The Races of the Babylonian Empire

Author(s): G. Bertin

Source: *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*, Vol. 18 (1889), pp. 104-120

Published by: [Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2842403>

Accessed: 14/06/2014 16:30

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Royal Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The Journal of the Anthropological Institute of Great Britain and Ireland*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

The following paper was read by the Author:—

The RACES of the BABYLONIAN EMPIRE.

By G. BERTIN, M.R.A.S.

[WITH PLATE VI.]

WHEN I undertook, at the suggestion of Mr. R. Poole, to write the present paper, I did not realise the difficulties which I had to encounter. Accepted ideas, and, I might add, scientific prejudices, have always a great influence over our mind, and are hard to be given up. In this particular case the conclusions at which I have arrived are so thoroughly different from, and even opposed to, the accepted notions, that I hesitated a long time before surrendering myself to the evidence.

Babylonia, unlike Egypt, is not a region isolated by its geographical position, but on the contrary is an open country offering a vast frontier to the intrusion of new races. For this reason it is difficult to consider Babylonia by itself, and I have been obliged to extend my inquiry over the whole of the Babylonian Empire. This area covers the vast region extending from the Persian Gulf and the Red Sea in the south to the mountains of Armenia in the north, and from the Mediterranean Sea in the west to the mountain range in the east from Armenia to Persia. We have in this area two distinct centres of civilisation and wealth, one in Southern Babylonia, and the other in Syria.

Two causes provoke the displacement of population, namely, the wish for plunder and the pressure from a more powerful nation. Babylonia being a wealthy, civilised, and open country, was liable to invasions from both these causes, and we must therefore expect a very mixed population. Syria was, by its geographical configuration, better fitted for resistance, but was never politically organised, and had likewise to submit to invasions from the two causes, and it therefore presents also a mixed population.

Before giving a review of the types on the monuments, a few words are indispensable on the characters of these representations.

The greatest numbers of the monuments recovered are from Assyria; the explorations in Babylonia proper have never been carried on systematically or scientifically. This is to be regretted, because the really Babylonian representations are scarce, and for the types of Babylonia we have to depend often on the Assyrian bas-reliefs. The sculptures of the two countries, Assyria and Babylonia, belong, however, to the same school, so to say. They are more realistic in many ways

PROFILES FROM THE ASSYRIAN AND BABYLONIAN MONUMENTS.

than the Egyptian pictures, though they are also more conventional in some points. As in Egypt, so here, the faces are represented in profile with eyes in full face.¹ The artists appear to have given great care to the representations of the facial types, but the bodies of all the different peoples are exactly the same; they differ simply in their dress. We cannot even depend on the comparative stature, for often the height merely indicates importance. The King, for instance, is always represented taller than his soldiers. It is also to be noticed on the bas-reliefs that in many cases the artists did not take so much care when they represented a man of the lower class or an enemy; these being often roughly drawn.

In Assyria we find two principal types well distinguished; the one the known Ninevite type illustrated by the representations of the Kings and their soldiers and attendants; and the other a low type, varying very much with the individuals, and found only among the people of inferior condition.

The first type presents a long head, straight forehead, slightly curved nose hanging a little over the upper lip, lips variable but often thin. Assyrians appear to have worn wigs, but, judging from those of the lower class having the same type, their hair was wavy; and we may suppose that they were of medium stature (Pl. VI, figs. 6 and 7).

The other type gives, as just noticed, many varieties, but the general characteristics are as follows:—Small round head, low slanting forehead, high cheek bones, prognathism more or less marked, but with lips often thin and a chin sometimes retreating or slanting back. The nose is often large and does not appear to have ever been flat and wide as among the Tatars; eyebrows often very prominent; generally frizzy hair and beard; stature short (fig. 8).

In Babylonia proper, though the monuments known to us are less numerous, we obtain more varied types.

The oldest, which is given by the monuments found at Tello, by M. de Sarzec, I will provisionally call *Gurian*, from the primitive national name of the Akkadians. This name is very defective, I know, and I would have adopted that of Tello, if the type had been exclusively found on the monuments of that city, which is not the case. The general characteristics of this Gurian type are: round head, low but wide and straight forehead, slightly prominent cheek bones, profile orthognate with rather fleshy lips, and a big nose, not aquiline; hair rather curly

¹ It is this fact which gave the false notion of oblique eyes in the Babylonian race, but the error of this notion is easily shown by the faces of the man-headed bulls and the few Assyrian statues.

than wavy; probably medium stature (fig. 1). This type, which appears on the monuments of Tello, and was, no doubt, that of the hero generally known under the name of Gisdubar, who is represented on many seals, seems to have disappeared before the historical period, though the portrait of Hammurabi, now in the British Museum, and of which fig. 3 is a faithful copy, has preserved most of the characteristics.

A type slightly different is offered by the portrait of Marduk-nadin-akhe (fig. 4). It is the same shaped head,¹ but the profile is different, the eyebrows being more prominent and the nose smaller, with a tendency to prognathism.

Another well defined type is the one of the Babylonians at the time of Assurbanipal. They fought in the army of the Assyrian King, but are easily recognised by their costume (fig. 5). The general characteristics are: long egg-shaped head, high forehead straight and wide, profile orthognate, flat cheeks, nose rather long but never curvy or aquiline, lips moderately thick, hair wavy, high stature. The general expression of the face is quiet and smiling, and well in agreement with the general moral character of the Babylonians; it has nothing of the stern and, I might say, brutal expression of the Ninevites.

The existence in Babylonia of the same low type, already noticed in Assyria, cannot be denied. We find it on some of the oldest monuments discovered at Tello (fig. 2), and it is easily recognised in spite of the roughness of the drawings. We detect it also among some of the Babylonian soldiers serving in the Assyrian armies.

In Elam, the great mass of the population seems to have belonged to this very type (figs. 12 and 13). It offers, however, a great many varieties; sometimes the prognathism is much developed, sometimes the forehead is nearly straight, though very low; sometimes the nose is very much depressed, and in other cases ridiculously big for the size of the head. A nobler type is presented by a small minority, the ruling family and perhaps the higher class or aristocracy. In many faces of the low type the expression is, however, intelligent, though in some cases there is a savage and cruel stamp (fig. 11).

In Syria we find equally two types. One is a variety of the low type already described and illustrated by the Jews captured at Lachish by Sennacherib (fig. 14) and by the Phœnician sailors on a bas-relief in the British Museum. The head is round, the forehead low and retreating but the nose is rarely much developed, and in many cases the lips are thick, the hair is frizzy, and the stature often medium.

¹ As it will be seen, this type does not, however, proceed from this precedent.

The other type is that of the Jews, as far as can be judged from the black obelisk. That a higher type existed in Syria we know from the Egyptian monuments, which give us representations of the Hittites and other populations, and also from the sarcophagus of Ezmanazar, on which the figure of the King has decidedly something Egyptian; this, however, may be due perhaps to the nationality of the artist.

On the Assyrian monuments are also found represented two other foreign populations, and these representations have, as will be seen, a great importance anthropologically.

The first is that of the Arabs. These do not present the type which we are accustomed to associate with the children of the desert, but in this case that which is sometimes designated under the name of Caucasian; the head is long and oval, the forehead high, the nose of moderate size and not aquiline, in fact all the lines are well proportioned. The hair is wavy, and the stature high. The rather wild expression given to the physiognomy may be a deliberate libel on the part of the artist, or due to the fact that these freedom-loving people were prisoners in the hands of the Assyrians (fig. 10).

The other foreign type is that of the Armenians, as represented by two ambassadors who visited Assurbanipal in Elam. These two specimens offer all the characteristics to be noticed in the modern Armenians (fig. 9): long head, long curved nose, fleshy lips, stature short; the general appearance is decidedly Jewish as in the modern Armenians. This Armenian type is so much more remarkable from the fact that at this period the language spoken in Armenia, and illustrated by the inscriptions of Van, is totally different from Armenian, and linguistically connected with Akkadian, Media, and Elamite. As it could hardly be thought that the two ambassadors were of a different type from the mass of the population, or at least from the ruling population, we are forced to admit that the district of Van was then, and no doubt from a much higher antiquity, inhabited by a race exhibiting the same characteristics as the modern population of Armenia. The fixity of the Armenian type has been already noticed by anthropologists.

Besides these two foreign types the Assyrian monuments give the faithful portrait of the Negro; but the black African never was really included in the Babylonian Empire.

The Persian came late on the political scene; it is doubtful if we can point to a single specimen of the so-called Aryan type before Darius. From the time of this King the representations of Persians on the monuments and the seals become numerous. The old Persian type, as illustrated by the monuments of Persepolis and other Persian cities, seems to be what we recognise as the pure Greek type (fig. 15).

I wish in this paper to limit myself to the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments; I leave therefore aside the Egyptian representations, which have besides been so well classified by Mr. Reginald Poole. A few words about the Hittite representations are, however, indispensable.

Judging from the original monuments in the British Museum and the copies, more or less faithful, which I have examined, we have four different types, with a few variations—(1) one very near to that exhibited by the portrait of Marduk-nadin-akhe; (2) a Jewish (generally called Semitic) type; (3) a low type reminding us of the Jews of Lachish; and (4) the variable low type already noticed on the Assyrian monuments.

How are these varieties of types, and their distribution, to be accounted for?

The classics give us very little light. The Greeks had not in science a critical mind. Herodotus, for instance, our chief authority on Babylonian history, reports what he heard without attempting to control it scientifically; and like the rest of the Greeks, he always made a confusion between the Medes and the Persians,¹ but this mattered little, as the human race was for them divided into two classes—Greek and Barbarians; as long as a nation was not Greek it was of little consequence what it was. Diodorus Siculus was a conscientious compiler, but his chief authority on Babylonia, Ctesias, was a Greek who does not appear to have known Assyrian, and was often misled by his translators.² Strabo, if he had lived at a period not so late when all traces of the ancient empire of Babylonia were nearly stamped out, might have given us more trustworthy information, but his statements are only the far and faint echoes of the old traditions, and some of them can be understood only by the light of modern discoveries.³ No doubt on account of the great influence exercised by the Ninevite Empire in Western Asia for centuries, the Greeks gave indistinctly to all the populations before the conquest of Cyrus, the name of Assyrians.⁴

We might expect to find more in Berosus, but as far as can be judged from the fragments preserved from the work of this

¹ The Greeks called *Medes* their *Persian* wars. Æschylus in his "Persians" considers Cyaxares as the rightful predecessor of Darius.

² This is how is to be explained the fact that Ctesias gave for names to the *Medes* Kings their Persian translations (Oppert's "*La langue et le peuple Medes*"). By a similar process, I have found, is to be explained the names of the Assyrian Kings taken by the chroniclers from the same author.

³ So we find that Strabo made a confusion between the *Kaldu*, a tribe of Southern Babylonia, and a class (not a caste) of priests or sorcerers who at a later date took the same name.

⁴ "Diod. Sic.," II, 2. The name of Syria is an abbreviation of Assyria. In Diodorus Siculus we have the statement that Semiramis had an inscription written in *Syrian* characters (II, 15).

author, he merely stated that the population was mixed.¹ Justin is the only author who speaks of an early invasion of Scythians,² identified by the modern Assyriologists with the Akkadians. I will refer further on to this statement.

If we turn now to the statements contained in the Bible, we obtain no more than from the Greeks. It has been lately shown that the so-called ethnographical list contained in the tenth chapter of Genesis is really a geographical enumeration of the populations known to the Jewish author.³ Prof. Sayce has shown that the primary division symbolised by Sem, Ham, and Japhet is taken from the colour of the skin; and it is evident that, once the distinction made, it was applied to the three great regions: *Ham*, the black, represents the South; *Sem*, the yellow, the Centre; and *Japhet*, the white, the North. By this process many yellow-skinned people are classed among the Hamites or black. The double principle underlying the classification has introduced confusion, and certain names are given as those of the descendants of Sem as well as those of Ham.⁴ This classification according to the geographical position is also used by the prophets,⁵ and nations having evidently no racial connection are brought together.

The Christian compilers and chronographers worked hard to reconcile the classic and biblical statements. The modern scholars, who treated the question before the discoveries of the Babylonian monuments, made further attempts with the same object. But as it happens sometimes, these attempts at conciliation only gave birth to a fictitious system. The greatest part of it has been exploded by the Assyrian discoveries, like the supposed primitive Aryan population of Babylonia. But some of it remains still, and has become a kind of scientific prejudice. I will allude only to one error, because some authors working on it have advanced the most astounding theories.

The Ethiopians of the Greeks were generally considered as the same as the Kushites of the Bible. *Æthiops* means black, *Kush* means black;⁶ it was right so far. But it was not enough

¹ He says that at its origin Babylon was inhabited by a mass of people of various origins. Plutarch in the life of Romulus reports a similar tradition about Rome. In both cases it is evident that this is an acknowledgement of ignorance.

² I, 1, and II, 3. It is important to notice that in the eyes of Trogus Pompeius (abbreviated by Justin), the Scythians were not Tatars or Turanians, as generally admitted, but a nation related to, if not the same as, the Gauls.

³ Lenormant in "Les Origines de l'Histoire," has brought together all what has been said on the question.

⁴ For instance *Havilah* and *Sheba* are given twice. The author was no doubt also perplexed when the geographical position placed in the Hamitic group a population evidently connected with the Jews.

⁵ Ezekiel xvii.

⁶ This meaning might be doubted, but *Kush* is the Egyptian designation for the Negroes.

for the commentators. The Kushites were further identified with the Cossœans and Cassi of the classics,¹ they were made to extend into Asia, and brought as far as the Hindoo-Kush. A brilliant French scholar, the Baron d'Ekstein, made himself the historiographer of this supposed Kushite race, and reconstructed their very imaginary empire.² None of his suppositions or assumptions have been confirmed by the modern discoveries.³ An ingenious author wishing to support this theory on philological grounds has gathered together all the geographical names having sounds more or less connected with *Kush*.⁴ In this amusing enumeration is the name of the Hindu-Koosh, which, as we know, means "the death of the Hindoo," another name for "Hindu-Koh," "the mountain of the Hindu," on account of the deadly influence of the climate on the Hindoo traders crossing it; if in the name of this mountain *Koosh* were a proper name, the whole word would have no meaning. The same author wishing to connect these Kushites with some real populations, looks to the Akkadians as their representatives, on the ground of a passage of Pritchard misquoted by M. Maspero;⁵ he does not seem, however, to have even understood M. Maspero, for this Egyptologist considers the Kushites as the ancestors of the Semites, and classes the Akkadians under the convenient name of Turanian. The desire to find Ethiopians in Asia has provoked the most surprising aberrations. When M. Dieulafoy sent to Europe the photographs of the representation of Persian soldiers found by him at Susa, the hasty examination of the photograph gave the impression that these soldiers were black skinned,⁶ though it was only the dark shadow on the photograph, and it was concluded that we had in this a representation of the famous Asiatic Ethiopians of Herodotus. But the chromolithograph accompanying the report of M. Dieulafoy upset the existence of the black Ethiopians of Asia; the representation is in colour and leaves no doubt as to the skin colour of these soldiers being not darker than that of the modern Persians.⁷

The amusing part of this theory is that these very Ethiopians

¹ In the classics we see already the germs of this confusion, though I am inclined to believe that there are interpolations in the text of Herodotus.

² In the "Athenæum Français" and "La Revue Archéologique."

³ The v. 11-19 of chap. 10 of Genesis, which is taken as evidence of the Kushite empire in Mesopotamia, is very likely a later interpolation.

⁴ "Oriental and Babylonian Record," No. 2. He forgot to give the names of several African populations which are certainly more Kush (black) than those he names.

⁵ The passage of Pritchard's "Physical History of Mankind," vol. ii, p. 44, refers to the modern Nubian of Upper Egypt. Some authors went so far as to consider the Akkadian a black skinned population.

⁶ "The Academy," July 24th, 1886.

⁷ "Fouilles de Suse," campagne de 1885-6, Rapport, Paris, 1887.

or Kushites, if we are to believe Brugsch Bey, spoke a language related to neither Hamitic nor Semitic dialects, but a language related to the Nubian, consequently a Negro language.¹

In conclusion it may be safely stated that the word *Kush* is the Egyptian denomination for the Negroes ; that it was used by the writer of the tenth chapter of Genesis to designate populations of the south ; that the Ethiopians of the Greeks were Negroes ; and that it was extended to populations to the south of Egypt² (Abyssinians) ; but that the Kushites or Ethiopians *never* extended into Asia.

I must apologise for having given so much attention to this point, but lately this Kushite theory has been revived and threatens to invade classical books, and I wish to show that the whole of it is built upon assumptions supported by a few similarities of names, a few misunderstood passages in the classics and in the Bible, and a few distorted facts.

Before trying to explain how these populations came to be distributed, and which was their relationship, we may ask : what is a race ?

Many classifications have been proposed to distribute the whole of the human race in groups, but we may say that they are all very unsatisfactory.

The most popular has been of course the philological classification, especially since the discovery of the relationship of the Indo-European languages. When philologists had separated the Aryan and the Semites, they failed to effect a satisfactory grouping of the other languages.

The anatomical classification is not much better, as we find in the same population long and short heads, fair and black hair, short and high stature, &c.

A moral classification has been proposed, but this is variable, as it is rather difficult to ascertain the intellectual capacities of a population.

The geographical appears in many cases the best, as the people group themselves often according to the conveniences of the land,³ and it is a fact that in most cases the racial divisions answer to the geological constitution of the soil.

The inevitable conclusion is that all these data, insufficient when isolated, ought to be studied together, and all taken into account in order to determine the characteristics of a race.

¹ "Egypt under the Pharaohs," first ed., vol. ii, p. 273, *et seq.*

² The name of Kush or Ethiopia became so much associated with the country at the south of Egypt that it was used to designate Abyssinia ; that is how the word Ethiopian is now used for the Semitic language of Abyssinia.

³ In France after the invasion of the Barbarians the various populations settled themselves according to the natural geographical divisions.

There are no pure races, or rather we ought to acknowledge that a race is the result of crossings and of many influences.¹

I have not spoken of the traditional or historical evidences. In many cases history enables us to determine the formation, and the development of the race; for instance, the modern nations of Europe have been formed in historical time. We must always proceed, however, from a starting point, and admit the existence of certain races from the crossings of which the new ones were evolved.

In the particular case of the races of the Babylonian Empire, the mythological traditions and historical documents enable us to trace back the development and distribution of the various types found on the monuments.

The first race, which inhabited all Western Asia, was the same short race, found everywhere, not only in Asia, but pretty well all over the world. Its characteristics, which have been noticed when speaking of the populations of Assyria, are more or less modified in various localities: but though this race is easily modified, it can always be recognised by its general features—short stature, round head, low retreating forehead, and prognathism. It is very likely that this is the race which the classics used to call *autochthones*, and which has received from modern writers the names of Turanians, Iberians, Ligurians, &c., all more or less misleading. As it appears to form the lower stratum, so to say, of the human population everywhere, I propose, until a better name is found, to call it the *Ground race*.

The presence of this race everywhere has not been specially noticed, though it is always mentioned in all ethnological papers of any importance. The type is not rare in Ireland,² and Barnard Davis, in his "Thesaurus Craniorum," gives characteristics which might be applied to the low race of Babylonia.³

It is found also everywhere in Scotland with the same characteristics.⁴ In England proper it is rarer, but there are many evidences of its existence in former times.⁵ I have noticed it myself in a great many parts of France, and also among Italians of the North or of Sicily. Mr. Hyde Clarke noticed it in Asia

¹ In a nation as in a family the various members show a certain likeness even if they differ anatomically. This general aspect, this *family likeness*, is the result of many influences and especially of moral and intellectual influences. The question of formation of new races in North America has been touched by D. Wilson in "Journ. Anthropol. Inst." vol. viii, p. 338, *et seq.*

² J. Beddoe, "The Kelts of Ireland," "Journ. of Anthropol.," No. 2, October, 1870.

³ *Ibid.*, p. 118.

⁴ H. MacLean, "On the Comparative Anthropology of Scotland," "Anthropological Review," vol. iv, p. 218.

⁵ D. Wilson, "Physical Characteristics of Ancient and Modern Celt," "Anthropological Review," vol. iii, p. 52, *et seq.*

Minor, but in Asia, as in the north of Europe, it has not been distinguished from the Tatars or the Finns; in fact some writers gave to this race in England the name of Finnic.¹ I have not carried my inquiry into the American populations, but I have no doubt that this race would be found there.² Neither is Africa any exception; the Puls are everywhere accompanied by a low class of Negroes; and what has been called Helotts, tribes composed of people of a lower anthropological type, are not uncommon in Africa.

A few weeks ago when Prof. Flower read his paper on the Akkas, I was struck by the sketch of an Akka exhibited; it offers the principal characteristics of my ground race.

An important point to notice is that this race is everywhere found in an inferior social position, and it was equally so in the remotest age³; nowhere did it rise to the rank of a dominating or ruling race, but everywhere it accepted the yoke of the conquering tribe invading its land. It is the race of the land, and accepts every new master with a passive obedience. This explains why this race has no language of its own, for it accepts willingly that of its masters.

If I were inclined to theorise, I might suggest that this ground race is that of a previous geological period anterior to the age of the nobler races. But this would be nothing new, for it has already been advocated, and I leave it to others to decide.⁴ The only fact which interests me is the existence all over Western Asia of a low primitive race easily recognised by its physical and intellectual characteristics; this is the ground race.⁵

The second race, which came to disturb the primitive inhabitants of Syria and Mesopotamia, was that commonly called Semitic from the language it spoke. I had myself adopted this name, but I must now reject it because this race had not the characteristics we are accustomed to attribute to the so-called

¹ See the paper of D. Wilson, "American Illustrations of the Evolution of New Varieties of Man," "Journ. Anthropol. Inst.," vol viii, p. 341.

² *Ibid.*, p. 60.

³ Some biblical exegetes declare that the double creation of man in the first and second chapters of Genesis refers to the creation of two races distinct.

⁴ M. Maspero ("Hist. Anc.," p. 131) seems to admit the existence of a population before the arrival in Mesopotamia of what he calls the noble races. But he falls into the same errors as most modern Assyriologists in placing the Akkadians before the Semites, though from the very evidences of the facts it is the contrary which happened. If the Akkadian invasion is to be identified with the Scythian one, the Semites certainly existed previously, for they were made tributary for 1,500 years according to Justin (II, 3). See my "Pre-Akkadian Semites" and "Origin and Development of the Cuneiform Syllabary" in the "Journ. of the R.A.S."

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 80, and all through the paper.

Semitic populations, taking for type the Jews. This race, as I have shown in a previous paper,¹ was originally from Africa, and acquired its special characteristics in Arabia Petra, where it seems to have made a long stay. For this reason I propose to call it *Sinaic*, from the name of the mountain *Sinai*, as the Caucasian is called from the Caucasus. This name is of course provisional. The Semitic tongue was certainly its language, but its physique must be looked for not among the Jews, Babylonians, Assyrians, and Syrians, but among the ancient Arabs as illustrated by the Assyrian monuments of which I have already spoken (fig. 10).

It has been noticed that by their peculiar geographical position the Arabs have preserved themselves comparatively purer than any other Semitic tribe,² and this appears to be true for the physique as well as for the language. From private enquiries of Arabs I find that the ancient type, just referred to, is the prevalent one in Arabia. This type, therefore, I take as that of my Sinaic race.

The third race which came to contribute to the stock of population of Babylonia, is that of the primitive Akkadians, and which I call provisionally *Gurian*. It is probable that the invasion of this people covered all Western Asia, that is, Babylonia, Assyria, and Syria³; at least, as we shall see, we detect its influence in all these countries. This race, after having affected the types of the other populations, and having contributed to form new races, appears to have melted away, and at later times is nowhere found pure.

A fourth race which contributed to the formation of new types is that represented by the two Armenian ambassadors, and which I propose to call *Nairic* from the name of Nairi, which designates in the Assyrian inscriptions the mountains of Armenia. As already noticed, the type appears at the time of Assurbanipal, when the Vannic language was still spoken. It is therefore probable that this Nairic race existed there in more ancient times, and it appears to have resisted all influences.⁴

¹ "Journ. Anthropol. Inst.," "Origin and Primitive Home of the Semites." Since this paper appeared the proofs in favour of my theory have increased tenfold; I have been able to connect the Semitic languages with those of Abyssinia (Aga, Falacha, &c. See "Notes on Assyrian and Akkadian Pronouns," "Journ. of the R.A.S.," vol. xvii, part 1). The Agaus of Lasta offer also the same type as the Arabs of the Assyrian monuments, regular and well proportioned features, &c.

² See, "Origin and Primitive Home of the Semites." Sayce, "Assyrian Grammar for Comparative Purposes." Palgrave, "Travels in Arabia."

³ And perhaps also Asia Minor. The origin and primitive home of the Akkadians is unknown. Some suppose they came from Central Asia through Media (Sayce, *ibid.*, p. 13), others through Asia Minor (Pinches' "Guide," p. 4).

⁴ The Armenian type seems to have a strong power of resistance, and maintained

These four races by their various crossings, which are in many cases attested by history, explain the existence of the various types exhibited on the monuments, and the formation of what I call new races.

The long-headed Babylonians are evidently the result of a crossing of the Gurian and the Sinaic.

In the type of Marduk-nadin-akhe we have a crossing of the Sinaic and the ground race.

In Assyria the Ninevite type appears to be the result of the crossing of the Gurian and Sinaic with a dash of Nairic. It may be that we have simply a modification of the Babylonian type (Gurian + Sinaic) through Nairic influence. It is from this influence¹ that the Ninevites have acquired their so-called Semitic nose. The influence of the Nairic tribes may have been exercised through early conquest or merely through contact and intercourse.

The low race of Assyria is the result of the crossing of the Assyrian with the ground race. And it is to be noticed that the curved nose of the Assyrian is visible in some specimens.

In Elam the mass of the population seems to have belonged to the ground race. It was subdued at an early period by the Gurians or Akkadians, who introduced their language, a dialect of which became the tongue of Susa, and brought in the variations which we notice in the type.

At a later date the Babylonian conquests and alliance brought in some modifications, especially in the higher classes; but it may be said that in Elam the ground race type predominates.

In Syria the mixture of races was, if anything, greater than in Babylonia. I will speak first of the Jews.

The very history of the people, as given by their sacred books, shows beyond any doubt, that they are not a pure race. The belief in the purity of the Jewish race is one of these prejudices which are repeated without trouble being taken to examine their accuracy. The Jews left Babylonia, under the leadership of Abraham, to escape persecution.² They went northwards and made a long stay near the mountains of Armenia; that is how they acquired the special characteristics, noticeable especially in the form of nose and chin of some of them,

itself through all accidents and influences (see "The Armenians of Southern India," by J. Shortt, "Journ. of Anthropology," 1870, p. 180).

¹ The partly Armenian look of the Assyrian was detected by R. Knox in his paper on the Assyrian marbles. "Transactions of the Eth. Soc.," vol. i, p. 146, *et seq.*

² It would require too much space to prove the point now, but the fact of such persecution is evident.

through Nairic influence.¹ Many travellers and anthropologists have noticed the likeness of Armenians to Jews: their moral characters are also very similar.² I do not speak of their common traditions, because these may be due to more modern intercourse. Once in Palestine, these Jews absorbed part of the native population. From Egypt they carried with them perhaps some Negrotic tribes, and thus was formed the type shown by the Jews of Lachish.³ The Jews, however, always preserved two types, the one acquired by Nairic influence, and the other due to mixture with the ground race and other tribes of Palestine and Negroes from Egypt. The first type may be considered as forming the aristocracy; it is from this that would descend the Portuguese Jews, while the German Jews would come from the other.⁴

The Phœnicians, as far as can be judged, were a race different from the Jews. They also offered two types, the first one the result of a crossing of the Sinaic with the ground race, and the other the ground race modified by various influences—Negroes from Egypt, Gurians, &c.

The Hittites, judging from their own monuments, give a similar variety; the type reminding us of Marduk-nadin-akhe is the result no doubt of a crossing of the Sinaic and the ground race; the big-nosed race with developed prognathism, a mixture of Gurian with the same ground race.⁵ The Nairic influence is also noticeable in some cases. But the Gurian element is larger, it would appear, than in Assyria or among the Jews. The Jews in fact have very little Gurian blood.

The Persians have a special type, and as they came late on the political scene they have had little, if any, influence on the population of Babylonia. Possibly before the conquest of

¹ An Arab Jew (judging from his type no doubt, from pure Arab descent, but converted to Judaism) exclaimed one day to me: "Where have the European Jews got their noses from!" The answer is simple; from Armenia.

² In many countries of the East the Armenians hold the same position and take to the same callings, as the Jews in Europe. See J. Shortt, *op. cit.*, p. 184, "with a general Jewish cast about their features," he says, speaking of the Armenians.

³ Some travellers declare having found in Palestine a Jewish Negrotic tribe, which would have perpetuated itself through all the various dominations ("Trans. of the Eth. Soc.," vol. i, p. 223).

⁴ If some people still believe in the purity of the Jewish race I would refer them to the paper of J. Beddoe in the "Trans. of the Eth. Soc.," vol. i, p. 222, *et seq.*

⁵ This is the most common type. The Hittite types, *i.e.*, the types on the so-called Hittite monuments, have not been classed by anyone the ethnologist from point of view. They vary very much according to the localities where they are found. It is to be regretted that in many cases the copies of the inscriptions cannot be regarded as accurate types. All the inscriptions have been collected together in the work of Rev. W. Wright, "The Empire of the Hittites."

Cyrus some Persians had penetrated into Elam and given birth to hybrid specimens, but this is still doubtful. The Persian type, judging from the Persian monuments, remained very pure till the fall of the Empire.

There are two monuments of which I have said nothing, though they would be most important from an anthropological point of view, if we could have trustworthy copies of them. I mean the Buhustun inscription of Darius and the tomb of the same King at Naksh-i-Rustam. In the first, the portraits of the captive Kings brought before Darius must give some idea of the types of the countries. In the copies published we can only notice the special dress of each figure,¹ but the type is too much European to be trusted, and the variations in the drawings prove their inaccuracy.² The other monument would be more important still, for it gives, as is stated in the inscription, the representation of all the populations submitted to Darius, but in this case the copies cannot be trusted. In the drawing of Flandrin³ we can detect the representation of the Negro, but for the other figures the type cannot be detected with certainty. I have been therefore obliged to neglect these two important documents.

Mr. R. Poole terminated his paper by expressing the wish that something might be done to secure to science accurate copies of the types on the Egyptian monuments. Thanks to the support of the Institute, his wish has been fulfilled. I will venture to express a similar wish with respect to the monuments I have just mentioned. Could not something be done to obtain accurate copies or casts of these representations?

Description of Plate VI.

Profiles from the Assyrian and Babylonian Monuments.

- Fig. 1. Head of an early king or patesi, from a bronze head found at Tello by M. de Sarzec, and now in the Louvre.
- Fig. 2. Head of a man of the lower class, of same period as fig. 1, from a rough outline drawing in intaglio on stone, from a fragment found at Tello by M. de Sarzec, and now in the Louvre.
- Fig. 3. Portrait of Hammurabi, King of Babylon (about 2000 B.C.), from a stele now in the British Museum.

¹ The costume of the Sakian leave no doubt as to his nationality.

² It is sufficient to compare the copy given in the "Journal of the R.A.S." with that of Flandrin to be convinced that none are accurate.

³ It would appear that the French artist had in view only the artistic side of the monuments; and the types of the figures cannot be trusted. All the monuments of the Persian kings have been photographed by the German mission, but so badly that the figures of the tomb of Darius cannot be even guessed.

- Fig. 4. Portrait of Marduk-nadin-akhe, King of Babylon (about 1100 B.C.), from a boundary stone now in the British Museum.
- Fig. 5. Head of a Babylonian soldier fighting in the ranks of the Ninevite army (about 650 B.C.), from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 6. Head of an Assyrian king, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 7. Head of one of the Assyrian king's attendants, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 8. Head of an Assyrian of the lower class, time of Sennacherib, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 9. Head of one of the Armenian ambassadors visiting Assurbanipal during his campaign against Elam, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 10. Head of an Arab prisoner, time of Assurbanipal, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 11. Portrait of Te-umman, King of Elam, killed by Assurbanipal, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Figs. 12 and 13. Heads of Elamite soldiers fighting against Assurbanipal, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 14. Head of one of the Jews taken prisoner at Lachish by Sennacherib, from a bas-relief in the British Museum.
- Fig. 15. Head of a Persian soldier, from the representation on enamelled tiles found by M. Dieulafoy at Susa, and now in the Louvre.

DISCUSSION.

Mr. PINCHES said that though one of the purposes for which he had attended the meeting was to hear Mr. Bertin's most interesting paper, yet he must admit that he could throw but little additional light upon the subject of the races of the Assyrian monuments. He had, it was true, paid attention to the question of the races delineated on the bas-reliefs, but he had no theory of his own to advance concerning them. Mr. Bertin had spoken in his lecture of the types of the Jews exhibited on the monuments, one—that of the tribute-bearers of Jehu—being a pure Semitic type, and the other—that of the captives of Lachish—being apparently much lower in the scale of intelligence. Now it was to be noted that examples of these types were to be met with at the present day, even that low type of the captives of Lachish, though naturally this was very rare. The tribute-bearers of Jehu, with their bent forms and their tribute (carried, in the case of some, in bags over their shoulders) reminded one of the now rather rare Jewish old clothes men, whom we used to see about the streets of London. It was true that the tribute-bearers were dressed differently, and wore boots with turned-up toes, but the type was practically the same. It was to

be noted, however, that the Arabic Jews, according to a gentleman of that race, from Bagdad, whom he knew, were of a different type from those of Europe generally, and did not show to a so marked degree the hooked nose which was their most prominent and distinctive feature. The Jew from Bagdad, to whom he referred, had a rather narrow face, a narrow but high forehead, and a nose which, though long, was only slightly hooked. Another very interesting type which Mr. Pinches had come across was that exhibited by the murderer Marks, a picture-frame maker with whom he had had dealings. Marks was a short man, rather swarthy, with high cheek-bones, broad nose, and curly hair. With but the very slightest modification—a mere rounding-off of the features—this was the very type of the captives of Lachish on the Assyrian bas-reliefs—Mr. Bertin's "low type."

The Assyrians, as represented by themselves, were certainly of a different type from the other Semitic races. They seem to have been of ordinary height, thick-set and muscular. The face was, as a rule, round and full. The eyes were large and overshadowed by beetling brows, well arched. The hair, both of the head, brows, and beard, was jet black. The nose, however, was, perhaps, one of the most interesting portions of their physiognomy, for it seems not to have been of the same shape as that of any other of the Semitic races, but to have had a longer depression between the eyes, and a more graceful rounding off at the tip. Judging from observations which he had made, Mr. Pinches thought that this feature of the Assyrians was the result of the intermingling of two races, one having a curved and the other a comparatively straight nose, in neither case, however, very long. It was such as might be expected from the union of, say, an Aryan and a Semitic race. In conclusion, Mr. Pinches said that he was of opinion that there was nothing so good as actual observation of the races and types now on the spot, and he recommended the subject to anyone who might have an opportunity of travelling in the East. He himself, staying constantly in England, could do but little in the way of comparison with the living representatives of those ancient races, but what little he had observed had been most interesting, and would not, he hoped, be without its value. In answer to a question by the President, Mr. Pinches said that he had not noticed, in the Armenians he had met with, that the upper lip was particularly short, but his attention had not been called so much to that feature as to the general type, which, in one case, coincided exactly with that shown on the bas-reliefs of the time of Assurbani-âpli, or Assurbanipal, king of Assyria, 667-626 B.C.

Mr. A. L. LEWIS referring to Mr. Bertin's statement that the figure of the King was usually more carefully executed than other figures, asked whether he thought the representation of kings were intended as portraits? This appears to be the case with many of the Egyptian sculptures and paintings (as shown by Mr. Petrie's photographs, &c.), but so far as he had himself observed there was

K 2

not much individuality about the Assyrian sculptures. Mr. Lewis also asked whether Mr. Bertin had compared the Assyrian representations with the Egyptian representations of the Khita, Arab, Syrian, and other tribes, against whom both nations had warred, and, if so, how far he had found them to correspond?

The AUTHOR in reply, said that the observations of Mr. Pinches tended, to a great extent, to confirm his explanation of the formation and development of the Babylonian, Assyrian, and Jewish, or so-called Semitic, races. The Armenian, or Nairic type, is most persistent; the Armenians themselves appear to be a non-Aryan population, who have adopted an Aryan language; their contribution to the Assyrian or Ninevite type is evident, but it is absent in the Babylonian. The Aryan race did not appear in Mesopotamia before Cyrus; therefore it cannot have had any influence on the formation of these types; what Mr. Pinches attributes to Aryan influence is due to that race, which is called in the paper Sinaic, and which must have been the Semitic-speaking population before the Akkadian invasion.

In answer to Mr. Lewis, the author stated that a careful examination of the Assyrian sculptures shows that the representations are, as in Egypt, undoubtedly portraits; if this does not appear at first sight it is on account of the strong family likeness of all the Ninevites. Mr. Bertin added that, in order not to unduly extend his paper, he had confined himself to the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments; he did so, especially as the question of the Egyptian representations had been already discussed by a competent Egyptologist.

MARCH 27TH, 1886.

FRANCIS GALTON, Esq., F.R.S., *President, in the Chair.*

The Minutes of the last meeting were read and signed.

The following presents were announced, and thanks voted to the respective donors:—

FOR THE LIBRARY.

From the AUTHOR.—The Tahiti Archipelago. By Baron Anatole von Hügel.

— The Tuamotu Archipelago. By Baron Anatole von Hügel.

— Sur la façon d'étudier une série de crânes d'après M. Topinard. Par M. le Dr. Victor Jacques.

— Antropologia Fisica della Fuegia. Pel Prof. Giuseppe Sergi.