the god whom they have offended and the sin they have committed, their superficial stressing of uncleanness and disease and persecution, we find a sure knowledge of the One and his will, and a spiritual sense of contrition and pardon.

The Psalms of wisdom, a new branch of lyric poetry, elaborate the law of retribution. The ways of the righteous and the ungodly, with their end in prosperity and disaster, are described (i), the Ten Commandments (xv, 1) and the Mosaic Law (cxix) are exalted, and the blessed portion of the righteous is described (xvi).

Another new branch of lyric poetry consisted of the songs of the pilgrims to Jerusalem; these are short psalms in which the emotional element is strongly stressed, in contrast to the didactic lyrics. Such are "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee", with its imagery of the soul waiting for the Lord more than they that watch for the morning, and "I will lift up mine eyes unto the hills" and "How amiable are thy tabernacles"—poems in which the pilgrims' deepest yearning, their brightest hopes and serene contentment, have found undying expression.

The Jewish poetry of the *Psalms* is a perfect achievement. In it an ardent, youthful enthusiasm gave full and enduring expression to the monotheistic philosophy of life. All subsequent spiritual songs on a monotheistic plane have but simplified the Jewish psalms, without adding anything new to their sentiment and imagery. The monistic plane is beyond the limits within which spiritual songs are possible. When the personal God is gone, the essential condition of prayer is lost.

The love poetry of the Jews is collected in the *Book of Marriage Songs*—the worldly counterpart to the *Book of Spiritual Songs*—under the name of *The Song of Songs*. These have come down to us without the authors' names, a late harvest of the spirit of *Ruth*. They contain words borrowed from the Greek, and the fact that the lovers address one another as "Brother" and "Sister" may point to Egypt; love between brother and sister was an abomination to Jewish orthodoxy. These are literary lyrics written in the fertile metres of the *Psalms*, but in a different and freer style, with echoes of songs appropriate to dance and play. They are marriage songs: lawful love is made the nucleus of a collection of all the poetry in which personal love found expression on the Jewish plane. The Church tolerated this book of worldly song, for only so could the Tammuz songs be got rid of or made harmless by evolving them into

something higher. Solomon, the ideal king, took the place of Tammuz; when the young couple were married they played at being king and queen, and the bridegroom entered as King Solomon; at the high festival of his marriage, the man compared himself with Solomon and felt that he was no less rich. But all the company, too, was dressed up, as country people, vine-dressers and shepherds and their womenfolk. In the country, in a small town (as in *Ruth*), in a primitive golden age and an ideal countryside, romance comes to flower with the ancient Nature god turned into a king of Judah's palmy days, and the bourgeois scribes and merchants and handicraftsmen into something like shepherds. The old natural relation between love and the year's course and fertility find free and modern expression in a historical and simple pastoral disguise. We have a type of sentimentality based upon history and Nature. God may tolerate that, for he is the gracious Lord of Nature. Tammuz, the heathen idol, is eradicated, and nobody recognizes the ancient solar mythology in the drama of marriage and love embodied in the songs. The same personal emotion that created the *Psalms* gave birth to the love songs—the greatest love song is almost a psalm; it soars to the union of both lyrical worlds: the flames of love are the flames of Yahu.

Babylonian love songs had been put alternately in the mouths of the lovers and a chorus of the woman's companions. We might discern in them a drama of the bride's longing, the arrival and greeting of the Tammuz-bridegroom and the sung dialogue of the couple. There is far more vivid drama in the *Jewish Book of Marriage Songs*, but it is no longer confined to a single scene of longing, arrival, and the union of lovers; it finds expression in varied action through a number of scenes. The king still enters with sixty warriors, and is still greeted and admired by the companions or "daughters of Jerusalem" (an ideal chorus of virgins instead of the harlots of Tammuz), the bride still dreams of her beloved, and longs for her "king", or begs the chorus not to wake him in her arms, and the lover still praises the charms of his beloved in a multitude of images, strong with sensuous emotion but chaste in expression.

But beside this central action, whose whole aim is the fulfilment of love, there are others: the lovers go out together to see whether the vines and pomegranates bud forth, they guard sheep together, he sings a morning serenade to his beloved or comes to her door by night with dew in his hair and begs her to open to him; she hears him between sleep and waking and does not open; when at last he goes home in anger, she gets up and finds the myrrh that he meant

to give her spilt upon the handle, and now she seeks him out in the street ; on another occasion she dreams that she went out to seek him and crept past the watchmen to go to him. These gay and tender little pictures had their precursors in the Egyptian love songs ; but what was there a mere germ, a picture in two strokes, is individual and living now, warm and full of feeling. The greater emotional force of the Babylonians has penetrated these images. And the tenderness and reserve of both lovers in pleading and acceding is on a higher plane than the Egyptian or Babylonian. Love is spiritualized ; it seeks not mere possession, but the joy of wooing, companionship in the open country, the willingness to be wooed and the compelling urge to woo. And therewith love poetry opens its doors to the imagery characteristic of the folk-songs of our own day, the latest descendants of the *Song of Songs* ; a wealth of variety in love songs blossoms from the themes of wooing, denials, and the granting of love's favours.

There is the song in which the lover rouses his beloved and calls her to come out, and the song of banter, in which the beloved represents herself as "black, but comely"—sunburnt through her labours in the vineyard ; or the chorus withholds the bride from the man because she is far too young ; there is the song of the fruitless visit by night, and the song of the lovers wandering together through fields and villages ; there is the dancing song in which the chorus, half teasing, pictures the bride from head to foot to the bridegroom who must wait, and the bridegroom's song of praise, who holds himself richer with this one woman than Solomon with sixty ; then there is the ancient morning-song. And through all this rings the earliest version of the heartfelt "He is mine, and I am his", and above all the mighty "Love is strong as death".

Even in Egypt love songs contained little sketches of natural scenery—love on the goose-chase or love whilst bathing, love in the Nile or the garden ; in the Jewish love songs the landscape, or the chamber of the beloved, or the country with its fields and vineyards and villages is an indispensable background for these shepherds and countryfolk. The landscape has a life of its own ; when the lover sings to rouse his beloved he sings the first spring song, telling how winter is past and the rain is over, figs and vines and gay flowers are in bloom and the turtle-dove calls. Another song likens the beloved to lilies and sweet flowers, and, indeed, imagery from the gardens and fields is generally in favour. Man's ancient oneness with Nature in love, which was expressed concretely

in the solar myth with its spring orgies, now found new expression in artistic form. A new oneness in divine philosophy was heralded by the vision of love as "a very flame of the Lord" which many waters cannot quench nor can it be bought with gold.

The imagery used by the poet as an artistic medium is vigorous and tender, yet natural. When the woman begs the daughters of Jerusalem not to wake her beloved, she charges them "by the roes, and by the hinds of the field"; to picture the serenity of love she says that "he feedeth among the lilies". And the images of the vineyard that the beloved keeps or the banqueting house whither her lover brings her, are chaste for all their natural sensuousness. Many an ancient image is more vigorously drawn because of increased intellectual powers, and emphasized by contrast (the beloved is a garden inclosed, a fountain sealed, a lily among thorns, an apple-tree among the trees of the wood). Some interpretations of tradition are almost witty, such as the explanation of the woman calling her lover "my brother", which would be sinful, as meaning "Oh, that thou wert as my brother", or the ambiguous image of the foxes' love for vineyards turned into a bantering lament of the virgins.

Jewish love poetry is supreme and enduring; it is youthfully and simply human, individual, popular. The love poetry of the Greeks developed into something freer and more brilliant, that of the Romans was even more personal, but both were remote from the people. The love poetry of every nation within the ambit of our civilization has borrowed from the *Song of Songs*. Folk-songs everywhere, but especially in Germany, have echoed that music, just as the music of the *Psalms* lives on in spiritual songs.

Jewish culture approached rather nearer to tragedy and comedy than the Babylonians. The Jews were capable of representing characters acting in a lifelike manner in a landscape or a room (the love songs, Jonathan and Saul, the patriarchs). They could depict character. Instead of the Egyptian types with their few characteristics or the one couple, Gilgamesh and Enkidu, we have all kinds of people in the epics and romances—kings and knights, patriarchal shepherds and merchants, prophets of all ages, and women too. There was the aged Abraham with his absolute obedience and faith, and the inquisitive Sarah; the rough Esau and the cunning and versatile Jacob with his beautiful Rachael who was quite as cunning as himself; and there was the jealous, gloomy, virile Saul, Jonathan the brave friend, Joseph the chaste and loving youth, and Rebecca, lovely and willing in service. Boaz stands beside

Naomi and Ruth, Esther destroys Haman and Judith Holofernes. Here is material enough for thrilling action, not only in relation with God but in purely human relations. Saul's pride and envy, Jonathan's love of his friend, Jacob's greed of gain, and Joseph's chastity and family affection are basis enough for terrible and moving scenes. The heroism of the father who is resolved to sacrifice his son and of the prophet torn between God's commandment and his own desires and fears, suggests spiritual conflicts, less stormy but touching the profoundest depths. In addition to human themes there came speculation concerning a great philosophic problem: man had forfeited his immortality not by obedience, like Adapa, but by disobedience and sin; but the righteous man suffers and accuses God of demanding what is inhuman; omnipotence and absolute wisdom have come into conflict with justice, and throughout the second phase of culture Judaism wrestled with this problem. Another problem, too, was already touched upon: why did Jonathan, the glorious hero, die young, why was Saul, the liberator, caught in the toils of jealousy, and the hero Samson in the toils of woman? It is no longer the same as the Gilgamesh problem that is presented here, but only its latest echo, nor is it yet the Greek problem of *hybris* or arrogance; nor is in every case sin put forward as the explanation of everything.

Of the formal elements of the drama we have, therefore, the form and the logical arguments; the Jews had the ability to bring together the pros and cons in an argument and to urge them in impassioned speeches of accusation and defence. We are conscious, too, of a twofold approach to the subject: together with psalms they composed bantering love songs, and set the boor Goliath beside the pathetic child David; even Samson and the cunning Jacob have comic traits.

But the Jews did not attain tragedy and comedy; and even later writers who used Old Testament subjects have not succeeded in producing tragedies and comedies unless, like Hebbel in *Judith* and Byron in *Cain*, they have transformed the material in its very essence. Many plays have been written about Saul and Samson, Cain and Adam, Job and Esther, Judith and the prophets, but except for the two named above none are tragedies.

The Jew's philosophy of life was not ripe for the production of tragedy, though it approached near to it, for at bottom all problems were satisfactorily solved through knowledge of the one God and of his nature and will. Job demands a justification of God, but he is convinced that God can give it. The Preacher doubts, but he doubts his own capacity to follow God's thought, not God himself. Thus the

solution of all problems ultimately depended upon a new definition of God's nature, as given by Jesus or in Paul's introduction of the resurrection. Judaism did not make man depend upon himself, his will and reason were not answerable to himself but to One who stands above the world ; if only he served that Master rightly, there was an end of danger and difficulty. And though Jewish logic always saw two sides, it did not weigh them evenly but was always prejudiced, defensive or aggressive. It recognized mutually exclusive opposites, but only in order to weigh, and reject or compensate, in order to defend a given position ; it did not treat them objectively as views of life equal in value and equally justified, weighing even in the balance. But when we accuse or defend we recognize only right and wrong, not tragedy, which must always combine accusation and defence, nor comedy, which breaks our bonds. There is no possibility of drama where this partiality prevails, this insufficiency and partisanship in men's attitude towards the world, this transcendence and self-interest. The characters share the same limitations ; they are merely sketched in outline, not fully worked out ; they are seen from without, as relating to something external, something beyond our world ; they are not full, free human beings. God alone is worth, being, activity, and Lord of the world. His Law, as the emanation of his nature, is the sole guide to right action. That is established ; how, then, can the estimation or the rightness of an action constitute a problem ? In spite of this, all manner of plays would have been possible—marriage plays and historical plays, sad and merry ; but they would be liable to develop into heathen mysteries and had, therefore, to be forbidden. All that emerged, therefore, was the germ of a variety of plays which could not sprout and grow.

Amongst the minor branches of poetry, the fable developed a step further. The Jews no longer felt any difficulty in discerning lessons in the actions of animals and plants ; the stories could be brief and compressed, the morals varied. The prophets found parables, far reaching and profound, in quite simple pictures of daily life. In Jotham's fable of the useful trees that refused the crown and the ne'er-do-weel bramble that accepted it gladly, told to confound the fools who desired a king, we have an example of the politico-philosophical fable. But this branch of literature does not seem to have developed. The loftiest subjects were too serious for such light treatment, and people were not interested in observing Nature to any considerable extent. It was the Greeks who first penetrated purely human relations to the depths, and the ethics of

character based upon them. Nor were there farcical narratives in Jewish literature, in spite of Samson's tricking the Philistines and Jacob's subterfuges; nor satire. Men were too serious and too much fettered. On the other hand they did appreciate riddles, as a combination of imagery and wit. The answer to Samson's riddle, indeed, could not have been found but by ploughing with Samson's heifer. And the numerical proverbs, such as, "There are three things that are never satisfied, yea, four things say not. It is enough," are half mottoes for communities, half riddles. But this type is an inevitable development of the allegory. The sexual allusions in the *Song of Songs* gave rise to the jests of the academies of scholars, in which foolish and ingenious interpretations of Scripture, together with the masters' quick and clever answers, are recorded with abuse or praise.

### MUSIC

Judaic and Jewish music played a great part in literature. A number of instruments are mentioned, and minstrels, of whom David with his harp was the most celebrated; and there were choruses of women who sang songs and danced with instrumental accompaniment. Here, again, nothing tangible has been preserved, for the melodies were only handed down orally and the musical notation which doubtless existed in the Hellenistic period does not seem to have been extensively used by the Jews or to have had much importance. There was a famous orchestra and an excellent choir in the Temple after the Exile; what divine service lost in ocular display by the removal of all images it recovered by means of music, in addition to incense and priestly vestments. The psalms were sung by choruses, according to report, with the accompaniment of harps. The directions to the conductor, referring to the melody, accompaniment, and possibly also to instrumental parts at the beginning and end, cannot unhappily be deciphered. Even these fragmentary remnants are lacking in the case of love songs; but they, too, were sung and accompanied by instruments (flutes?).

The melodies doubtless developed from the rhythmical recitation of the verses, from the rhythm and melody of speech; for originally speech and melody were one. We cannot suppose that the original Jewish music is still to be found in the ancient melodies of the synagogues, for in the Hellenistic and Christian periods everything was subject to the influence of the Greek school.

A remarkable statement in 2 *Chronicles*, v, 18, may be taken to

mean that one aim of church music was the absolute unison of voices and instruments, so that they sounded like a single note. Upon the occasion of the Temple's consecration, when this was successfully accomplished in a song of praise, Yahu filled the house with his glory. According to this the solemn unison must have been a Jewish invention. It was in harmony with their culture, which strove for unity in all things.

Of course the psalms and marriage songs were also sung in the congregations far distant from Jerusalem. The Temple provided the model for the singing of psalms, but there were orchestras and choirs elsewhere. When the Temple disappeared and divine worship was left wholly to the synagogues, and when music was zealously fostered in all regions where Hellenistic culture prevailed, especially in Egypt, the synagogue choir must have become a regular institution. But we can hardly assume that there was actual congregational singing.

#### PLASTIC AND PICTORIAL ART

Plastic and pictorial art in Judah before the Exile must have been essentially Babylonian in character, perhaps with a few extraneous Egyptian features. What we are told of Yahu's image and the altar of Ahaz is fully consonant with Babylonian ideas. In the time of the prophets plastic and pictorial art must have made progress, but we cannot tell whether it found expression in the Temple. Then the prophets' hatred of images prevailed (622 B.C.) and caused the destruction of images in the land of Judah. There followed during the Exile the prohibition to portray anything whatever in the heavens or on earth or in the water, the best possible proof of the danger of apostasy and idolatry. The Greeks could allow images serenely, for they knew that the Deity could not be in images but was invisible, around them and above them.

This prohibition of images stifled Jewish plastic and pictorial art. Not a little was thus lost; we can tell from the portrayal of likenesses and landscapes in literature that Jewish art would have been at least equal to that of the Cretans. In Cretan frescoes we see the spring meadows with lilies and crocuses in which the lovers of the *Song of Songs* wandered; and on a Cretan potsherd a siege is portrayed that matches the story of Jonathan storming the Philistine pass in its lifelike vigour.

It may be that when the Temple was rebuilt after the Exile

these higher powers found expression. The problem was to erect a simple and uniform sanctuary, without a tower, without images or chapels, and especially a hall of grand and simple proportions in which the altar and its accessories and the music would make their full impression, besides the priestly processions. The spiral columns in the interior (the existence of which, however, is very much in dispute) would not be at all out of place in a hall that was to be neither Egyptian nor Babylonian nor Greek. For the rest, the architect was bound by all manner of recollections and assumptions relating to Solomon's Temple as described by the scholars of the Torah and in Ezekiel's vision. When the Temple was rebuilt under the Seleucids, Greek features were doubtless introduced. And when Herod built it anew he certainly emphasized Graeco-Roman features still more.

Another task which the new church set before the master builders was the erection of meeting halls for the elucidation of the Scriptures. But they doubtless built these halls altogether in the Hellenistic style wherever they were required for large gatherings. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that the Jews simplified their sanctuary in consonance with their idea of the undefiled worship of God, and adapted it to their own higher form of worship, just as the Greeks simplified theirs in pursuance of an ideal of artistic perfection. Still, the fact that they were restricted to one sanctuary and bound by ancient scriptures, and the diversion of the pious from pictorial and plastic art, necessarily cramped the expression of their ideal impulse. But in any case the loftier achievement of the Greeks would have won the palm. It was they, and not the Jews, who endowed Christian architecture with the basilica. True, it was not in accordance with the spirit of Jesus to make a sanctuary of it, for he told the children of God to pray in their own chambers. Here, too, he achieved the consummation of Judaism, preaching the utmost simplicity, purity, and personal fervour in the worship of God in order that the worshipper might serenely lose himself in God.

#### LEARNING.

The Jews borrowed their writing from the Philistines. They would have had the requisite concrete and logical ability to invent an alphabet of their own, but not till the eighth century when their capacities matured on a higher plane than Babylon's. Meantime the alphabet had come to them, and no people invents what it can take over ready made. The Cretan series of picture-letters was

adopted in the Cretan order, as is proved by the numerical speculations incorporated in it; but it was "translated", that is the little pictures, which were perfectly well understood to be religious symbols, received new names and new phonetic values. It would have been possible to retain the Cretan phonetic values and names (which designated the pictures, and their initial sound the phonetic value of the character), just as the Greeks did later when they turned Aleph into Alpha and Beth into Beta; but the Jews were not sufficiently emancipated from the pictorial and sacred meaning of the characters. So they tried to retain the pictorial meaning and to introduce Semitic words which more or less described the pictures and whose initial sounds coincided with the Semitic consonant series. This could not be accomplished without distortion<sup>1</sup>; it was made somewhat easier by the Jews' desire rather to obliterate than respect the meaning of the pictures in so far as it was religious; for that must have been offensive to the translators. The names as they now are stand for a series of quite commonplace, everyday notions—ox, house, camel, door, nail, etc., with a few meaningless sounds interspersed. The translation must have been made before the seventh century, for about 600 B.C. it was adopted by the Greeks. A borrowed alphabet does not tell as much of the borrowers' capabilities as one invented by the people themselves. The negro writes an alphabet, but could not have invented it. But one thing it does show: the Semites, Aramaeans, Phoenicians, and Jews were satisfied with an alphabet of consonants; it never occurred to them to add vowel characters. Here was a limitation of their accuracy and their powers. The Greeks were the first to overstep that limitation and set an example which the Jews followed at a later period.

The great achievement of the Judaeans and Jews was the creation of a unified outlook on life. They laid the foundation of the monotheistic view of the universe. One God, one people, one world, one human race, one world law (which was demonstrated particularly in history and in the life of individuals and was based on morality), one doctrine of right conduct, one sin: unity dominated their whole outlook on life, even to the one Temple, one Book, and unison in music.

Where men strive eagerly for unity, we are not far from a system or framework of knowledge of the world starting from one supreme concept. Jewish monotheism remained on the pre-scientific plane;

<sup>1</sup> See my essay *Ursprung und Sinn unseres Alphabets* in *Gesammelte Aufsätze*, Kröner, Leipzig, 1924.

it was with monism that the theoretical problem of building up a system was first realized. Jewish speculative thought in search of unity did not go beyond the one God, that is a supreme concept in personal form; it conceived a divine character and will, but not natural law. The outlook remained practical, concerned with the immediate usefulness of the supreme perception; there was no ability to separate the parts of the universe, the individual branches of science and art, from the uniform block. But Jewish thought approached near enough to the scientific, unified outlook to regard everything from the standpoint of God and right conduct, the supreme concept and the purpose. And straightway metaphysics and the evaluating sciences<sup>1</sup> emerge side by side with natural science and the humanities, indiscriminated but dominant, in the unified world picture.

Metaphysics, indeed, is the essential study of Judaism, for the Jews' whole view of the universe was based upon "principles" (Aristotle). These "principles", these "substances and essences", are united in God. God is the sole Being, the sole cause, the sole power in the world. He is the Creator and Preserver, the Inspirer and Guide. His existence explains the whole reign of law and the Law itself which is the basis of his plan for the nations and for individuals. In face of the Creator the world is mere creation, in face of the essential Worth only not worthless in so far as it understands and serves and glorifies him. Man thereby becomes a chosen part of creation; without desert on his part, the earth was given to him and may be divided into "man" and "man's possessions", or animals, plants, and things. Israel, too, becomes thereby the chosen among men: without desert on its part, revelation has been granted to it, and the way of salvation for all mankind. God's nature and God's law are the sole course of guidance in right conduct: the righteous nation and individual prosper, the wicked suffer misfortune.

This was no scientific theory of metaphysics, either in substance or form. In substance it does, indeed, give us a Supreme Being, a Supreme Cause and Power, a law of causation; but they are indiscriminated and all too human. Man and his right conduct are, indeed, the centre of interest, but the really active agent is God, upon whom man is dependent. That which is presented to man's perception consists of the Creator, Cause, Being, and Worth on the one hand, and

<sup>1</sup> Ethics and what Professor Schneider calls *Güterlehre*, the theory of non-ethical values.—*Translator's note.*

dependent creation on the other. Natural laws are of minor importance and the moral law is still a divine "commandment". All this is formally proclaimed and demonstrated in the Torah, the Prophets, and the historical books, and explicitly in the Law. But the narrative and prophetic books are unsystematic and the Law is a tangled mass of commandments. Jesus simplified all—there remained one formula for the divine nature, one prayer, one commandment, one divine fatherhood. But great as was the advance, a fully scientific outlook was not attained.

God is our treasure, he is goodness, he is absolute righteousness; the idea of worth which is the nucleus of the evaluating sciences and of theories of value and morality, remains undifferentiated in the great, uniform whole. In detail theories of value and morality are enunciated in the Law and in the wisdom literature, and are discussed in the latter. A "doctrine of right conduct conducive to happiness" is here put forward, naturally without any scientific distinction between amoral and ethical conduct. God reveals himself upon Sinai, or Wisdom incarnate (Greek influence?), Yahu's first-begotten child (Athena?) and handmaiden invites mankind to eat in her house. The central doctrine is always one and the same; only in the Law is it associated with particular commandments; in the wisdom literature it is inculcated in poetical form, in couplets, in vivid or striking phrases, briefly or attractively. He who truly understands God's might and will must act wisely, must search out and keep his commandments so that he may prosper in life and win all the good things of life, understanding and joy in understanding, health, wealth, married happiness, and the blessing of offspring and a long life. The pious and wise man prospers, the sinner and scoffer and fool suffer misfortune, so the Proverbs teach as well as the psalms of wisdom, following the prophets.

The logical form in which the teaching is couched is often that of contrasted opposites, the comparison of the conduct and lot of the righteous man and the fool. Jesus the son of Sirach, the scribe (after 200 B.C.), makes of these whole series of dualities: there are two kinds of ruler and two kinds of friend and counsellor, two kinds of human creature and two kinds of woman, two kinds of wisdom and two kinds of shame, the good and bad, the true and false. In addition to this central doctrine, which was subsequently discussed by Job and the Preacher within narrow limits and found its consummation in Jesus, there was a purely human wisdom, not independent and untrammelled as with the Greeks, but only so far

identified with religion that the wise man who has understood the soul of things practises it, too, as a matter of course. It is the wisdom of experience, naturally useful and well-pleasing, the expression of that same natural humanity that was presented concretely in the figures of Saul and Joseph, Boaz and Ruth, and in the love-songs. Idleness brings poverty and industry riches ; subtlety and cleverness win favour, faithlessness leads to ruin ; the simple believes every word, but the prudent man looks well to his going ; a wholesome tongue is a tree of life, but perverseness therein is a breach in the spirit ; hope deferred makes the heart sick, but when the desire comes it is a tree of life—such are a few of the hundreds of proverbs in which the practical wisdom of daily life is coined and noted in brief antithetical form. They are crowned by the proverbs praising and advocating happy family life and peaceful, loving, patient, beneficent humanity. Here the ethics of Judaism are developed. It is a religion which in many parts of the Law does not distinguish outward cleanness and uncleanness from morality and immorality, but in the Ten Commandments and in maxims like those which teach love of our neighbour or mercy towards beasts of burden it is far in advance of all older doctrines. The limitations of this ethical doctrine are due to its restriction to the relations of man to man ; it recognizes a man's "neighbour", and the natural community of the family, but it knows neither State nor nation in the higher sense (in the lower sense it had just cast off and superseded both). But in its very limitations it was great and creative. Judaism created and anticipated the ideal of happy family life. Directly following the commandment to worship one God without idols by observing the Sabbath and refraining from oaths, comes the fundamental commandment of family life : "Honour thy father and thy mother." And this commandment is elaborated in detail in the *Proverbs*, which extol the upright woman (magnificent in praise of the virtuous housewife) who is a crown to her husband, whilst she that makes ashamed is as rottenness in his bones, and the wise son who makes a glad father, whilst they execrate the fool and the ingrate who is the heaviness of his mother and curses his parents. The commandment is supported by educational maxims such as : "He that spareth his rod hateth his son, but he that loveth him chastiseth him betimes," and by precepts commending a kindly, loving, active life in the family and congregation, free from greed and avarice and adultery. The Jews were the first to sanctify marriage and the family by basing them upon God's commandment. They were the first to forbid

altogether by the Law of God the coveting of others' property and the taking of oaths and to evolve the notion of "neighbours" and "love of our neighbours" which Jesus afterwards made the centre of human relations. Man still existed only for the sake of God, his worth and his justification still depended upon God alone. But his worth was augmenting, and such affairs of law and business as marriage and theft were becoming the concerns of God. The wisdom of the scriptural proverbs is still on everyone's lips, like the Ten Commandments. It represents a system of ethics comprehensible to everybody, men and women alike, and therefore immortal.

The Jewish phase of evolution was not so fertile in the natural sciences as in metaphysics and the evaluating sciences, which first attained unity in that phase. True, it taught men to look at the world as something grand, and freed them from too human weaknesses of vision and superstition. The Jewish story of creation, with its chaos and the Spirit of God moving above it, with its days of creation when the parts of the world and the species and kinds of creatures came to life at the word of God, and "God saw that they were good", has hardly any resemblance with the combats and labours and fashioning by hand of Babylonian accounts of creation, and only faint traces of ideas connected with procreation and breeding and name spells. The world was created from nothing—a new and bold logical development of the old ideas of the establishment of order. But this theory contributed nothing to physics and hardly anything to biology.

Jewish scholarship repudiated the interpretation of omens, astrology, divination by means of goblets, the observation of animals, and haruspication. But it was not sufficiently advanced to develop from them, as did the Greeks, a science of astronomy and the elements, and to rise to zoology and anatomy. The Jews simply ignored these whole fields of study; they were as dangerous to faith as idolatry. Only at one point did the subjugation of Babylonian superstition bear fruit: the seventh, unlucky, day was turned into the Sabbath, God's day of rest, in defiance of the heathen and as a mark of distinction. That was a progressive step from the social and human as well as the religious point of view, and it had an influence upon the calendar, for the seven-day weeks were dissociated from the moon's changes and proceeded evenly through the whole year.

For the rest, Nature was God's handiwork and his garment. People rejoiced to observe anew the grandeur of Nature because it showed forth God's might. Now for the first time an exalted religious

and aesthetic sentiment felt the beauty and grandeur of sunrise and sunset as God's handiwork, and men learned to marvel at God and fear him in the terror of earthquake and storm. In small things, too, they gathered examples of his wisdom and care. So Jesus marvelled at the lilies of the field arrayed in glory; and the metaphors of the love songs are rich in imagery from the pastoral world of gazelles and hinds and doves, pomegranates and vines. But God was above the world. Only incidentally was he found in Nature. Man approached nearer to him in the moral field of history and right conduct. Nature was really of minor importance except in so far as it was identified with the human soul. It is cited as the subject of strange miracles of early times, when the sun stood still and the sea parted at the command of a hero of God. For miracles were a matter of course to the supernatural God. Everything in Nature, as in history, was his handiwork. He set the courses of the sun and the stars, but no law bound him to abide by them, as his own nature bound him to righteousness. The Jews were indifferent to natural law: the Greeks were the first to set a value upon it, for to them God and Nature were equivalents and they studied him as the spirit of law. To the Jews natural law was a sign of divine power, but its absolute validity would be a limitation of God's omnipotence.

The Jews were no more interested in chemistry or mathematics than in physics and astronomy. They succeeded in detaching the Babylonian prescriptions for chemical products from a certain amount of superstition and making some practical improvements in the Babylonian methods of calculation and surveying. But of all those achievements no traces are left.

A subtler psychology emerges in all branches of poetry. The theory of the soul profited little. It was in the late era, when interest was strong in man's immortal part, that "soul" and "mind" were distinguished, following in the footsteps of the Greeks. Practical psychologists, on the other hand, knew of all manner of inner processes, of states of ecstatic joy and exaltation as well as the profound emotions of penitence, atonement, and divine pardon. There was a practical science of character, too, in use amongst merchants and those who had the cure of souls: "Man's soul is a deep well," so a proverb teaches, "but the wise man can draw from it."

In medicine, likewise, the Jews did away with Babylonian superstition, magic, and ceremonies of purification (which, however, the Law still practised). The way was thus clear for a science of

therapy based on experience, applying tried remedies and resembling more or less a natural cure after large bottles of medicine. Prayer, too, and penitence before God and fervent supplication were resorted to in a simpler form and acted with strong suggestive power. The Jews did not evolve a theory of medicine, but only the doctrine that illness was a punishment for sin, and this was disastrous both when it made outlaws of the sick and when it led men to attempt to heal by prayer.

But in all these fields the Jews' freedom from Babylonian superstition enabled them to accept and use Greek discoveries in spite of the fact that they were the products of more advanced theory. The Jews filled the gaps in their philosophy of life with Greek mathematics and physics, Greek psychology and medicine, once those sciences had been invented. As practical people and good technicians, they made Greek inventions their own. Just as Philo of Alexandria set out to prove that all the philosophy of the Greeks was included in the Law, so Paul adapted Greek psychology to Pharisaical speculation, and Jewish mathematicians and doctors associated Greek practice with the Torah.

In the humanities, on the other hand, the Jews accomplished great and tangible things. Embedded in the Jewish philosophy of history are shattered fragments of older historical records. There were objective lists of kings and annals in Judah and the northern kingdom, and after the seventh century there were rhymed chronicles, like the *Book of the Wars of Yahu* and other versions of Judah's history re-edited so as to do honour to Yahu and the ancient heroes. Such was the *Book of the Upright* in which, however, history was thoroughly mixed up with heroic songs, epics, and imaginary, mythological genealogies, especially from Jeroboam's kingdom. In the fifth century Ezra's and Nehemiah's accounts of their share in the re-establishment of Jerusalem are accurate and objective. They almost amount to reminiscences, personal records, but they were held worthy of preservation with the writers' names, like prophecies, only because the actors were plainly tools in the hand of God. The Persian king, likewise, was God's tool. That is why these books were included in the canon of the Holy Scriptures.

But the greatest historical achievement of Judaism is the refashioning in the Exile of all knowledge and belief concerning the past into a history of Israel. This was not a science of history, but a philosophy of history. The editors were not concerned with the objective presentation of fact but with the proof of Yahu's oneness

and power and his scheme revealed in historic events. The law of Yahu's activities after he had chosen Israel was to be revealed : when the people were pious they prospered, when they turned apostate they were chastised. The law that Yahu had given the people by the hand of Moses as a guide to the conduct of all individuals was to be introduced and justified. Finally, the desert period had to be introduced by an account of how the people had been chosen since the time of Abraham, and the account was then continued back to the creation and the first judgments upon sinful man, back to Adam and Noah. The first " world history ", starting with " Israel " was built up from Creation and Flood myths, from Judaic prophetic speculation and genealogical speculations originating in Israelite Schechem, from romances and heroic books and rhymed chronicles and some few annals, by a very vigorous process of selection and revision. In the process of revision Moses and Samuel were introduced as dominant figures, the ark was transferred to Jerusalem and the image of Yahu explained away, and everywhere Yahu made the law of his activity forcibly felt. We have here the consistent reign of law, the same for the people and their leaders and each individual, a uniform explanation of the course of events (based on the causal law that springs from Yahu's nature and scheme) from the Creation to the Flood, from the Flood to the judgment upon the Pharaohs and Egypt, from the Exodus to the judgment upon Israel and Judah. Then the judgment upon Babylon and the restoration of Jerusalem is added. It is the mightiest and most powerful apologia in human history. The truth of the Jewish faith is demonstrated by prophetic documents verified by history, and by the fact that Israel's destiny has followed the law of God's plan and revelation. At the same time the work shows magnificent scholarship in the elevation and adaptation of tradition to the prophetic idea of God and his plan, in the introduction of miracles and marvels from all parts (the Sinai district), in the interpolation of new elements like the table of nations (the first of its kind ; starting with Judah, it treats the three neighbouring peoples, the Ethiopian and Egyptians, the Philistines and Cretans, and the desert Bedouins, as the three divisions of the human race), and in the arrangement according to a chronological system of generations. We have, too, the germs of a historic method based upon psychological explanation in the character studies of Saul or Joseph. But the germ could not sprout, for everything was dominated by the consistent theory that every leader, like the whole nation, sinned as a human being and still more that sin and piety explained

everything. The historic interpretation contained in the canon of Scripture is an apologia for Judaism. But it is also the first complete application of causal explanation to a great historical subject. Yahu creates the world and guides the nations, he chooses Israel and will convert all nations through his servant. Together with the one God we have a single historical process and the law that governs it.

We can still track the labours of these scholars if we do not fall victims to their suggestion. From the pre-Exile poetical works in honour of Yahu and the romances the Yahuvist and the Elohist<sup>1</sup> must have grown during the Exile (the Yahuvist more complete and with more sense of superseded heathen romanticism, therefore later). Whither the process was leading may be seen in the *Books of Chronicles*; there not only is everything omitted that conflicts with the scheme, but hardly anything is left except the scheme.

A political doctrine arose from the sense of law dominating historic events. It was the first occasion on which policy had been considered theoretically and deduced from a world law alleged to be proved by experience. The prophets demanded that the kings of Judah should act in accordance with it; they were to do nothing from fear of men, but to act wholly according to the revealed will of God; they were to introduce the pure worship of God, to amend morally, and to trust in God. In practice the prophets' policy did not prove sound; but it was an achievement regarded as an intellectual effort, as part of the philosophy of life, as a uniform guide to right conduct in national life based upon a fundamental principle.

The Judaic and Jewish laws, united in "the Law", had become the foundation upon which the members of the congregations based their whole lives; that was both more and less than was achieved, for instance, by the Babylonian code of Khammurabi. The Law of Josiah was the constitutional document of a theocracy, containing the covenant with the Deity and the duties of the Judaeans towards God and men (other Judaeans). The Law of the Exiles was the constitutional document of God's church, regulating the life of the Jews. In the Ten Commandments and in many individual passages the general duties of man towards God and his neighbour are declared for the first time. There is no detailed account of human rights; they are touched upon in the promises and sufficiently stressed in the prophetic sayings about the blessings in prospect for the people and for the pious and righteous, or about Yahu's kingdom. All these laws

<sup>1</sup> The Elohist and Yahuvist (or Jehovist) narratives run parallel through the Pentateuch and are presumed to be of different authorship.—*Translator's note.*

are God's commandments, for God is the mighty Lord whom none can bind, but only his own rational, righteous nature. Yet since he is the very soul of reason and righteousness, it is possible to speak of a covenant, and treaty with the people as the basis of all law. For the first time the State and the law are based upon a treaty; not, indeed, a treaty between men, but with God, which really means that they are based upon authority, yet linked with obligations freely accepted. At bottom the laws were another version of the Jewish philosophy of life in imperative form, as the rule and standard of right conduct.

Since God is the very soul of reason and morality, there emerges a reasonable justification occasionally and a moral justification invariably side by side with his authoritative command. Neither of these were known to Khammurabi's code, nor was there any discussion of the assumptions upon which the law was based. It was simply a civil code, whilst the Jewish Law comprised a rule of life and a philosophy of justice in its commandments. Philosophically that implied an advance, but not juridically in any immediate sense. According to Khammurabi's code simple judicial decisions could be decreed in cases of inheritance and property and also in criminal cases, which might be subtler in the differentiation of guilt from *force majeure*, humanly freer, and logically more profound, but which were practical and clear. In the Jewish laws questions of intention and humanity and morality came into play and influenced the judge's decision. Questions of purity and morality presented themselves, in addition to strictly legal questions. Sometimes the penalties were humane and mild, sometimes inhumanly severe (as the result of moral indignation; for instance, for unbelief). A community could be disciplined by these laws in spiritual and legal matters, but for commercial relations with the heathen the code of Khammurabi and its offshoots were essential. Nothing is more significant of the character of the Jewish laws than the fact that Jesus, in whom Judaism attained its human and moral consummation, could summarize them in two rules and call upon men to love God and their neighbours, as the basis of all right conduct.

The nature of the Jewish Law, its claim to set a standard of conduct, its composite character—part divine ordinance, part free human reason—and the failure of the promises attached to it, turned people's minds to interpretations of it; beginnings were made of a science of jurisprudence. The scribes became God's jurists, his defenders, who sought to prove that he was the very essence of truth;

they were his servants who reconciled his commandments with life, who investigated the meaning and intellectual substance of the commandments. The very logical capacity that the Law had nurtured, the combination of authoritarian constraint with human freedom, now made it the subject of theological apologies and juridical interpretations produced with impassioned religious zeal and with that ability to gather and proclaim all that supports the speaker's own view and to omit or reinterpret all that contradicts it, that we have already seen at work on the "history of Israel". This was not yet science, there was no question of genuine jurisprudence (for theology was still predominant), nor of the formation of clear concepts nor strict theoretical inquiry (for the atmosphere was one of perpetual religious ardour). But it was destined to evolve into science—with the Greeks. Nothing of the kind, at least, would have been conceivable so long as the fundamental point of view of Khammurabi's legislation was maintained.

Together with jurisprudence we find the germs of scientific philology. The scribes were not only God's jurists but also his philologists, and their labours as interpreters required them to investigate the forms of words and sentences more profoundly than was done in the Babylonian vocabularies. It was no more than a germ; the Greeks were the first to establish grammar and philological criticism, and the Jews thereupon made use of them, feebly enough, in their own squabbles; but impassioned argument had taken the place of the dogmatic system of lists prevalent in Babylonia. The Jews had plenty of opportunities for genuine philological work of an objective nature, for, since the Exile, Hebrew had been a dead language and interpretation involved simultaneous translation into Aramaic and then into Greek (the *Septuagint*). The alphabet changed, too. The old Cretan script was replaced by the square characters, and then vowel sounds (on the Greek model) were introduced. But all this was merely the occasion for preparing translations and a canonical text (that is, one slavishly copied from a sacred manuscript with the vowels in the proper names poorly supplied under the influence of learned ignorance and deliberate accusations of heresy levelled against opponents); no true philological scholarship emerged. Here, too, Philo's harmonizing effort illustrates the limitations of Jewish science.

The scribes were God's jurists and God's philologists, that is to say, first and foremost theologians. Scientific theology now came into being in the form of theological metaphysics, apologetics,

propaganda, accusations of heresy against those whose beliefs were different ; and its principal achievement was " the history of Israel ".

The Jewish cultural ideal is that of the pious man who fears God and is at the same time wise and righteous. What is needful is a right disposition, and that had various aspects : piety indicated a right relation with God in a general sense, an attitude of mind ; fear of God emphasized the element of unassuming humility ; wisdom meant that right understanding is the basis of right conduct ; and righteousness that a man's attitude of mind must find expression in moral conduct towards others. Just as the ideal is analysed logically, so is its opposite, the conception of the sinner, who is at once godless (arrogant and a scoffer), foolish, and wicked (malicious and violent).

Piety is the uniform ideal of a democratic religious outlook. Before the one God all men are equal, and their merit differs only through their relations with him. All are rational, men and women alike, all may and should acquire true knowledge from the Scripture, all ought to live according to the Law so that they may prosper on earth ; all ought to be " Jews ", that is, " human beings." The Jewish cultural ideal is the first in the history of mankind of a universal, piously rational, and moral humanity in the individual, the first that sought to emancipate and bless all men alike through reason and education and law. There were no longer any kings, and soon no priests and merchants, in fact no class privileges.

This ideal is set forth in all its broad scope and with temperamental differences through concrete personalities in the scriptural stories. All varieties of piety (and sin) are portrayed : Abraham's trust and obedience, Jacob's loyalty in his busy life of sensual experience and affairs, Joseph's blest innocence. Even a heathen beloved by God, Melchisedek, was possible before the Law was proclaimed. And there are the women too : Sarah, to whom God shows favour in her old age, the tranquil Rebecca quick to serve, the fair and cunning Rachel, all pious in obedience to the law in spite of human weaknesses. And as at the beginning of the evolution of Jewish culture the ideal of piety is represented by concrete figures, so at the end it is personified by Job and Boaz, Daniel and Tobit, Ruth and Esther and Judith.

In between the uniform ideal of piety was defined in the abstract, discussed by sceptics and sects, and modified. Its loftiest form was the ideal of God's child embodied in the teaching of Jesus, to which all mankind might rise without the aid of the Law ; and its most effective form that of the Christian embodied in the teaching of Paul,

who sought to follow in the footsteps of Jesus in life and death in order to win the crown and hasten the coming of the judgment and the kingdom.

If it is the highest interest of every individual to know a sacred Book, if that Book, containing the sum total of all wisdom, is written in a form comprehensible to all and in a simple alphabetical script, universal school education must be based upon the Book. And in fact Judaism did establish the earliest system of universal education and schooling in its zeal to spread the true doctrine. Associated with divine service and the cure of souls and the study of the Law in the congregations, which were based upon Scripture and the interpretation of Scripture, synagogue schools were established in which general elementary education was given, and general higher education in reading and interpreting the same holy Book of instruction. Elementary education comprised reading, besides incidental writing and arithmetic as a means of understanding the Scripture. Nevertheless, it did constitute general elementary education, and was equally useful for business purposes. It even included the study of language, though only of the dead Hebrew language. Higher education was imparted by the same teacher, and its value therefore depended very much upon his personality or upon students of the Scripture who chanced to be in the congregation; but it was universal and led to the study of the actual Scripture which, indeed, was to be accessible to investigation and confirmation by the free conviction of each and all, so that its influence was direct. And this teaching could be completed by study under other masters and in the chief city of the church, Jerusalem, the High Court of faith and justice. The Scripture included school books for all grades: the *Psalms* and *Proverbs* taught in brief emotional or rational form what the Biblical stories taught in concrete imagery. The *Chronicles* summed up history in abstract form as the Law summed up doctrine. The outcome was a general education that gave to each and all such knowledge as was needful in the form that suited him, a body of wisdom with sure guidance in right conduct, one and the same in essence, only varying in form and degree of abstraction.

Judaism, therefore, created universal education, and a uniform school system from the elementary to the university grade, a product of monotheism and designed to inculcate it. It is true that this universal education was confined to the Scripture. Elementary and language teaching were merely means to an end and the whole school served the cause of religion and its propagation. The object of higher

education was interpretation, dialectical scholasticism, whilst practical knowledge was only acquired incidentally through the Scripture. But this limited school was the first to foster understanding of the child mind as the fruit of religious fervour and a religious scale of values. According to Josephus—who was not, it is true, an impartial observer—the success of these schools was such that in the first century A.D. every Jewish maid-servant in Alexandria had a knowledge of the Law.

#### SUMMARY

The Jews brought to consummation what the Babylonians had begun, and stood, in fact, upon the Babylonians' shoulders. The unified survey of the world in perceptions and concepts, logical and intellectual, was completed for the time being. The process of breaking the world in two, and contrasting the worth and power of free, strong immortal gods with weak and mortal men was carried to its conclusion with ruthless zeal, and ended in the earliest monotheistic religion devoid of images and endowed with a moral law. One God, *the* God, was the Creator and Ruler of the world, its essence and worth, the supreme concept of Being; he was the force and cause behind all that happens, the supreme concept of flux and causality. Face to face with him was one man, mankind (won by the medium of a Chosen People and by individual prophets). Mankind rose above the rest of creation as a favoured part because man alone could understand God and act rightly and justly. One Law, founded upon God's essential nature and made visible in his plan, united God and man and explained the whole course of history in the life of the nations (with Israel as the centre) and all the personal destiny of individuals as the result of one sin, the Fall, and one good deed, obedience. The upshot was one uniform march of world history, one rule of life, one cultural ideal to be attained by all in one uniform school through one Book which was the sum of all wisdom. As God's chosen and favoured creature man recovered his worth and personality as an equal among equals in the sight of God. His reason and his moral being, as parts of his nature which was God's handiwork, acquired a certain justification in God. For the first time man attained to a natural outlook, recognizing God in Nature, permitting natural love, esteeming natural family bonds, acknowledging a general human code of morality. Of the arts, music flourished and the pictorial and plastic arts withered. The foundations were laid of theology,

theological metaphysics, and the evaluating sciences, whilst the first world history (the first great causal explanation of the march of events) was outlined. We discern the germ of jurisprudence, and many superstitions were swept away. But the whole belonged to the pre-scientific phase, an undifferentiated unity, only half personal, half free; the supreme concepts were too human, the outlook too much restricted by practical considerations; logic was scholastic and apologetic. It was the Persians who took the next step upwards to something freer, a more clear-cut logic and morality, a less personal God. The Greeks were the first to attain the full liberation of personality and art and science.



## B. PERSIAN CIVILIZATION

### RACIAL FORMATION AND POLITICAL HISTORY

About 2000 B.C. conditions greatly changed in the civilization of the solar peoples north of the Pyrenees, the Alps, and the Balkans. Solar civilization still prevailed, but it was no longer that of the Stone Age; the age of metal had come. Bronze had penetrated to the dwellers in the north. Solar religion still prevailed, but its gods were changed. We hear of triads of great gods, including always a god of day and a weather god—in fact, the beginnings of a pantheon. Somewhere within the realm of solar civilization people had succeeded in taming the horse, and the result was a knightly culture growing out of the peasant culture of the Stone Age. In spite of these advances the civilized realms of the south—Egypt, Babylonia, and a little later Crete as well—were still superior in wealth and civilization, and attracted the barbarians. But these latter now came with metal weapons and chariots of war, superior alike in equipment and martial spirit, incited by the eager desire to win the wealth of highly civilized countries. About 1750 B.C. they broke in victoriously upon the southerners along all the roads from the north. In 1750, Khammurabi's empire fell before the invasion of the Khatti from Upper Mesopotamia and the Kassites from Elam, and a little later Egypt collapsed under the assault of the same flood of immigrant peoples from Asia Minor and another from Arabia; for several generations the barbarian Hyksos dominated the whole civilized region of Hither Asia and Egypt.

In the migration of peoples after 2000 B.C., in which the pre-Indo-Germans emerged—the Kassites and Semites and the Canaanite tribes of Jacob-el and Joseph-el, and others from the north and south—the earliest Indo-Germans also made their appearance in history. We must suppose that they played a part in the assault of the Khatti upon Babylonia. When the storm had abated, we find a Khatti (Hittite) empire in Asia Minor, in which the upper class was Indo-Germanic. In Upper Mesopotamia there was a Mitanni empire in which the population was likewise part Indo-Germanic; here about 1400 B.C. were the "Harri" (Aryans), and a list of gods contains, undifferentiated, the chief gods of the subsequent Persians and Indians, who were the descendants of the Aryans; there are Mithra

and Indra and Varuna as well as the Asvins, the Twin Brothers in their chariot of war. These earliest traceable Indo-Germans must have reached Hither Asia by way of the Caucasus or the Bosphorus.

Even earlier than 1225 B.C. Indo-Germanic, Aryan tribes, with the same chief gods as their fellows in the west, must have been settled in large numbers north and east of Babylonia. In Media the racial interbreeding which produced the civilization of the Mannai and Chaldaeans in the eighth century, with their chief gods Bagamazda and Khaldi, must have begun in the thirteenth century B.C. Before 1100 B.C. the racial interbreeding had begun which produced Zoroaster in Persia and Yajnavalkhya in India.

In the ninth century B.C. we can trace Aryan tribes in the mountains north and east of Assyria. On a campaign in 836, Shulmanu-asharid II (Shalmaneser 860-824 B.C.) reached Parsua, Amadia and Arasias from the Diyala; he mentions "twenty-seven kings of Parsua" and "the Mannai" who are ruled by "the great men of Manna". A hundred years later Tiglath-pileser III (745-722 B.C.) and Sharru-kenu (Sargon; 722-705 B.C.) destroyed the empire of the Mannai and Chaldaeans after a severe struggle. They distinguished various kinds of Medes: "powerful Medes," "distant Medes," and "Medes living among the Arihi of the East"; the whole area stretching from the sources of the Diyala to Parthia was designated by one general name. One chief of the Mannai was "Daiukku" who appears later as "Deioces", the ancestor of the Median royal house. In 713 Bit Daiukku was an object of attack in the Median war. The war ended in the destruction of the city of Ardinis (Musasir) by Sargon, and the capture of its gods (714 B.C.), and then the subjugation of the "powerful Medes" (713 B.C.).

For a time peace ensued and Assyria was safe. But in 702, Sennacherib (705-681 B.C.) had again to fight and repulse the Medes, and in 690 he fought and repulsed the Elamites and Persians at Khaluli on the Tigris. This was the first occasion on which the Persians appear as neighbours of Elam (Pasargadae). It may have been at this period that Hamadan (Ecbatana), the future capital of Media, was founded.

About 680 B.C. the Scythians and Cimmerians from the Crimea invaded Assyria from the mountains in the rear. Esarhaddon (681-668 B.C.) was clever enough to use the Scythians (Ashguzai) for the defence of Assyria by marrying his daughter to their King Bartatua. He defeated the Cimmerians several times in 673 B.C., and drove them away into Asia Minor. And now a Scythian empire

arose in the mountains and in Asia Minor ; it kept the Medes in check and covered King Ashur-bani-pal (668-626 B.C.) in the rear all his life ; after 626 B.C., under Bartatua's son Madyes, it dominated Asia Minor and Syria during the " Cimmerian storm ".

Against this great empire the Median King Cyaxares (Uaksatar, Uvakshatra ; 635-585 B.C.) and the Chaldaean ruler Nabopolassar (625-605 B.C.) fought, unsuccessfully at first, but afterwards with growing success (probably after the death of Madyes). In 605 they captured Nineveh. In 597 Cyaxares partitioned Asia Minor between himself and Nabu-kudurri-usur II (604-562 B.C.), the son of Nabopolassar, to whom he was related by marriage ; he himself took the mountainous country between Elam and Asia Minor and Nabu-kudurri-usur Syria and Palestine. In the nineties he conquered the Scythian parts of Asia Minor, whilst Nabu-kudurri-usur pushed forward as far as Egypt. In 585 B.C. the new partition of the world was completed. An eclipse of the sun during a battle between Cyaxares and the Lydians on the Halys in 585 brought about a truce and then a treaty of peace and inter-marriage. In 586 Nabu-kudurri-usur had destroyed Jerusalem and so established peace there too.

Twenty-five years of peace followed. Astyages (Kshakitra ; 585-550 B.C.) and his brother-in-law Nabu-kudurri-usur ruled the world between them, but the latter thought good to enlarge and fortify his city of Babylon in readiness for all events. Shortly after his death, Astyages did in fact invade the plain (in 560 B.C.) and in 556 he captured Harran. Thereupon domestic quarrels broke out in the Median empire. The Persians had paid tribute to the Median king since 597, or had rendered him voluntary service as his nearest of kin ; they now rose in revolt under Cyrus (Kurush = sun). Astyages was overthrown in 550, and Cyrus conquered Elam, Media, Asia Minor (besides Lydia in 541 and the Ionian cities in 540), and then Mesopotamia (Babylon in 539). He was about to secure his empire from the steppes where the Massagetae lived and to end his conquests when he died in 530. His son Cambyses (533-522 B.C.) conquered Syria, Egypt, and Nubia, and so established the greatest of world empires ; it was even greater than the Assyrian empire, and securer, for it embraced all the lands inhabited by the waiting barbarians in the north, whence the recent storms of invading tribes had burst, and the dominant nation among them was the maturest for the development of its own civilization.

The Medes and the Persians under Cyrus must have attained a

considerable degree of civilization. During the centuries in which they had been neighbours of Assyria and Babylonia (Elam) they must not only have adopted Babylonian writing and literature, commercial and legal customs, as well as Hittite culture, but in many of the most important spheres they must have retained independence and outstripped the Babylonians. Just as Jewish monotheistic culture was based upon Babylonian and Egyptian elements, so the monothestic culture of Eastern Persia flourished upon the foundation of Babylonian-Median-West Persian civilization. Not only did Cyrus and his son Cambyses weld together the new great empire, they established the basic principles of its future administration, respecting the existing religio-political and constitutional structure (amongst the Jews, Babylonians, and Medes). Nevertheless the dynasty of Cyrus, like that of Bartatua, Cyaxares, and Nabopolassar, only survived for two reigns. It was Darius and his dynasty who over a long period of sovereignty enjoyed the benefit of Cyrus' conquest and pacification. In the calm of the following centuries in which the migrations of the peoples had ceased, the fruit of Cyrus' labours matured.

The new dynasty was Persian, too, but east Persian. The second monotheistic, ethical religion of the human race, the native culture of Persia, developed on the outer edge of the civilized world, in districts less fertile than Elam or Persia, but capable of cultivation and not mere pasture land; the conditions must have been very similar to those under which the tribes of southern Judæa lived, except that there was no great city as a centre. The founder of this religion, the first classic of the new nation, was Zoroaster of the house of Spitama, a noble family, but not wealthy. He was born about 600 B.C. and won over Prince Hystaspes (Vishtaspa) to the purified religion about 560, and afterwards induced his son Darius (Daryvush) to spread the new doctrine by means of the sword. Before this Messianic king (comparable with Josiah) set forth on his religious war in 522, Zoroaster must have died. Darius invaded civilized regions at the head of a league of east Persian princes and tribes, much as the first Islamic believers did subsequently at the head of the Arab tribes. He was the champion of Ahura-Mazda, the leader of a religious movement, and a conqueror who initiated a migration of peoples on a small scale in order to gain predominant power among the Persians. His father, Vishtaspa, was still alive when he set forth with the youth of the home country to conquer the world.

In the Behistun inscription, which contains the official account

of his victorious campaign, he declares that a Magian imposter, Gaumata, had revolted against Cambyzes, professing to be his murdered brother Bardiya. He, the true heir to the throne by his god's grace, by his descent from the house of Akhacmenes, and by the choice of the magnates, had justly overthrown this swindler. Then he had annihilated five other imposters who falsely declared that they were descendants of Cyaxares in Media, of Nabu-kudurri-usur in Babylon, and of the Susan royal house (the list included another "Bardiya"), and other rebels; at the end of six years, in 516 B.C. he had gained the upper hand.

Such was the myth; its character is marked by the very first sentence which tells how, after Cambyzes' departure to Egypt, "the people grew rebellious and lies became prevalent in the provinces". Darius wished to appear in the character of a beneficent king sent by God, and putting an end by just means to lies and rebellion. In actual fact it was he who was the rebel, and took advantage of Cambyzes' absence to get rid of Bardiya, the lawful heir and Regent, if, indeed, he did not actually depose Cambyzes himself. For that reason the lawful heirs in all the provinces rose against him, and were likewise crushed. His birth gave him no such claim; he hastened afterwards to secure a right of inheritance by marrying Atossa, the daughter of Cyrus. Nor did he derive any right from the illegality of the rebels' claims, which were probably all sounder than his own. His claim rested upon his power and his religious fanaticism. He came as the word of God; his enemies were infidels who "slay the bull" (Cambyzes) or "have no ears" (priests of the false god Bardes), imposters who claimed to be legitimate heirs, whereas there was only one legitimate heir, God's envoy. He was nowise troubled by the thought that six imposters was rather much. The word was a merely formal indication of the illegality of their claims.

Darius reigned from 522 to 485 B.C. He subjugated the whole realm of Cambyzes and gave it a new and durable organization. The subdivision into satrapies seems to have originated with him, and survived to Alexander's day. He imposed the new religion upon the ruling tribes and the empire. Towards the subject peoples he was tolerant, as Cyrus had been and as the Islamic Caliphs were at a later date; it was the toleration of a politician and ruler. In the new capital city of the world empire, which the Greeks called Persepolis, he built a marble palace. Like the pious rulers of the past in Egypt and Babylonia, he continued building at the chief sanctuaries of those lands, but his God scorned temples. In the

later years of his reign he extended his power over parts of India, Cyrenaica in Africa, the Bosphorus, and Thrace. An attempt at rebellion on the part of the Ionians led to the destruction of Miletus. Carthage sent gifts. The Greeks, too, were his enemies, but his advance into Greece was checked at Marathon in 490 B.C.

Xerxes (Khshyarsha ; 485-465 B.C.) carried out his father's plan of conquering Hellas, but after the destruction of Athens he was repulsed at Salamis in 480 B.C. and at Plataea in 479. He lost Thrace and Macedonia, then Byzantium. Led by Cimon, the Athenians freed the Ægean islands and won supremacy at sea. Under Artaxerxes I (Artakshatra ; 465-425 B.C.) the Athenian efforts to gain a foothold in Egypt were frustrated (455 B.C.). As a result of the antagonism between Sparta and Athens Persia recovered her predominance. The State finances were restored and order established. But the empire was beginning to disintegrate from within. Conflicting claims to the throne brought an army of Greek mercenaries within the vicinity of Babylon in 401. In the fourth century Greek merchants and mercenaries pushed inland from the coast. Under weak kings of the great empire the governors attained independence and Greek tyrants rose to power for brief periods. Finally Alexander the Great made an end of the Persian empire in 331 B.C. and founded instead a world empire in which Greeks and Persians were to be the dominant peoples. His heirs, the Seleucids and Ptolemies and the lesser ruling families in Asia Minor, encouraged the Hellenization of the Persian heritage. This hybrid culture was dominated by Greek cities and a Greek enlightened class of citizens and merchants.

Unhappily we know very little of the development of Persian civilization in the period between 600 and 100 B.C., when it must have flourished. The Persians of the first cultural flowering time and the early part of the second (600-300 B.C.) wrote very little. Even the canon of the sacred Scriptures is said not to have been completed till the reign of "Dara, son of Dara" (Darius Codomannus ; 336-331 B.C.) ; two copies are said to have been deposited in the Treasury and the State archives, where they were destroyed by Alexander. The Greeks were always keenly interested in Persia, but theirs was a propagandist interest ; on the one hand it was the wonderland of reactionary tyranny, all family scandals and brutalities which the good republicans held to be a matter of course in such a land ; on the other hand it was the wonderland of rational monarchy which the reactionaries desired in Greece ; and the effect of both

tendencies was such that realities were apt to be disregarded in their reports. The Jews always looked upon the Persians as a necessary evil and made use of them as such. We can only trace the general line of development of Persian civilization: Zoroaster's religion, as the religion of the State and the ruling class, was slowly reconciled with older religious elements, but it did not spread among the people in general under the dynasty of Akhaemenes. After Alexander's time, when the Persian race was submerged in the masses, Zoroaster's religion was slowly, very slowly, adapted to the middle class and became the rival of Judaism. Jewish literature betrays increasing Persian influence from the *Book of Job* onwards to the fanatical and miracle-mongering works of the Roman period (the apocalyptic works). About 50 B.C. Persian middle-class religion likewise penetrated to India and entered into rivalry with Buddhism, the third world religion.

The Parthians broke away from the Seleucid empire about 250 B.C. under the rule of the Arsacid dynasty and aspired to drive the foreigners from Persian soil and restore the Akhæmænian empire. Their history is to us merely a record of external events. About 130 B.C. they shook off the domination of the Seleucids and long asserted their independence, first against migrating peoples in the north and east (Saka and Tochari), and finally against Rome itself (the defeat of Crassus at Carræ in 53 B.C.). We know nothing of their attitude towards Persian civilization. It was only one of their last rulers, Volagases II, in the second dynasty A.D., who is held to have been well-disposed towards the Persian religion; he caused the fragments of the lost canon of Scriptures to be collected. Through a long period of domination, and the protecting power of the Romans, this ruling race also grew ripe for the development of a bourgeois culture, but it was the product of a fresh process of interbreeding, the second Persian racial mixture.

The supreme god of the Persians before Ahura-Mazda was doubtless Mithra. He was adopted anew in the religion of the Akhæmænid dynasty before 400 B.C. Later he re-emerged in the names of satraps, then in the names of the Arsacid kings and especially in those of the kings of Pontus (Mithradates the Great, 120-66 B.C.). One year before the death of Mithradates a monotheistic religion made its appearance in Rome (67 B.C.), worshipping Mithra as its supreme god, and after the conquest of Cappadocia, Pontus, and eastern Asia Minor it rapidly spread in the Roman empire. It, too, was the product of the first Persian racial mixture; it was a religion

of the masses, not bourgeois in character but adapted to primitive warlike people, and was the outcome of a compromise between Zoroastrian and primitive Persian elements and Hellenistic influences.

The second Persian racial mixture had its origin at the time of Alexander when the Persians lost their dominant position and began to merge with the other peoples of Hither Asia. The wars of the Seleucid and Arsacid kings furthered the process. In the second century A.D. the new race was gradually maturing and placed the royal family of the Sassanids on the throne of Persia in the person of Arteshir (Artaxerxes I; 226-240 B.C.).

The new dynasty, unlike the Arsacids, aspired to be a cultural monarchy and to realize the Messianic ideal of Zoroaster's religion. Arteshir had himself portrayed overthrowing the Parthians; opposite him stands Ahura-Mazda, who has overthrown Angromainya, and gives him the ring, the symbol of sovereignty; on the coins is stamped the fire-altar. Later the dynasty was held to be of priestly origin. And now the High Priest Tanvasar "collected" the "Law", the *Avesta* (document) and the commentaries (*Zend*). Under Shapur I A.D. 241-272), who captured the Roman Emperor Valerianus and pushed forward into Syria and Cappadocia, the Law was extended by the addition of medical and astronomical books and made the canon of all knowledge. Mani, the founder of a religion which sought before Mohammed to reconcile Jewish and Christian ideas with Buddhist and especially Persian elements and create a unifying religion for an empire stretching from India to Rome, maintained his position till the death of Shapur I. Four years later, in A.D. 276, he was crucified. Shapur II (A.D. 309-379) moved the royal residence to Ctesiphon on the Tigris, and after the death of the Emperor Julian he concluded a victorious peace with Byzantium. Under him the canon of Scriptures was completed. Twice during his reign the Christians suffered persecution. The empire asserted its position between the Turks and Huns, the Arabians and Byzantium. King Cobad (A.D. 490-531) in the early years of his reign attempted social reform on communist lines. The doctrine of Mazdak, which attributed all evil to the desire for pleasure and wealth, cost him his crown for a time. Later he was restored to the throne and pursued less radical but more successful reforms. He established cities and introduced a just system of land taxation. His son Chosroes Noshirwan (A.D. 531-578), who waged war victoriously against Byzantium at first and was celebrated in all lands, was also a great builder and especially a patron of art and learning. He admitted fugitive scholars

from Edessa to his empire and had the works of Greek philosophers, mathematicians, and astronomers translated into Persian. The *Book of Kings*, which professes to record Persian history from the beginning of the world, was begun. At the end of his reign the Byzantines took Armenia and Mesopotamia from him. The empire was enfeebled by prolonged wars against Byzantium and by internal disorders, and it succumbed to the assault of the Arabs under Caliph Omar in 643; with it the Avestic State church collapsed.

#### CONSTITUTION AND GROWTH OF SOCIAL CLASSES

From Assyrian sources during the reign of Darius we learn of "twenty-seven kings of the Parsuas" (836 B.C.) and of "magnates (chiefs) of the Mannai" who enjoyed comparative freedom under a king (714 B.C.). Daiukku (Dcioces) seems at this period to have tried to establish a Median imperial government. After 700 he seems to have succeeded, with Hamadan (Ecbatana) as his capital. Under Cyaxares Media became the nucleus of a great empire (about 600 B.C.). Under Cyrus the centre of gravity shifted to western Persia, to Pasargadae, and the empire was extended as far as the Aegaeon and Mediterranean Seas and the Arabian desert. Cambyzes added Egypt and Nubia. We know next to nothing about the constitution of this earliest Persian empire.

The empire of Darius is the first of which we have any detailed knowledge. Eastwards it extended as far as Afghanistan (the Gandarii on the Kabul River and Pactyae in the Indus Valley), northwards to Bactria, Armenia, and the southern coasts of the Caspian and Black Seas, westwards to Thrace, Macedonia, and Cyrene, and southwards to Nubia and the Arabian deserts. This vast realm was divided into twenty-three (according to the Behistun inscription) or twenty-eight or thirty-two provinces or satrapies. The ancestral land of the kings, Persis, was not included in the number. Probably twenty-three regular provinces were established and ruled by royal officials. These, together with the king's ancestral land, would make up the magic number 24 ( $2 \times 12$ ) as a basis of partition. The other five, or nine, satrapies in the lists were regions that were loosely annexed or merely paid occasional tribute (such as Carthage, for example). The powers of the governors varied considerably. Some controlled the civil and military administration and thus exercised supreme authority; these governors simply replaced the kings of previous days. In other cases the powers were divided, and besides

the satrap, who dealt with administration and justice, there was a military governor commanding the provincial troops. It was desirable to entrust the governor with full powers in distant frontier regions where prompt and responsible action might be necessary, but particularly where there were old-established civilized communities (Egypt and Babylonia) or where tribal susceptibilities had to be considered (Media, Parthia, Bactria). Certain satrapies were made hereditary at quite an early stage, such as Armenia and Pontus. All governors were liable to sudden inspection by royal envoys. All sent regular reports, some drawn up by independent scribes, to the king's court. The governors were princes who maintained a court and their own bodyguard and levied taxes for the support of themselves and their court in addition to the imperial taxes. Earlier national and civic authorities continued to exist under their control. In Phoenicia, Caria, and India there were kings, in the Greek cities aristocracies or tyrants. A large measure of consideration was shown, with deliberate intent, to religious and political national peculiarities.

This applies to taxation, which was administered on a money basis, but also consisted of deliveries in kind corresponding to the character of each country—gold dust, corn, animals for riding, sheep, and even eunuchs. According to a statement of Herodotus the sum total of the imperial taxes in gold amounted to 14,560 silver talents. Darius introduced the first imperial coinage in gold and silver (with a fixed ratio of  $13\frac{1}{2} : 1$ ) on the Lydian model. National and city coinages were also current.

A royal road was constructed leading from Susa to Nineveh across the Tigris and Euphrates to Comana in Cilicia and across the Halys to Sardes. From it roads branched off to all the principal cities and the provinces. It was used for the imperial postal service which was carried on by mounted messengers. The main road was kept up and official communications maintained from all different stations. Naturally the road was also used for purposes of trade, for which the State likewise kept the old river and canal routes open and navigable. "Justice" is one of the chief duties that Zoroaster's religion imposes upon those who profess it. The administration of justice was therefore regarded as one of the king's chief concerns. The rulers themselves pronounced judgment in the palace gates. In addition there was a High Court of Justice with seven members. Primarily these supreme courts doubtless served the purposes of imperial administration, and also the requirements of the ruling people, who maintained justice between themselves according to the free customs of their

forefathers by electing judges from among themselves. According to Greek accounts the Courts recognized rewards as well as punishments. The subject peoples were judged according to their own laws by their own judges ; the governors and their royal courts were above these national courts, just as the king and the imperial judges were above the governors. We can quite well believe that in the sixth and fifth centuries corruption was severely punished in all judges.

Darius' administrative structure was a really great achievement ; it was the first to embrace a great empire in the modern sense and to organize and inspire it over a long period. It was the fruit of a great capacity for uniform supervision and organization and a skilful adaptation of the earlier achievements of the Babylonians, Assyrians, and Egyptians, as well as the Lydians and Ionians, and it lasted for centuries. Many chance circumstances favoured it--inventions like coinage, and progress in transport and communications first made and put to the test in the great Assyrian empire (road-building) and in Ionia, and now to be applied on a really large scale. But chance could not supply what was worth most ; that was the fruit of Persian culture in its youthful prime. It endowed the Persian kings with a religion which taught that wisdom, justice, piety, and welfare were the essence of divinity and the duty of rulers who were responsible to their God and could hope for immortality and bliss only through the fulfilment of those duties. The strongest impulses of morality and self-interest were enlisted in support of a religious code that served the general well-being. But this same youthful civilization supplied the means of putting that code into practice : young men trained in chivalry and the ideals of warfare in the cause of good and of a wise and just God, so that they grew up to form a caste of free helpers in the divine and royal task, and to be civil servants and officers bound to the king's service nationally (as the ruling race) and by religious and military loyalty (as leaders in an army of warriors fighting for the victory of wisdom and justice). So it was that the earliest patriarchal absolutism arose, the first religious and beneficent monarchy in the history of the human race, where the king felt himself to be responsible not only for order and justice but for the welfare of his subjects, and where the official class was inspired by a sense of duty and honour and obedience in the service of a great idea. Only thus was it possible to establish lasting and worldwide sovereignty over refractory peoples in the most varied phases of development, barbarians and peoples with an ancient civilization,

priests and merchants professing religions hostile to the monarchy, princes and nobles with all manner of ambitions. Only thus were the Persians justified in extending their conquests to more and more countries.

Hitherto there had been great empires naturally united by a navigable river, like the Nile or the Euphrates (if we ignore barbarian agglomerations of short duration); then came still larger empires united by the necessity of resistance to particular invaders (the Hyksos, the Elamites, or the Bedouins). Finally there came empires like those of Assyria and Chaldaea, where union and defence and order were the work of a system of civilization and monarchical power. In these empires roads were built for armies and commerce, but the armies consumed the commerce and the empires, which were forced to extend further and further in order to justify their existence. And now the first peaceful world empire arose, strictly organized from above, but allowing a moderate degree of freedom to its subjects; the taxes were bearable, and the administration and army were only means to the end of its lasting preservation; it was equipped with the most modern system of currency and transit, and was the outcome of a great idea which animated the kings and their officers and administrators. Jewish civilization, with its one God and its Law, gave birth to the first universal Church; Persian civilization, with its divine Spirit promising wisdom and plenty to all men of goodwill and hostility to all the wicked, produced the first world empire based upon rational peace and the activity and beneficence of righteousness and ability—a "kingdom of God".

True, it was for a hundred years, not for ever. The first zeal of the champions of God and the genius of their Messianic king exercised a prolonged, but not an eternal, posthumous influence. The isolated empire sank into a state of inactive calm after its defeat in Greece, and the unchecked personal forces which were essential to great achievements were bound to conflict among themselves when activity ceased. The ruling race lost the great idea that had enabled it to accomplish the honourable task of producing the early caste of officers and administrators; they turned into a class of pampered profiteers and fell asunder. They were not humanly mature enough to create a similar caste by force of sheer rationality and moral idealism, without the cement of nationalism. What remained, therefore, was a legitimate monarchy claiming absolute authority but devoid of vigour, and a ruling class that boasted of its religious and chivalrous superiority, but had lost its sense of duty; each took thought for its

own interests and mistrusted the other. The satraps aspired to the position of princes, to independence and hereditary power, and the kings were afraid to admit anyone else to a position of power. The subject peoples had always submitted unwillingly, only because they were occupied with commercial interests, and the like; they were despised and exploited by their rulers, and they made no effort to save the collapsing empire. It fell like any barbarian domination of civilized peoples.

And now the Persian people and the Persian religion joined the company of ancient peoples and religions and the Greeks became the new ruling race, with their enlightened military monarchy. And then it proved that the level reached by the Persians had remained very near that of the Jews. It was only for great monarchs and their dominant peoples that Ahura-Mazda was zealous for justice and the well-being of all; he was not jealous of his own unique position, like Yahu who would tolerate no alien gods. To the bourgeois classes and the remnants of the old free nobility he became one rival among several, for the most part "sole" gods of the universe with like claims to universal authority. The Sassanid monarchy came to be a papal monarchy as fanatical in the persecution of Christians as these were in turn in the persecution of the heathen. The State church crucified Mani and persecuted heretics with all the ferocity of a faith which makes the fight for truth the condition of prosperity in this world and bliss hereafter. It was only as a servant of religion that the monarchy could survive amidst the general disintegration.

From the fifth century onwards the dominant middle class, closely allied with the priesthood and nobility in the service of the papal kings, was menaced by a throng of exploited peasants, handicraft workers, and slaves<sup>1</sup> whom Mazdak endowed with a communist ideal. Kindred aspirations, embodied in religious sects, had been associated with Mani's reform in the third century, but this counterpart of Christianity in the Roman Empire had been suppressed. King Cobad, likewise a Messianic king, tried to establish equality between all believers and the abolition of aristocracy and property by authority from above (A.D. 500), and he was overthrown by the propertied classes. After he had recovered his sovereignty by repudiating radical reforms, he tried to reconcile conflicting

<sup>1</sup> Amongst the ruling Persian race under the dynasty of Akhaemenes there were no Persian slaves, and in Jewish communities there were no Jewish slaves as a matter of principle. Doubtless the Persian church likewise forbade the enslavement of its members on principle, but allowed it in practice. The enslavement of people of other religions was, of course, permissible among them all.

social interests by the old methods of patriarchal absolutism and by reason and justice. This did not stifle the mass movement, but only alienated it from the church. When the simpler Mohammedan religion appeared, with its fanaticism and its cruder hopes of a hereafter for all champions of God (not for wisdom and justice), with its absolute equality among the faithful and the overthrow of all civic conditions, the "heresy of the fire-worshippers" came to an end with extraordinary rapidity, not on account of the fanatical power of the Caliphs Omar and Osman, but because the masses turned away from the bourgeois State and the bourgeois church. The Asvestic communities only persisted tenaciously in India as middle-class sects, just as Judaism persisted in the Christian Roman Empire of the masses.

Of the religion of Mithra in its original home in Asia Minor we know practically nothing. It reached Rome as a religion of pirates and soldiers. It spread as a sect in the Roman army and made converts among the frontier barbarians, especially in Germany. It remained a caste religion of professional soldiers.

#### RELIGION

The first Indo-Germans that we can trace between 2000 and 1000 B.C. in Hither Asia did not bring the ancient Neolithic solar religion with them, but a higher form of religion which, however, is easily recognizable as the offspring of its forerunner. Exactly as in Egypt and Babylonia, the process of evolution in the solar civilizations led to the emergence of great universal gods. This implies the emergence of new races, for they alone have creative force. Since all Indo-Germans appear endowed with this more advanced religion, we may perhaps assume that the advance was the outcome of a racial mixture which produced the Indo-Germans as a "people" and the uniform Indo-Germanic civilization. Racially this would probably have been the intermarriage of the old Shell-Heap peoples and the nearest peoples of another race. In that case we must not suppose that the Indo-Germans were uniformly fair and blue-eyed; intermixed there would be a dark element; and the first sound-shifting would be explained by this means. The process of interbreeding would have begun about 2500 B.C. and have born fruit between 2000 and 1500 B.C.

This Indo-Germanic civilization represented an advance upon Neolithic civilization. The knightly civilization of the European

Bronze Age came to birth. Progress, born of the inner development of one people and the importation from without of bronze from southern lands, took the same direction as in Egypt and Babylonia in outgrowing the ancient solar civilization, but it did not advance as far as the Egyptian phase. It is unlikely that religious ideas from the more highly evolved South were introduced in the homeland. In that case writing would certainly have been taken over, as it was by the Hittites. The new civilization of the Indo-Germans evolved spontaneously and their ideas of the gods are stamped with their own peculiar character. Since they were still on a lower level, writing was not invented.

The earliest Indo-Germanic peoples of whose religious ideas we have some tangible knowledge are the Aryans, the "Harri" in the land of the Mitanni, who worshipped a divine triad, Mithra, Indra, and Varuna, and a pair of brothers, the Nashatianna (about 1400 B.C.). The later Persians and Indians also described themselves as "Aryans", and the gods whom they worshipped, now separately, were the same, though the series was otherwise differentiated.

The beings known to Neolithic solar religion had become great, immortal gods among the Harri—a god of the heavens and the day, a god of the storm, and a god of the depths (water) and night. The god of day (the heavens) and the "weather-god" were certainly common to all Indo-Germanic tribes. The third, Varuna, may have acquired his character in the neighbourhood of Babylonia (Ea) by a process of speculation which set up three gods of the parts of the universe (Anu, Enlil, Ea). There is no mistaking their descent from the solar myth. We can still recognize Mithra and Varuna as the bright and sombre brothers. Indra is a New Year's victor who slays the dragon (Babylonia?) Vrtra and frees the cow, the virgin, and the water of life. Mithra was a solar god, like Ra, and both the others have solar traits (especially Varuna; nocturnal sun?). The Nashatianna (Asvins) were simply the two solar brothers who wander through the world as friends and helpers of mankind to purge it of monsters.

As in southern lands with a higher civilization, the solar religion was differentiated by speculative thought. Men recognized that the sun, the god of day, and the storm god were immortal. A process of identification with Nature had been accomplished, though it was primitive in character; the day, the storm, and perhaps the night had been attributed to great gods (there was no division of the universe into heaven and earth and the depths, nor any identification with

the stars). These universal gods were phantom figures, except in so far as they were the heirs of solar mythology, even more phantom-like than the Egyptian Keb and Nut (Earth and Heaven); but they were immortal. And there was some attempt at a subdivision of the universe, though it never got beyond the wholly concrete and crudely impressionist stage (day, night, thunder and lightning). People looked for something beyond and above the sun (day); they sought for Nature apart from humanity; they sought founders of civilization distinguished from incarnations of the phenomena of Nature (the Asvins, the Dioscuri).

Of course the god of death and resurrection survived side by side with these Nature gods and immortals. The sacred legend with its heroic, social, and ethical treasure and its imaginative power must not be lost. Its hero likewise became a god, a "Hor" or "Her figure". The ancient Min or Man receded and was replaced by Mithra, Indra, and Varuna as immortal, universal gods, and at a later date Zeus, Jupiter, Tiu, Donar (Thorr), and others. The youthful Horus became the chief god of life and death as leader of the "Haryans". (Perhaps the Aryans were not other than the earliest Indo-Germans who went to distant lands led by Har, as the Dorians did later led by the youthful Her). Horus was the newly-married, dying god, mourned and rising again, the lord of the water of life. Like Osiris, this hero continued to be a great god, although he died. But his name was changed when he was adapted to the character of a country or became a hero (as the result of further speculation by which the pantheon was developed). In a country that was securely held he disappeared altogether.

Even the Medes of the eighth century had a more developed pantheon than the Indo-Germans. In the city of Musisir, which Sargon destroyed in 713 B.C., a god Baga-mazda, "the god of wisdom" was worshipped. He may have been the same as the god of heaven known to the Khaldi, with whom were associated a weather-god and a sun-god. In any case he was an ancestor of Ahura-Mazda, bearing a Median name and essentially something more than a mere god of day or a portion of the universe. Herodotus tells us of the Median capital, Ecbatana, that the seven walls of the royal citadel bore the seven colours of the sun, moon and five planets; clearly Babylonian stellar speculation had made its influence felt. We are witnesses of the rise of a State religion superior to that of the Indo-Germans, influenced by Babylon but springing from native speculative powers (Mazda).

The information obtained from the *Gathas* of Zoroaster concerning Persian religion prior to his reform, the religion of Cyrus and Cambyses, is applicable within certain limits to Median religion of the seventh and sixth centuries. In western Persia, and in eastern Persia before Zoroaster, there were seven great gods, for Zoroaster made good their loss by the seven Ahuras, the aspects of his new god Ahura-Mazda. Chief of the seven was undoubtedly Mithra, the god of day and victory and kingship, and beside him was a chief female divinity Anahita, doubtless the mother of the gods and an earth-goddess. Both were restored to the reformed religion immediately after the death of Darius. The fight between light and darkness must have played a leading part in the myth: Mithra as the creator of the universe must have overthrown Chaos like Enlil, and possibly he destroyed the wicked in the Flood like the Babylonian god. But Zoroaster's chief struggle was against the worship of Haoma with its sacrifice of bulls and its orgies. Haoma was the dying god who rose again, the bull who gave his blood as a drink conferring immortality, the Haoma herb on Mount Hara from which a vitalizing, intoxicating drink was brewed. He was the forefather of all the gods who intoxicated their worshippers Dionysus-wise, inspiring them and saving them from death. The god's mortality, the folly of destroying useful animals, and the immorality of the orgies were all equally detestable to the Prophet. But even Haoma theories very soon found their way back again into the purified Persian religion.

We must assume the existence in Persia prior to Zoroaster of a religion which united Aryan elements and borrowed features from Babylon, and so built up a pantheon of great gods and a religion of the dead; it was administered and elaborated by a priestly caste, the Magians. We know too little of this religion to judge accurately how exalted it was and whether it was a compound or a new organic growth. There are some indications that it remained a compound, stirred by new ideas of its own creation.

It should be mentioned here that possibly the king was called "Sun", as was the case with the Hittites. Kurush, Cyrus, means "Sun", and the sacred solar legend later provided the outline of the story of the first Persian sovereign.

Zoroaster,<sup>1</sup> the founder of the Avestic religion, like Amos, was the owner of flocks and not very wealthy; he came of a tribe on the edge of the desert and was a free east Persian whose family and tribe are known by name. He was born about 600 B.C. and is

<sup>1</sup> Compare my book on *Religion und Philosophie*, Kröner, Leipzig, 1924.

said to have received his revelation at the age of thirty by the river Daitya. This he enshrined in the *Gathas* which contain laments for his poverty and the threats to his life, besides, lesser injuries from unbelieving lords and prophets of Haoma, whom he curses. In 559 B.C. he succeeded in converting Prince Vishtaspa to his doctrine. His lot was completely reversed : he connected himself by marriage with the principal family at the prince's court and gained political influence by his eager, repeated challenge to spread the doctrine. But his political influence did not reach its full force till after his death when Darius, the son of Vishtaspa-Hystaspes, without doubt a personal disciple of Zoroaster, undertook in 522 B.C. the final labour of Messianic kingship, the annihilation of the Magian religion among the Persian people and the establishment of a world-wide empire of truth ; this task he accomplished in years of warfare.

Zoroaster was a prophet like Amos, but freer as an individual and more abstract in his thinking. He did not utter with foaming mouth the words thrust upon him by the Deity. It is very doubtful whether he ever had a vision, and he never stood in the presence of his god, pleading and supplicating. What he sang and revealed (*Gathas* are songs) were didactic speeches showing deep insight into the nature of the "wise Spirit" ; they were recited on particular, personal occasions and were coloured by personal emotion, even going so far as curses upon particular persons ; but for all their impassioned element of emotion and their zeal for truth, their form is almost abstract. Moreover, the circumstances of the prophet's life emerge in a more personal form than is the case with Amos.

The teaching of Zoroaster sprang from a religious movement which sought to unite men with God. The Haoma mysticism sought to bring men near to God and identify them with Him by means of ecstatic states produced by the Haoma drink and by consuming the flesh and blood of the divine bull. Zoroaster sought to achieve the same union, but by means of rational, natural knowledge and moral action. In so doing he started with the new revelation that he had received of the divine nature.

When Zoroaster wished to designate his new god as one, and by one name, he called him Mazda Ahura, which means literally "Insight (Wisdom) Leader", or, in the customary more or less adequate translation "Wisdom-Spirit" or "the wise Spirit". "Insight-Leader" is not so much an all-embracing indication of the nature of the god whom Zoroaster desired to serve as a programme of religious reform : wisdom and reason were to guide men, not the folly and

madness of the celebrants of the bull orgies who absorbed God in the semblance of a bull, killed useful animals for superstitious reasons, and hoped to attain immortality by drinking blood. For the rest, wisdom, or reason, was the only one aspect of the new Deity. He had six others—"right, good thought, piety, immortality, welfare, and dominion."<sup>1</sup>

If we, with our superior logical powers, seek to form an all-embracing general concept to include the seven aspects of the Deity, it might be that of "goodness"; goodness in the sense of what is rational and moral, the natural, serviceable insight (wisdom), and morality (right, good thought, and piety) as well as the fruit of both which everyone desires, the epitome of the good things of this world (welfare, dominion, and immortality). It is a concept which out-distances the powers of the Jewish intellect (the aspects or characteristics of the Deity are almost all elaborated in abstract form) but does not attain to the Greek level of maturity; the good acts that are to be performed (that are demanded as what "ought" to be) are not distinguished from the good things that are desired; the characteristics are not logically integrated. But reason and Nature are guides to right conduct, to what is advantageous (good things), and to morality. Wisdom and morality constitute the nature of the true God. Man is akin to God and may approach him and attain bliss through wisdom (the possession of natural insight) and morality (right, good thought, and piety).

God is "Good". Opposed to him is "Evil", also in fact resolved into seven qualities: folly (irrationality, madness), injustice, evil thought, impiety, misfortune, servitude, and mortality—so at least we should expect. But Zoroaster did not follow this method; he did not pursue the mutually exclusive opposites down to the last detail. But he laid great stress on the contrast; as a whole it became the true kernel of his system of the universe.

Amos contrasted God, who was universal, eternal, almighty, holy, righteous, and the epitome of worth, with his whole creation that was in truth nothing beside him, transitory, weak, unrighteous, worthless, although both Nature and history as God's handiwork, and man as capable of knowledge and right conduct, reflected God's

<sup>1</sup> An additional characteristic, at least subsequently, was that the Deity was a radiant Being, symbolized by fire and the sun. Zoroaster did not stress this aspect associated with elemental Nature, but only the moral and human aspects. Possibly the association with Nature was part of the movement which led back after his death to the worship of the sun and of fire and away from the moral and rational spirituality which lived within and behind all the "aspects".

own worth. For Zoroaster, likewise, a perception of the contrast between worth and worthlessness was fundamental; it was not, however, the contrast between the Creator and his creation, God and the universe, but between good and evil. It was not conceived in a purely ethical sense, for "good" and "goods" were identified, but it was altogether dominated by ethical considerations. It was not a contrast between the world and that which is above the world, but was within the world. It came to be a contrast between one God and another. The Deity was divided into the good, true God and the evil, false God, into God and the Devil.

The world and man were both alike good and evil. That is a fact, and one of the fundamental facts from which Zoroaster must have started out. It can be seen in Nature and in history as well as in the lives of individuals. Everywhere constructive forces are opposed by destructive, alike in lifeless and in living Nature. The storm-flood destroys the cultivated fields, weeds overrun the wheat, the poisonous snake kills the useful ox. In the human world a bad ruler succeeds a good one, an evil man gets the better of a just one; the foolish servant of Haoma slays the draught-ox, and deprives himself of reason by intoxicating drinks instead of using it. In every man there is a spirit of wisdom and a spirit of folly; they struggle one against the other and prevail alternately. Everywhere light and darkness are opposed.

That is possible only if from the very beginning two gods have existed in the universe side by side and in opposition, one wise and righteous and the other malicious and evil. If there were only one God, either the good or the evil one, the world must be either purely rational and moral or purely irrational and immoral. The good God can neither create nor tolerate evil, nor the evil God good. Between good and evil, reason and irrationality, there can only be warfare; no mediation is possible.

We have the ideal of a rational, righteous, and perfect divine Being which does not accord with the image of the world as it is. The Jewish God had been able to create a world that contained much evil; that was impossible for Mazda-Ahura, for he was wholly good and the creature must surely resemble the Creator. The Jewish God governed this world, and in spite of his omnipotence it remained refractory and worthy of destruction. Mazda-Ahura in his place, as sole Lord, would have eradicated evil long ago. Zoroaster's logic is more advanced than that of Amos. It demands that a perfect world should correspond with a perfect God, and as that does not

prove to be, it sets the utterly evil up against the perfectly good God. A rapturous and somewhat indeterminate enthusiasm has given place to a clearly formed ideal intellectually conceived, an absolute contrast. The first theodicy, or justification of the Deity, is the product of logical maturity. From all eternity all that is good, righteous, and rational has its source in the good God, and similarly all that is evil, irrational, and immoral in his wicked brother. The two have been at war with one another ever since they made their choice in the beginning to create and to do good and evil respectively.

Man stands between God and the Devil, free to choose and to do good or evil, like the gods. He may be wise, just, right-thinking, and pious, and so attain welfare and dominion and immortality; or he may be foolish, unjust, and impious and reap disaster, defeat, and immortality in the form of damnation. He will remain in life and death with the God to whom he attaches himself as a companion in arms.

Now for the first time the freedom to make the rational and moral or the irrational and immoral choice, the duty of fighting on behalf of all that is serviceable and moral, and the ultimate logical conclusion in an eternity of bliss or misery, were thus forcibly emphasized. This logic passed blindly over the fact of decay which caused the Jews to halt. Just as Zoroastrian logic divided the Deity in two for the sake of the ideal, and in order to contrast good and evil, so it asserted the truth of human immortality for the sake of a moral claim. An evil man may have plenty on earth and dominion and happiness; that is obvious, but in the hereafter, in eternity, it must appear that all was frailty and disaster.

For in the end (here desire prevailed over the even balancing of logic) the good God will conquer and rule with his own. In order to hasten this consummation he sends his prophet Zoroaster to proclaim to mankind the true nature of the universe, the struggle and its issue, so that men may choose rightly, rationally, and morally, and may join zealously in the fight for the establishment of the universal rule of the wise and rational God of light. The Persians as God's people and Darius as the sword of God are to establish the reign of reason and righteousness, peace and happiness on earth.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> I think it not impossible that the Zoroastrian doctrine originally prophesied the destruction and collapse of evil men upon earth in the "final labour" of Darius, and mortality in death without a hell. The logical contrast in the formula of the seven aspects of the Deity would then be more perfect and the tolerance of the first professors of the religion, who saw the victories of Darius, would be easy to understand. In that case the elaboration of the doctrine

But Zoroaster's speculations embraced a second antithesis besides that of good and evil, namely the contrast between "spirit" and "matter". It is true that "*Ahura*" does not mean "spiritual being", but "leader". The opposing concept "*dæva*" does not mean "physical being" but "seducer, devil". Nor was the concept of "spirit" logically worked out, any more than the general concept "good"; but it is implied in the attributes of the Deity and plays a dominant part in the doctrine. Reason and right, good thought and piety (as characteristics) are spiritual traits borrowed from man's spiritual nature. Even welfare (blessings, we might say), dominion, and immortality as qualities and gifts of the good Deity have a spiritual character (in another sense light is also non-material). Thus Mazda-Ahura is designated as a non-material, spiritual Being. Naturally his brother and opponent is similar; he is a thinking, willing, immortal Being, of the nature of a force, although all these qualities are characterized by folly and immorality, inferior power and damnation.

God is Spirit, non-material and spiritual in character according to the model of human reason and moral volition. That is something more than Eh, the moving, generative, life-giving Being in the Solar Disc known to the Egyptians, and the spirit ghosts (Ka, Ba, and others) of the Egyptians and Babylonians; more, too, than Ruah, the spirit of the Lord, the female, brooding offshoot of Yahu at the Creation, whose name did not become the saving word to describe fully the God without image or form of the Jewish universal church until Persian influence made itself felt. It is not yet the Greek concept of "spirit", the rational part of man's soul which Aristotle distinguishes from the bodily soul. Greek philosophy was the first to reach a sufficient degree of maturity to distinguish soul and body scientifically as fundamental notions of the psychical and physical world and to divide the soul into the spiritual and bodily souls, into thought, emotion, and volition. But Zoroaster took a first step towards these distinctions.

God is Spirit. Therewith all material ideas concerning him simply fade away. He may be symbolised by light and darkness and fire, and represented as reason and moral volition, but there can be no thought of portraying him. Anything that is an image of stone or metal or wood cannot be God. For that is a dead, material mass, concerning the wicked would belong to a later period, when defeat had bred fanaticism and "wickedness" had replaced "folly" and was to be punished by eternal damnation. It is not possible, indeed, to prove that that is what happened, since we only possess the *Gathas* in the canon, in a revised form.

liable to crumble and decay. Nobody can confound images with spirit ; it is quite unnecessary to prohibit and combat images.

Man, indeed, is compounded of both, spirit and body, reason and irrationality, the moral and immoral will, trunk, head, and limbs. But if we examine more closely, his original, fundamental essence is spiritual. It is the spiritual element in him that lives and acts, thinks and moves, whilst the bodily element is the dead mass, the tool, the extraneous part. One day the bodily part will fall away and decay, but man as a spirit will live on, without a body ; he is enduring like God because, like God, he is spirit. The obstacle to full compensating justice, which death seems to constitute, and which the Jews found almost insurmountable, is done away with. The immortality of the spiritual, rational, and moral is implied as a matter of course when it is said : " God is wisdom and right, good thought and immortality ", or in other words, " God is spirit " ; for man knows that he, too, is reason and the moral will, or spirit.

Zoroaster achieved something great in his discovery of the spiritual nature of the Deity and of man, in its clear definition as reason, the moral will, and good thought, and likewise in its combination with non-psychological notions such as prosperity and power and with the claim to immortality. The doctrine of immortality was new and based upon far higher considerations than was the case in Egypt and Crete ; it did not rest upon magic or the annual course of Nature, but upon the spiritual nature of God and man. We have here the germs of an elementary theory of physics and of the mental faculties in psychology (reason, justice).

Zoroaster fashioned his world upon the basis of a mutually exclusive antithesis between good and evil. The eternally recurring fight of the bright and dark brothers became in his hands a timeless antithesis of light and darkness, reason and irrationality, morality and immorality, which, however, would be resolved by the march of world history leading to the victory of light. At this point his doctrine becomes wholly intolerant : there can be no toleration of irrationality and immorality ; all resistance is accounted wickedness, and all pity for the wicked, sin. All man's powers, his zeal for truth and righteousness, his desire to serve the strongest master for his own good, and his freedom-loving pride are directed against the wicked enemy.

Yet in spite of this Zoroaster's religion was capable, because of its tolerance, of establishing a world empire of peace and reason. Yahu was jealous of his unique position and required the destruction

of idols. Mazda-Ahura tolerated the worship of alien gods and images; he felt himself to be high above these childish customs. Forbearance towards immorality was impossible, but not towards inability to conceive of spiritual gods. From his loftier logical standpoint he could even make concessions to the prevailing polytheism; it was not utterly to be condemned, for there really were many spirits, though a clear thinker summed them up under a single pair, two opposing spirits. Zoroaster himself analysed the "Leader Insight" by a logical process and distinguished seven aspects in which he revealed his nature: God was wisdom, right, good thought, piety, immortality, welfare, and dominion. He who possessed God had all these qualities and graces; the possession of God expressed itself in the application and possession of all these aspects of his being. Zoroaster himself used forms of prayer that sound polytheistic; he cried to Wisdom to endow him with good thought through the mediation of Right, or he prayed to Wisdom and Good Thought to grant him welfare through right. Anyone who was not intellectually free and abstract enough could think of Mazda as the old god of light and the heavens, and of *Armatay*, welfare, as the old Earth-Mother. He could even work in the concepts of the religion of Haoma, and understand wisdom, right, and piety as "the food of life" and "the draught of salvation". Only he must fight in the cause of reason and morality. God is spirit, and even Mazda-Ahura is not a proper name designating a person, but one of seven aspects of a great vision of the universe.

Mazda-Ahura had been changed to Ahura-Mazda and was declined like a personal name even in the inscriptions of Darius (522-485 B.C.), the disciple of Zoroaster and founder of the ultimate kingdom of the Wise Leader. The new universal God was the Creator of earth and heaven and mankind, the giver of royal power and every blessing. He was portrayed as a human figure soaring and flying in the winged solar disc and followed by the moon. The king prayed to him at a fire-altar. He had been assimilated to other great gods, Marduk, Ashur, Yahu, and his worship to the old Magian religion.

Herodotus tells that in his day (about 450 B.C.) the Persians worshipped God on the summits of mountains and in pure places, but that they knew neither temples nor altars. According to him the seven aspects of the one God were gods of Nature and the elements: the sky (Zeus), the sun, moon, earth, fire, water, and the winds. A priestly, caste whom he calls "Magians" accompanied the sacrifices with sacred songs and litanies. Clearly these were

learned scribes, not consecrated priests. These Magians were also distinguished by their zeal in combating "harmful" animals, ants and snakes, and by the fact that they would only consent to be buried after the desecration of their dead bodies by dogs and birds.

During the reign of Artaxerxes II (404-361 B.C.) the old divine names of Mithra and Anahita reappeared even in Persian royal inscriptions.

The process of elaborating the doctrine into a system had begun. According to Persian tradition that process was completed under "Dara, the son of Dara", who is identified with Darius III (336-323 B.C.), the last of the dynasty of Akhaemenes. But the *Zend-Avesta*, the Scripture of the Avestic religion, of which we possess remnants, was not collected and canonized till the time of the Sassanids (A.D. 226-651). Its nucleus is the *Gathas* of Zoroaster, round which a Law (*Vendidad*) and hymns, prayers, and litanies have accreted. It is only in these later portions that we find the system of spirits, the system of Nature with its good and evil parts and essence, and the system of history.

The idea of the struggle between the two spirits, the Lords of Light and Darkness, continuing from the earliest beginning till the victory of light, had grown to a mighty vision. We are familiar with all its essential features, for it entered directly into the apocalyptic literature of Judaism and Christianity and through the Manichæans into St. Augustine's doctrine. Round about Ahura-Mazda, the god of light and the heavens, stand six "immortal helpers". The seven aspects of the godhead are sometimes persons, children of light, a god with his archangels, and sometimes, as in Herodotus, divisions of the universe (heaven and earth), elements (fire and water), and natural kingdoms (metals, animals, plants), or placed in command of these latter. Mithra, too, is an angelic Being, the great conqueror and hunter, the protector at the "Bridge of Separation" which leads to the hereafter. So, too, Anahita, the queen of motherhood and the waters. And behind them are countless guardian angels of the clans and families in the land. The "hero Haoma" is no longer a god of the dead, but a benefactor of mankind, whose earliest heroes he taught to prepare the "good intoxicating liquor".

Opposed to the God with his host of angels was the Devil (Angromainya) with the arch-devils and the host of demons (*dævas*). The two hosts were extended in learned categories to earthly creatures; there were good and bad animals, plants, and metals.

There were clean and unclean places, conditions, and objects which must be accurately observed.

Heaven and hell came into being as places of light and darkness, regions of blessedness and perdition. The Egyptians only knew of Ra's boat and Osiris' palace for the blessed and a monster Devourer of the West for the damned. The Babylonians transferred the gods to heaven and the dead to a sombre realm of earthy dust. But now Heaven was opened to men, and the "cavern" became an "abyss" where the damned live, a place of eternal torment, hell. The kingdoms of Good and Evil were world-wide, and everywhere good and evil spirits were contending for victory.

Their warfare constituted the history of the world, which ran its course in four eras of three thousand years. In the first era the two primeval Beings were alone. Ahura-Mazda created light; thereupon Angromainya, the evil spirit, came forth from the darkness. Since he refused to conclude any treaty, they fought and he was driven back into the darkness by the power of prayer. Ahura-Mazda now proceeded with creation; he formed the good spirits, heaven and earth, the elements, and also men and animals and plants. Angromainya interposed, slaying the first bull and the first man, seducing, and bringing forth evil. This process of physical creation likewise lasted three thousand years. Then the combat began on earth and continued for another three thousand years without victory. It began with the period of the primeval kings, the Flood hero Yima, and the three slayers of dragons, and ended with Vishtaspa's reign. Finally Zoroaster appeared and the last era began; three Saviours of his seed, one every thousand years, were to complete the victory. Ahura-Mazda's kingdom would dawn with a universal day of judgment, and Angromainya and his followers would be confined in the abyss for all time.

Divine worship was also elaborated systematically. It was fire-worship, for fire is light upon earth, the pure element. It is righteous warfare for the good and destruction of the evil Being, a service of purity and purification. Just as Judaism transformed the heathen unlucky day into the Sabbath, so Parseeism made the desecration of dead bodies by animals the pre-requisite of burial. It sought thus to stress the doctrine that the body is nothing, a corpse is dung and makes everything unclean that it touches. The soul lives and its lot in the first days following death was made the subject of elaborate speculation. At the Bridge of Separation its life reaches an eternal consummation.

In this systematization of his doctrine, Zoroaster himself was assimilated with the sun-hero. Like him he was stolen from his mother by the Magians and exposed (after an attempt at murder had failed); he grew up in a cave and was suckled by a sheep. In this cave, or in another where (according to another legend) he withdrew from his own people, all knowledge of Nature was pictured on the walls; supernatural knowledge was revealed to him by the Deity at the age of thirty by the river Daitya, whence he was carried away to a mountain (Dio Chrysostom) or to heaven and hell. At the age of forty, he came to Vishtaspa. Once more the Magians effected his imprisonment, but he was miraculously set free and began his final labour, the victorious struggle against darkness; in this combat he fell and entered the presence of God as a risen soul; but three men of his seed will one day conclude the struggle.

The Avestic church sprang about A.D. 200 from the youthful piety of the second Persian racial mixture. Besides the men who collected and completed the *Avesta*, which was to sum up all knowledge, it counted among its adherents a religious genius, Mani, born in Babylonia in A.D. 215. He grew up among Christians and was acquainted with Judaism and Buddhism, but he was himself a convinced Parsee. We have no writings of his, so that we can form no direct idea of his religious life; he was no more a mere syncretist than Mohammed. He aspired to complete Zoroaster's work of establishing the reign of the "wise Spirit" on earth. He sought the Messianic king who might found a world empire upon his revelations, and discovered him in Shapur I (A.D. 242-271), who accorded him lifelong protection. To this king he offered his teaching, which we know only in outline; it is a philosophy of history in which all the great prophets of Parseeism, Judaism, Christianity, and Buddhism appear as messengers of the God of Light, but Zoroaster and Mani are the third and sixth in the series; he offered the king, too, a practical system which was to place a host of saints or monks in the service of the new religion. The essence of his prophecy was the struggle between light and darkness and its aim was the establishment of a world-wide kingdom of the true God. As a genuine disciple of Zoroaster he strove to realize his aim through reason (the reconciliation of the various universal gods and their schemes) and moral zeal (asceticism). The doctrine of Amos was capable of giving birth to a doctrine of pity and love like that of Jesus; from Zoroaster's only a doctrine of reason and zeal could spring. Mani himself fell a victim to orthodoxy after the death of Shapur II in A.D. 276. But

his teaching was the only creed that proved a serious menace to Christianity until Augustine, himself a Manichæan, brought its central doctrine of two kingdoms running through the course of history into the service of Christianity. Mohammed, too, followed in Mani's footsteps when he enumerated his succession of prophets and uttered his call to fight for the true God and his kingdom even to death; and by this means he gained dominion over Hither Asia and Africa.

It is not certain how the Mithraic religion grew historically out of the religions of Persia, but it is beyond doubt that they were its source. It seems certain to me, too, that it absorbed an element of Mazda worship into its essential creed, and not merely into its mythology, like the Hellenistic elements of a later period. Mithraism is easiest to understand as quite a simple development of the Neolithic solar religion: the New Year's combat of the sun-hero against the bull is the central theme of its mysteries. Mithras was the young sun-hero, born of the mountain, with the knife and kingly cap; as an unprotected child he hid in the fig-tree; as a young hero he stopped the sun's chariot, took the crown of rays from the sun-god, and climbed into the chariot, or sprang across the solar bull, caught him, dragged him into the cave by the hind legs, and killed him there. The bull, like Helios in the sun-chariot, was himself the sun; the scorpion, the sign of the zodiac in which the sun sets, hangs from his sexual organ. Mithras killed the bull in order to enter into his heritage; he took his vigour and power as he took the sun-chariot from Helios; he was himself the youthful, conquering sun.

All of this is the New Year legend. If there were any doubt it would be refuted by the fact that Mithras, like the sun-child, was born on 25th December, and that the great ceremonies of the faithful took place at the springtide New Year.

What had been rejected from the sacred solar legend was the marriage and the association with blossom and fruiting in Nature; rejected, too, is the death of the victorious sun-hero. He was the Unvanquished, the Immortal. On the other hand, the New Year's orgies remained; Mithras killed the bull in order to give its flesh to his worshippers as the meat of life. Indeed this had become the chief content of the myth; the immortal hero gives the assurance of resurrection to heroes through his victory and his own flesh and blood.

Through his own flesh and blood; for he, Mithras, was the bull, the sun, just as the bright and dark brothers were at bottom one and

the same, the sun and the year. That is indicated by the two boys to the right and left of the sacrificial bull. One was lowering and the other raising a torch ; fire was quenched in the bull and flamed up in the hero, who was at once the sun and the bull. Mithras slew himself in the bull and yet he lived ; he was the lord of life and could therefore, give life to others.

Here is a monotheistic theory of immortality, without national or local limitations, sprung from solar mythology, and exalted as the mystery of a sect or group of persons linked in free association. It might have been the direct offspring of the Haoma mysticism that preceded Zoroaster ; blood and wine flowed at the rites of consecration.

But the blood was that of the faithful who inflicted martyrdom upon themselves in order to prove their self-sacrifice and power of moral self-conquest. The actual sacrificial meal consisted of bread and wine, a symbolical, bloodless token of flesh and blood which Zoroaster might well have approved. But the moral ideal embodied in the doctrine was borrowed direct from Zoroaster : man's life is a struggle, he is a soldier of God, who wins his way to oneness with God by labour and sacrifice, by moral deeds and obstacles overcome. He must earn immortality ; he climbs up step by step, gaining understanding of the meaning of the mysteries and the divine universe, and achieving righteousness in the hosts of Mithras. First he is made acquainted with the varied scenes and rites of the ceremony of consecration, then with the unity in them, Mithras the solar bull, and then with the moral law. First he tortures his body and swallows wine and bread as a life-giving spell, then he subdues himself spiritually and swallows wine and bread as symbols of spiritual oneness with the God of light ; finally he stands a free man in the great fight for the cause of light and order, a spirit in the host of good spirits.

I should suppose that Mithraism was a form of Zoroastrianism which arose during the struggle of the Parthians and Pontine Persians against assimilation to Greece and Rome—an absolutely simple religion capable of permeating the great mass of the soldiery (including barbarians from the realm of solar civilization), a religion of the utmost profundity and moral power in its appeal to leaders of highly developed personality in the fight for the Persian cause. In 67 B.C. it was first brought to Rome by prisoners of Pompey (by " Cilician pirates " it was said, but it was precisely in 67 that Pontus was subdued). In the succeeding century it spread in Rome. As a mystery religion,

one amongst others, it appealed to the Romans who had developed a personal outlook, and as a religion of soldierly form and moral loyalty and duty it was specially in harmony with the feelings of those who saw the corruption of the imperial religion and the crumbling of the imperial frontiers and were resolved to devote themselves heart and soul to saving their empire and their civilization. The sect or free religious association replaced the nation, and moral duty in a romantic and religious garb replaced the ancient Roman spirit. It is very likely that Mithraism or some kindred faith was the religion of the great military emperors who restored the Roman empire towards the end of the second century, and the secret formula embodying the moral will and heroic deeds and self-conquest of those who surrounded Diocletian. It united the legions with their leaders, as only a personal, religious bond could in that age of disintegrating moral notions. As sun-worship it was within the grasp even of the German barbarians.

In Mithraism, therefore, we see a chief rival of Christianity springing from Zoroastrian sources. The Persian spirit, nearest in level to the Jewish, proved the only serious opponent of Christianity in its conquest of the world. It could be overcome only by incorporating in Christianity its loftiest doctrine, the formula of life as a war between light and darkness, a fight between the two primeval powers running through world history (the Manichæans and Augustine), and the struggle of the individual for the prize of eternal life (Mithras, and Paul who, however, was indirectly influenced by Persian thought).

Unfortunately we cannot trace the Persian religious movements in detail. We may be sure that here, too, scepticism was not lacking and doubtless it remained partially embodied in the accepted notion of God, as was the case in Judaism (casting doubt, perhaps, on the victory of light or asserting the victory of darkness) and was partially merged in naturalistic and Hellenistic ideas. It was crushed by the first religious movement of the second prime which produced the State church of the Sassanid period. In citizen and scholarly circles amongst the adherents of this church the pugnacity and the intellectual and moral exaltation of religion found expression in severe persecutions of heretics. With the disappearance of the ruling nation that ruling nation's tolerance had vanished.

## LITERATURE

Just as in the case of the Jews, a whole literature must have sprung from the Persian religious movement in which Zoroaster's doctrine had its origin, a literature on a level corresponding to the advancement of Persian civilization. There must have been epics and love songs sung in the Akhæmenian empire. Unfortunately the love songs are all lost and no more than scanty fragments of the epics have been preserved, such as the references to Yima, the son of Vivasvat, who built a stronghold where the good might take refuge when the Flood overwhelmed the wicked, and to Thrætona and Keresaspa, who overcame the dragon. Haoma, the dying god, and other forms of the ancient sun-god such as the divine subduer of dragons, became heroes, bearers of civilization, warriors who fought Angromainya's demons, examples of heroism like the Prophet Zoroaster. They came in times of danger and distress, but there could be no human tragedy in their lives: he who had chosen and acted rightly might die serenely, for resurrection was assured to him. There may be the remnants of epics in Herodotus' stories of Cyrus and Cambyzes, which would have been more or less the equivalents of the heroic legends in the Judaic *Book of the Upright*, especially the story of Saul and David; indeed Cambyzes in his madness recalls Saul individually. The charm of these stories lies in the human relations, in the characters of Astyages, Harpagus, and Cyrus, in the exciting adventures, in our concern for the youthful Cyrus menaced by dangers, and the fear and pity stirred by the fall of such great heroes and kings. The Persian texts have undergone drastic revision; in Persia the legends upon which the legitimacy of the Cyrus and Darius dynasties rested had been interpolated, and the Greeks carried on the process, especially Herodotus himself, who aspired to make strictly accurate history of them. Nevertheless something characteristic of Zoroaster and Persia, a sober comprehension of motives and an equally sober religious morality has survived within the broad outlines of the legends of the sun-hero who is born in secret and exposed, overthrows the tyrant (Astyages), conquers the world, but meets his death through a woman (Tomyris)—*Kurush* means "sun"—and of the wicked, accursed king whom the Deity punishes with blindness, death, and the fall of his dynasty. Both qualities must have appealed to the Greeks, especially to Herodotus. If we had original works dating from ancient Persia, they would probably give evidence in the mythological and historical

heroic epics of more free humanity, more delight in adventure than the romance of Saul, or at least as much. And women must have played a great part in these works. The material for a Kriemhild-Brunhild feud (from a solar heroic epic ?), re-written as a court romance, lies in the story of Xerxes' love for his daughter-in-law and her arrogance which angered Xerxes' wife and incited her to destroy her rival's mother. The lost epics (lost, perhaps, because they were only sung and not written down) must have been seized upon by religion under the dynasty of Akhaemenes and transformed into prose tales (romances recited by professional story-tellers). In the *Book of Kings* of the Sassanids, which Chosroes caused to be written down about A.D. 550, they are worked into the fabric of "world history". In Firdausi's great work *Shahnama* (A.D. 987-1020) they re-emerged as an historical epic. This book belongs to a more recent phase of civilization, born of a racial mixture that must have begun about A.D. 400, and does not further concern us here. Themes from the epics and romances of ancient Persia, solar myths (of the miraculous garden, the phoenix, the water and trees of life—an *Odyssey*), travel tales, and history, find an echo in the fairy-stories (romances) of the *Arabian Nights* (of Aladdin, of the talking bird, the singing water, the chiming tree, Sinbad's travels, and Prince Codadad, etc.).

A little of the lyric poetry of ancient Persia is preserved in the *Zend-Avesta*, in particular the first classic in this branch of literature, the collection of Zoroaster's "songs" (the *Gathas*). These poems are written in lines varying in the number of syllables (11, 14, 16), with irregular cæsura (both one and two); they are grouped in three-lined verses. Their subject is the revelation accorded to Zoroaster by Mazda-Ahura, which he communicates in the form of personal prayers, including appeals on behalf of his followers and curses upon his enemies. These poems burn with a great and fervent devotion, a lofty religious and moral enthusiasm, but there is little visual imagery of outward objects. The prophet gazed upon spiritual, abstract things—the Deity who is pure spirit and his aspects which are metaphysical notions. The visible world had sunk from view. And so even these great poems affect us as something cold and sober.

The reason lies in the stage of abstraction reached by the thinker-poet. At the stage reached by Amos (monotheism) God was still tangible and vivid; he was personal, bound by ties of love to the Israelites and Jerusalem, and the world, too, was still tangible and vivid, whether as Nature or history. When we reach pure monism (Xenophanes) God, the One and All, becomes altogether intangible,

not to be conceived as a person, but the natural variety of the objective world is restored as a problem of art and science. Zoroaster stood between monotheism and monism. His Deity is a spirit, without personality or moral law. His world is stripped of all its detail except such as relates to the great world drama of the fight between good and evil. He has vision, but he does not see with the material eye. Judaism had room beside God and his government for the beginnings of a natural and human outlook upon the world, for individual characterization, for the presentation of natural feelings such as the love of parents and children, husband and wife. In Hellenism after Xenophanes the whole world of visible Nature and civilization came under the sway of a free art and science. Amongst the Persians the ruthless demands of the battle of faith crushed the enhanced power of natural and human vision more severely than in Judaism. The Jewish religion forbade plastic and pictorial art, but being itself still imaginative, it admitted much that was vivid and natural into the canon of knowledge. The complete rationalism of a Pythagoras or a Confucius on the monistic plane, will tolerate only what is didactic—mathematics, history, moral doctrine, besides metaphysics. The incipient monism, the semi-rationalist outlook of the Persians despised plastic and pictorial art, poetry, and imagination. It expressed itself in sober intellectual forms, in useful, moral, and intellectual works. Imagination withered, confined to the narrow field of metaphysics.

The hymns and litanies of the later *Avesta*, largely in verse—originally altogether in verse most likely—are only vivid and colourful where they picture Mithra or Anahita, the ancient sun-god and earth-goddess; even the angelic hosts and the demons are somewhat colourless. Fresh and vivid are the descriptions of the soul's fate after death and of the end of the world; but even there logical antithesis, causal explanations, formulas, intellectual elaboration (like the beauty of the true believer's conscience which receives the dead man in the form of a virgin) predominate over portrayals of bliss and damnation. It is true that the selection from the Persian scriptures in our possession, the total of formulas, hymns, and commandments for purification used by the practising priests in ritual, is not a good basis for a judgment on the poetical merits of Persian hymns. Nevertheless, an equivalent selection from the Jewish Scriptures would surely have contained one or other of the personal psalms besides the Law.

At the Persian phase of culture conditions were not propitious

for the preservation or production of great poetry. The freer humanity of Persia and her more fertile vision was held in check by a rationalist tendency to be guided by practical and moral considerations and by enhanced intellectual powers, both assuming a religious guise and exercising fanatical sway. This restraint blotted out the epics and love songs, cramped religious hymnology (only prayer remained freer), and prevented a further advance in the direction of drama. True, the later portions of the *Zend-Avesta* are often in dialogue form, but the dialogues consist only of the man's questions and the Deity's replies, and are altogether without inward dialectic quality. Nor are there any human problems that might develop into tragedy. He who chooses aright and fights for the good cause finds his reward in this world, or, if not here, then assuredly in the hereafter. Thus all Job's questions are answered dogmatically; and the humanity and problems of Prometheus, Œdipus, or Hippolytus had not as yet arisen.

#### LEARNING

Nowhere did the Indo-Germans bring with them their own writing. They stood at a cultural level which, though it rose above that of the Neolithic peoples, was yet below the line at which writing is invented. The Medes and Persians, being neighbours of the Babylonians, adopted cuneiform in the first instance. Their advance beyond Babylonian civilization is demonstrated by their simplification of cuneiform to a syllabic script with few but quite sufficient characters, obtained by a process of selection. This is how the script used in the monuments of the Persian kings (at least since Darius) was developed. Side by side with it all the scripts as well as all the languages of the peoples belonging to the world empire were in use within its frontiers. It seems that Persian administrative documents were written in "Aramaic", that is, alphabetically. Very little literature appears to have been written down.

Persian, like Jewish learning, was a branch of religion. Man's relation to God was the only matter of importance, that alone need be known, and scholarly interest only subsisted where that was involved or where its ubiquitous influence was traced. As in Jewish monotheism so in Persian bitheism (which was in fact, an exalted, moral monotheism) this led finally to the collection of all that was of value in a single book, in the canon of the *Zend-Avesta*, which

was produced between A.D. 200 and 400, but is unfortunately almost entirely lost.

As with the Jews, so with the Persians, metaphysics was the principle subject of study, within the uniform theological system. It was a religious form of metaphysics, but its supreme notion of Being was less personal than in Judaism, closer to monism and more clearly conceived. The Deity was in the world, not above it, but he still created the world (at least in the canon, not according to Zoroaster !): the sky and the stars, the earth and the living creatures. Nature was the emanation of his Being (in the canon); men, and even animals and plants (in the canon) were his fellow-soldiers and confederates (but likewise his creatures). The dominant antithesis is not "creator and creature" with the adjunct "perfect and vain", but "good and evil", "good spirit and evil spirit", with the adjunct "spiritual and material". The supreme notion of Being may, indeed, be interpreted as "spirit", as reason and irrationality, moral and immoral thought and volition, the essence of light and darkness. The body is also a "being", but only a lifeless mass which the spirit seizes, moves, inspires, and casts away. It is an adjunct, meriting no further consideration, corruptible, and of no account. But spirit is also the supreme notion of flux; it moves the body; its character, its conflicting moral choice and action, set in motion in the universe the great struggle of light and darkness, good and evil. Its existence, therefore, provides causal explanation of all that happens in the universe, primarily the great drama of the struggle and its progress in history, secondarily and incidentally the material and physical motion of the universe. The great march of events in the world is explained by a single principle (spirit) acting in two directions; it is the combat of light and darkness in Nature, in history, and in the life of the individual. The meaning of "good spirit" and "evil spirit" is more accurately defined through the general meaning of "spirit": the "good spirit" is wisdom, justice (righteousness), good thought, piety (beneficence), welfare, dominion, immortality. The notion is not quite clearly analysed; in addition to spiritual qualities (thought, right or wrong volition, life) there are those of reward (and punishment). Nor is the antithesis strictly carried through; at least in the canon the wicked, also, are immortal, but are in a place of torment. There is no comprehension of wickedness rewarded by "disaster, absence of dominion, death" (though it is true that "evil thought" produces these things in life). Logic is still in the nursery, but it is endeavouring to set forth an antithesis

of mutually exclusive opposites (not always successfully) and to move in a region of pure intellect.

As in Judaism ethics, the theory of conduct was not at first distinguished from the theory of the spirit in metaphysics. The formula that summed up the divine nature likewise embodied the formula of right and wrong conduct. The Deity was spirit, but spirit of a twofold nature, he was the essence of righteousness or of unrighteousness. The "wise Spirit" did not issue commandments. Man, being a spirit like himself, perceived by his reason (wisdom) that he must act rightly if he desired to increase and attain welfare, dominion, immortality (bliss), for these were one with wisdom, right, good thought, and piety. What is new is the clear conception of the Deity as righteousness, excluding unrighteousness, the imposition of a moral duty to fight for the good cause, and the declaration that man has come of age and is free to choose and free to combat. The human and family and neighbourly code of the Old Testament is more genial, but less forceful in moral volition and less personal. Freedom of moral choice, and, indeed, wickedness, as the sole explanation of a wrong choice in spite of all loss in time and eternity, are strongly emphasized.

The individual sciences owed their general concepts and the ideas that animated them to the new outlook, receiving them for the most part direct from metaphysics and ethics. The detailed development, in which their value would have lain, seems in part to have remained in abeyance because the exclusive interest in metaphysics and religion deprived all else of value; in part it was probably blotted out by the introduction of the more advanced science of Greece. Practically the whole of it is lost. At first the universe was seen altogether from the metaphysical point of view; the two spirits and their eternal battle, spirit as the essence and matter as the unimportant adjunct—this is pure metaphysics. But the view of all that happens as a battle, in the physical world between light and darkness, in the biological, social, and psychological between evil and good beings—that was a germ destined to prove richly fertile in the hands of later peoples. Even the parts of the universe were transformed by metaphysics; the sky came to be regarded rather as the dwelling of the creatures of light (angels) than as the home of the stars, the "abyss" rather as the place of devils than the depths below the earth. But the notion of "the spiritual" endowed physics with the future notion of energy, and that of "the material" with the other leading notion that was to

enter into subsequent surveys of the universe. And for the first time the elements appeared in the category of parts of the universe—fire and water and the winds—although, indeed, they were hardly regarded as elements. Fire was primarily light and purity on earth, and water the great fertilizer. But later, incidentally at least, the winds were used in explaining the movements of heavenly bodies (Greek influence ? ).

Metaphysics endowed anthropology with the antithesis of man's spirit and body. Indeed the notion of " spirit " was actually derived from experience of the human spirit ; it is very characteristic of this phase of evolution that the divine Spirit thereupon took up the central position, but equally so that the human spirit remained independent and individual beside it. And the aspects of the divine concept were derived from the human spirit ; wisdom—reason, right—righteous resolve, immortality—life. In return notions fruitful to the study of psychology were derived from the divine Spirit ; a psychological theory of the mental functions emerged in the germ (reason, will), and in particular psychology explained righteous conduct by means of new concepts ; wisdom teaches righteous conduct ; free-will is stressed side by side with knowledge ; one central notion is that of conscience, but there is also obduracy and malice. The relation of spirit and body was only considered in order to emphasize that the spirit is independent of the body ; the spirit lives without the body, the body is animated by the spirit and without it is an unclean, dead mass.

The medical section of the canon is wholly lost. Medicine must have worked through the medium of prayers of penitence and thanksgiving and acts of purification. A theory of vessels dating from the late Sassanid era was probably of foreign origin (Egyptian, Greek, Indian ?), as, indeed, much foreign knowledge found its way into the canon, including the astronomy and astrology of the Greeks, and more besides.

Of the humanities, jurisprudence and philology are wholly lost. But the Persians, like the Jews, unquestionably had a theory of interpretation of the canon and used it not only for practical purposes but for scholarly argument (*Zend* means " commentary "). The Darius legend of the fall of Cambyses is an example of pious apologetics which utterly annihilates an opponent and yet forms a link with his legitimate claims ; Cambyses as the slayer of the bull (Apis) is made altogether detestable to the followers of Zoroaster, and yet forced to support Darius' claim to the throne, being avenged

as the legitimate king. The central religious motive for the usurpation is indicated—Darius sets aside Bardes, “who has no ears,” and Cambyzes, the murderer of bulls. But the first is presented as an imposter and the second as the murderer of Apis, a man who has desecrated Egyptian gods; all the personal gain and violence of Darius are explained away. A good deal of history has been preserved. Here, too, people’s real interest was in the application of metaphysics to history. An elaborate philosophy of history constructs and analyses the progress of the battle between light and darkness in world history. The canon books and Mani worked out the story of the earliest and the final eras with particular care—the eras of spiritual and material creation and that of the Saviours. There was less interest in the era of struggle from the creation to the appearance of Zoroaster. Men’s minds were dominated by ideas, the tendency to survey in the abstract, a timeless monism. We can still trace the borrowing and adaptation of Babylonian speculations concerning eras, fights with dragons, and stories of the Flood. An age of culture-heroes was dawning. National history can hardly have been worked out as in the Jewish canon, for no “law of the march of events” could be proved. Towards the end of the Sassanid period Persian history from the beginning was brought together in the *Book of Kings*, in imitation of Greek models. In this way it attained a certain independence, which, however, only prepared it for epic treatment in the hands of Firdausi.

We have the fullest records of the Persians’ theory of education. Xenophon wrote a great work upon the education of Cyrus (*Cyropaedia*); unluckily it is a propagandist romance in which certain historical elements are blended with the Greek ideals of the Athenian reactionaries of the fourth century. In addition there are a few observations by Herodotus and others. But we can verify what is of Greek origin by comparison with the educational ideal embodied in the ideal of the pious worshippers of Mazda-Ahura, as presented by the *Gathas*. Man as a spirit is to be wise, just, right-thinking, and pious like the wise Spirit. Because he is endowed with reason and free will, he is to make the right choice, to join the host of Mazda-Ahura as a soldier of the good and great cause of light and truth, to know him and pay homage to him by deeds. This he does if he himself lives in the true faith, honest, and pious and just, and without deceit, if he extends the realm of civilization by peaceful means, by bringing land into cultivation and tilling it, planting trees, irrigating, exterminating harmful animals and

fostering useful ones, diminishing desert land, and spreading the true faith on all sides by speech and the sword in the holy war.

As the outcome of this ideal of the warrior fighting for light and truth and justice, which won free souls for the cause of the wise and righteous God by holy zeal, by the presentation of a lofty and eternal purpose for their life's labour, and by the prospect of the highest reward—a good conscience, welfare, dominion, and immortality—an aristocratic ideal of education for a ruling race grew up in the empire of Darius. Herodotus says that until he was five years old a boy was not shown to his father; from his fifth to his twentieth year he was taught three things only, and that plainly by men alone: to ride and shoot with a bow and tell the truth. Physical training as a knight went hand in hand with spiritual training as a soldier of God. "Truth," as the essence of the true doctrine and as a knightly virtue was the supreme duty. "Lies" as the essence of false doctrines and cowardice constituted the sin of sins. "Lies" came to be regarded as the essential characteristic of the Devil or darkness. "Truth" embraced all else, scorn of theft, deceit, lewdness, and intemperance, knowledge of the law which must be preserved unaltered, knowledge of the duties of man, mercy and gentleness, knowledge of the duties of a civilized society and how to extend fertile land and care for the bull. All of this was taught, not from books, but by sharing the life and activities of adults as in Sparta and Rome; examples were to be found in the boy's own circle and in administrative offices for the government of subject peoples, in religious ceremonial, in judicial and administrative activities, and among the boy's companions at table and in the tent. Zoroaster elevated and spiritualized the traditional warlike discipline of free tribes by offering a new and lofty purpose, moral, religious, and humane. These born soldiers of God, who were rulers and were to remain rulers by proven fitness, were the administrators and officers of the world empire of Darius and Xerxes. Two hundred years later, when the ideal had become corrupt and its restriction to a ruling class had turned it into a caste ideal, when its compromise with the convenience and advantage of an unoccupied ruling class had supplanted it by a caricature of itself, these Persians still seemed to Alexander the Great worthy to be spared and fused with the Macedonians and Greeks.

In the Mithras sect of Roman days Zoroaster's ideal once more became the educational ideal of a knightly community, perhaps in a higher and certainly in a more individual form. The great

idea that life is a struggle between the powers of light and darkness, in which every individual must take sides and stand up for light and truth, order and justice and civilization, gave rise to a free community or sect ; it united members from all parts of the late Roman world, not only from the ruling nation, who aspired to make themselves competent soldiers by good thought and firm resolution, to train themselves in the host of Mithras and so to do their duty and be worthy of immortality. The great emperors round about Diocletian possessed this consciousness of a martial aim in full measure, though in their case Zoroaster's idealism was transfigured by the influence of Greek ethics.

In Persia and the neighbouring countries the ruling race sank with the fall of the Akhaemenian dynasty and were merged in the mass of their subjects, and the religion of light became a bourgeois religion, like Judaism.

The Sassanid State church stood for Zoroaster's ideal transformed in a priestly, bourgeois sense. The fight for light, truth, and right became a fight for the one righteous Ahura-Mazda and his fire-worship without images, very similar to Jewish propaganda. Scholars and merchants proselytized on behalf of their scriptural church. In some respects they were rather freer and more intellectualized than the Jews, more concerned with practical morality, and they were bound to no sanctuary ; in other respects perhaps their outlook was narrower, for instance in their division of all creatures and things into enemies and friends of the true Deity. But in the main the cultural ideal of the soldier of God was with both peoples that of the good merchant and irrefutable scholar, and it was followed and attained by the zealous study of the Scriptures in the schools, by stringent measures to avoid uncleanness, and by legally correct service and conduct in the sight of God.

#### PLASTIC AND PICTORIAL ART

The Persians, like Mohammed's Arabs, entered the arena of history as a ruling race spreading a new monotheistic-bitheistic faith by the sword. Together with their religion they possessed poetry, but no plastic or pictorial art worth speaking of. When they were masters of the world they continued to be rulers and soldiers of God ; socially manual crafts and art were held to be beneath the dignity of a knight. There was never, indeed, any religious prohibition of images, but the impulse to model and develop pictorial

powers was never roused. Persian religion had no temples and no divine images. In its determination of values it rejected all that was not part of the struggle for the kingdom of God. Its intellectual quality was almost monistic and sought to express itself in the form of homogeneous notions and sharply defined methods of presentation. And now in a civilized world extending from Egypt to Babylonia and Lydia, these Persians had the opportunity to choose from a wealth of architecture and sculpture and pictorial art, and the best technical experts for its execution. It is easy, therefore, to understand that Persian civilization is relatively weak in the field of plastic and pictorial art; it was dependent, a selective art, and made no serious advance towards a higher level. It is true that little has been preserved; we have only the ruins of royal palaces and a few tombs, and these must have been specially influenced by religious restrictions and the need of impressing the subject peoples by extensive works in the style of their own great kings of former days. If we had the residential palaces of other magnates besides the kings, or a piece of actual mural painting, or something of the kind, in which the freer individuality of the Persians could express itself, perhaps our impression would be different. We should expect Persian achievements in art to reach the Cretan level, and something beyond. Unfortunately there is also no record of Persian music.

We know Persian architecture from the ruins of Cyrus' palaces in Pasargadae and of the palaces of Darius and his successors in Persepolis, together with the adjacent tombs. Some of the palaces were dwellings; in these the hall is surrounded by secondary rooms; some were used for purposes of reception and these consisted only of a hall with ante-chambers. In all cases the hall and entrance hall, evolved from the northern megaron with its wooden pillars, are the nucleus of the groundplan. The several buildings are separate in a walled-in enclosure embellished with plantations of trees, which in Persepolis is marked out by being raised on a terrace. A royal city such as those, for instance, in Assyria, was not intended.

The halls are all columned edifices with a number of tall, slender pillars set far apart. They must have produced an impression of great magnificence, bright and solemnly festive, at least in Persepolis, where it has not entirely faded. The rooms were all coloured, and their light wooden roofs made possible their spacious and lofty proportions. In Pasargadae, the columns are smooth and rest upon a simple round stone base. In Persepolis they are fluted, with highly

decorative bases and capitals that bear traces of Egyptian and Assyrian influence. But the main feature of the capital is Persian; two figures of the fore parts of recumbent bulls, symmetrically turned away from one another, support the architrave, just as in the teaching of Zoroaster the useful bull is the support of agriculture. The two largest columned halls are the hall of hundred columns of Darius, 75 metres in length and width, with a great entrance hall, and the hall of thirty-six columns of Xerxes, with three antechambers, each 22 metres in length and breadth, in front of the main hall in the manner of a propylaeum, almost twice as high as the hall of Darius.

The pictorial decoration of these palaces is thought out on a uniform and impressive plan; we see here a characteristic Persian achievement springing from the intellectuality and simplicity of the religious spirit. In the palace only the king himself is portrayed, seated upon the throne, walking always with an attendant carrying an umbrella behind him, or occupied in slaying the monster of heresy and revolt, calm and sure of victory. Outside, on the steps and ramparts, his guards are keeping watch and his servants approaching with horses and chariots and peoples offering tribute accompanied by all manner of animals. The mantels of the walls are crowned with Assyrian winged bulls, and on the stringboards are groups showing the New Year's victory of the lion over the bull: but the bulls support the roof, quite in the spirit of Zoroaster. A single mind has designed all the ornamentation here on a uniform plan, each part reduced to the simplest and most pleasing form; everything essential concerning the significance of these kings and their dwellings is conveyed in symbols. The next great works of this kind, the outcome of an idea, were from the hand of Phidias.

The tomb of Cyrus is a pyramid with six terraces and a gabled house at the summit—a kind of ziggurat for the solar king. The tombs of Darius and his successors are rock-hewn chambers entered through four bull columns with a beam across, and surmounted by a throne-like erection supported by all the peoples of the empire (28). Upon this erection stands the king opposite a fire-altar in the presence of the soaring Ahura-Mazda, the six archangels, and the lunar disc. What is striking in the throne-like erection are the spiral wooden pillars. The Greek ovolo is used here, too. The whole is remarkable, in spite of its variety, for its grand and simple effect.

We have no Persian sculpture in the round. The reliefs are remarkable only for their vigour, solidity, and simplicity of form.

The new contrast dominating the whole is that of the king, worshipping, enthroned, walking, conquering with ease (there are nowhere armies in battle), and the mass of approaching guards, servants, and peoples of the empire bringing tribute or supporting the throne. In detail the profiles are, perhaps, better than in Assyrian art (the eyes and the way the arms are joined to the body); all the rest has simply been borrowed from Assyria, Egypt, and Babylonia (particoloured glazed tiles making pictures of lions and guardsmen).

A special branch of Persian art is said to have been the designing of gardens. Here, too, there were Babylonian models, groves of Tammuz and lion-gardens. But Zoroaster taught that instead of cultivating sacred trees and keeping wild animals men should multiply and care for useful plants and animals in general, for practical, moral, and humane reasons. Nothing has been preserved of these useful and zoological gardens (Paradises).

Persian art under the Sassanids produced great cities and palaces, aqueducts and equine monuments of victorious kings in high relief. In all cases Greek and Roman models exercised a dominant influence, as did Egyptian and Assyrian models under the dynasty of Akhacmenes.

#### SUMMARY.

The Persians surpassed the Jews in their logical assimilation of the universe and in the severity of the religious and moral demands that they made upon the true God. The moral antithesis broke the universe as spirit into two mutually exclusive, opposing halves; so strong was its influence that to fight in the cause of the good God became the only purpose worth living for. General notions, including ethical requirements, became more abstract, and the universe was rather barren in its purely intellectual and ethical character, though complete monism was not attained. In the State the earliest patriarchal absolutism was reached. In the royal palaces and tombs plastic art attained to great unity and clarity of ideas, expressed in alien material. In the remaining branches of culture too little has been preserved for us to demonstrate in detail that the same level had been reached. Persian culture as a whole remained below the level of monism, half logical and half individual. It relapsed into an enlightened bourgeois legalism and commercialism

very similar to that of the Jews. The Indians reached a higher level and attained to an embryonic monism, whilst the Chinese attained to monism in a fully developed but undifferentiated form. Both made it the basis of a religion of painlessness and State morality. But it was the Greeks who brought the new growth to perfection and rose to a point of view at once fully theoretical and fully personal.





