

body, though my expectation is that it will be solved, if ever, by one of two alternatives: either the tradition was mistaken and the body was disposed of in some unknown but natural manner, or else the same creative power which had brought into being the mortal frame withdrew it into nothingness. If the latter is the fact, there would be to ask why such special intervention of Deity was needed? I do not know what other reason suggests itself than that the witnesses, in the then

state of psychologic knowledge, would have found it harder to accept the assurance of Jesus, "It is I Myself," if they had been sure that all the while Jesus was lying a corpse in Joseph's vault. They might have still believed that they were seeing but a ghost. This speculation will probably not seem very substantial, but I put it forward as the only conjecture I am able myself to form.'

The other question he takes no notice of.

## Thirty Years' Progress in Assyriology.

BY C. J. GADD, B.A., BRITISH MUSEUM, LONDON.

THIRTY years represent not much less than half the total life of Assyriology, which is thus among the youngest of the sciences, and shows a tendency to rapid growth thoroughly in accordance with its age. What directions this progress has taken will be summarily indicated in the following survey of its principal departments. It would, of course, be impossible, in dealing with so immense a body of material, to trace the history of work accomplished, and it is proposed, therefore, to outline rather the position attained as the result of that work, omitting entirely, since completeness would be impossible and selection invidious, any reference to the many brilliant men who have laboured so fruitfully in this field.

### I. EXCAVATIONS AND ARCHÆOLOGY.

The year 1890 found three major explorations in progress on Mesopotamian sites. The oldest of these was also the most fruitful, and the remarkable discoveries at Tall Loh, the ancient Lagash, remain unsurpassed in interest, whether historical or archæological. Here it must be sufficient to say that they revealed a new and splendid art, especially notable in sculpture, as well as a long chapter of the earliest history. The remains were almost exclusively of the early Sumerian age, and they have since formed the canon by which similar objects from other sites have been judged and classified. But their particular importance resided in this, that they established, once for all, the position of the Sumerian race in early Babylonian

history, and called at once into brilliant life a people whose very existence had been hitherto only a dark inference from the relics of their strange language. From the moment that the first inscribed statue of Gudea, or the Stele of the Vultures, came to light, the obstinate 'Sumerian question' was answered—against its raiser. And, further, it was now realized for the first time that the arts and culture of the later Babylonians stood in the direct tradition from this early people, among whom they were already in their full bloom. In the early third millennium B.C. the inhabitants of Lagash were already past masters in building, metal-work, and, above all, sculpture, both in relief and in the round, while in the beautiful craft of the gem-engraver they had attained a perfection never again to be equalled. From the stone heads discovered there emerged the physical characteristics of the race, which were strongly marked in the face, and the Sumerian type is now familiar, though the knowledge has not thrown much light upon the difficult question of the racial affinities of this people.

Meanwhile, in four expeditions, from 1888 onwards, an American mission excavated the ruins of the ancient Nippur, particularly those of the celebrated E-kur, or temple of Enlil, the most important shrine in ancient Babylonia. The construction of this temple was found to date back to Naram-Sin and Shar-gali-sharri, kings of Agade, but even below this level a deep bed of accumulated ruins served to indicate a much greater antiquity of the site. From a purely archæological

standpoint the results of the digging were not so interesting as might have been hoped, but this was amply compensated by the discovery of a great mass of literary material, of which, however, this is not the place to speak. Babylon itself has been worked upon systematically by German excavators since 1899, up to the outbreak of the late war. Very high hopes were naturally entertained of so famous a site, but it cannot be denied that they have been largely disappointed. Nebuchadnezzar II., in the sixth century B.C., had been so thoroughly the Augustus of his city that he left little belonging to earlier ages, and his own splendours, which dazzled the eyes of Herodotus and Ctesias, have themselves so sadly faded that Babylon is indeed little but the 'shadow of a great name.' Nevertheless, it is not all disappointment; the magnitude of the city and its buildings, its walls and quays, its spacious planning, above all, its remarkable Sacred Way, paved with stone, leading between high walls, sculptured with lions in brickwork relief and coloured glaze, until it passes under the imposing Ishtar Gate with its façade of bulls and dragons depicted in the same striking technique—all these are still worthy remains of that royal capital which was once 'adorned as none other city that we wot of.'

If the enthusiasm of the German explorers had received something of a check at Babylon, it was to find a magnificent reward in another place. In 1903, operations were begun on the mound of Kalat Shargat, the ancient city of Ashur, and the site has, since then, yielded a rich and continuous stream of monuments, which have thrown an entirely new light upon the early history of the kingdom. But, apart from these, the architectural remains of temples and palaces, of the remarkable quay-wall of Adad-nirari I. (1300 B.C.), and of the city fortifications were in themselves no mean recompense for the labour expended in their excavation. A very important discovery, though rather of historical than archæological interest, was that of two parallel rows of stone monuments, found practically *in situ*, and running roughly east and west across an open square in the city. These were the memorials of men who had held the *limmu* office, or eponymate, including, of course, the kings themselves, who were distinguished from the commoners by having their monuments placed together in the northern row. In the lowest strata there came to light statues and fragments, in the

characteristic early Sumerian style of sculpture and dress, and it is significant that another such statuette has been found lower down the Tigris in the neighbourhood of Samarra.

Space forbids more than a passing reference to some highly interesting finds at Tall Halaf in the extreme north of Mesopotamia on the Habur River. This place is now known to be the site of Guzana, that Gozan to which Sargon sent Israelite prisoners after the fall of Samaria; it has yielded the figure of a veiled goddess and a number of stone reliefs in the curious mixed style of art found at Sinjiri and (later) at Carchemish, which is doubtless predominantly Aramæan, though tinged with Hittite influences. But we must now leave Mesopotamia itself, and glance at two other widely separated regions, both of which have now definitely entered the range of our survey. First of these is the ancient Elam, where Susa, the capital city, has been explored since 1897 by a French mission with brilliant results. It is strange indeed that this foreign city should have given us some of the finest specimens of purely Babylonian art and culture. For Naram-Sin's stele of victory, Manishtusu's obelisk, and Hammurabi's laws we are indebted to the somewhat indiscriminating taste of one Shutruk-Nahhunte, who obtained them as the spoil of a successful foray. This implies, of course, that at Susa Babylonian influence is more in evidence than any purely native art. But the Elamites at least learned well, and have some highly creditable achievements in stone and metal work. They showed most originality in their seals (which at first imitated those of Babylonia neither in shape nor in design), and in their pottery, which flourished in its most perfect attainment in the earliest days of the city. There is an evident connexion between the geometrical and naturalistic designs on the early seals and on the best painted pottery. It is in this respect that Susa presents the greatest contrast with purely Babylonian sites, upon which the pottery is usually plain and uninteresting, though very early red and black sherds have been found at Ashur, and recently a quantity of such fragments, with black naturalistic designs on a plain ground, have been found in the British Museum excavations at Eridu and in the small mound called Tall al-Ubaid; comparison with the early Susian pottery is suggested at once. It is possible that such ware would be found in other Babylonian mounds, if digging were carried down

to a sufficient depth, which has very seldom been done hitherto.

One other site, far removed from the last, must be noticed before this brief survey ends. Boghaz-Keui is a modern village in Cappadocia, lying in the bend of the Halys, east of Angora; but above it stand the remains of the city of Hatti, once the heart of the Hittite empire, in the fourteenth and thirteenth centuries B.C. This fact was revealed by the discoveries made in 1906 and 1907, when the cuneiform records, which almost immediately came to light, disclosed to the explorer that he had chanced upon a far more important prize than that which he had set out to seek. These same records proved to add a whole new wing, as it were, to the history of Western Asia in ancient times, and incidentally a new language to those which already existed for the more discomfiture of Assyriologists. But of these things and of the connexion of the Hittite use of cuneiform with the 'Cappadocian' traders of Cæsarea, this is not the place to speak. Boghaz-Keui was not merely the site of a royal archive; it was in itself a city of imposing proportions, with temple, palace, and fortifications complete, and all of stone, at least in their lower courses. The city wall was of enormous strength, with its outer and inner facing of stone filled in with rubble, the whole surmounted by towers and pierced with gates, each side of which was formed by huge incurving monoliths, with more than a slight suggestion of Mycenæ. In front of this wall there ran also, in the weaker places, an outwork of lighter build. Sculptured lions, forming part of a water-trough in the temple courtyard, and others which flanked the entrance of the southern gate, together with a fine life-sized relief of a king at the east gate, were characteristic products of the sculptural art found at many other places in the Hittite country, from which we can obtain an excellent notion of the national dress, with its pointed cap and upturned shoes, of the form and worship of the gods, and of the physical type of the people.

## II. HISTORY.

In no department that we shall have to survey has our progress been so rapid, and withal so definitive, as in that of history. This, of course, is not always the case with ancient studies, in illustration of which it would be possible to quote Crete,

and even Egypt. Assyriologists, on the other hand, are fortunate enough to be able to follow a virtually unbroken thread from the latest times to the earliest (historically speaking) in Western Asia. Latest to earliest—that is the natural order of recovery by the spade. A thread, too, it is indeed, and occasionally a slender one, but even a thread can unpuzzle a labyrinth. Let it be said at once, therefore, that the study of that portion of history which may roughly be defined as derived from cuneiform sources has been at once progressive and centrifugal; progressive, that is, ever further into the past (if the apparent paradox be permissible), and centrifugal in the sense that it now yields a picture of much more than the mere centre from which the cuneiform script radiated. Babylonia and Assyria were not one in descent any more than in politics; the latter was not merely an upstart younger brother of the former. But, more than this, the land of the two rivers was surrounded by neighbours, mostly alien in race, whose own history could not fail to have a profound effect upon that of the two nations. The great event of more recent historical study has been the entrance of these mighty forces from the circumference. To this phenomenon even the remarkable extension of our knowledge concerning the early period of internal development must take second place. In order to give due importance to both of these features it will perhaps be most perspicuous, and most conformable to the limits of space, to make a very summary sketch of the early period as a whole, rather than to attempt a geographical arrangement.

The years about 3000 B.C. form a convenient beginning for the definite history of Babylonia, or rather of Sumer, for it is there that the past first becomes articulate. Perhaps, indeed, before that time, for we now have lists of dynasties and kings which profess to extend back even to the Deluge. But in those days the gods still walked on earth, and Etana, Lugal-banda, Tammuz, and Gilgamesh himself, shepherds or hunters as they were among men, ruled from their cities of Kish or Erech for their hundreds of years, alternately with many mortal kings of more than patriarchal longevity. The picture is fancifully coloured, but the drawing is accurate enough, and represents Sumer as it was yet to be for many centuries—a congeries of city-states in a condition of perpetual warfare, each under its own governor, contesting the 'kingship,'

which passed from city to city according as each was able, for the time, to assert its supremacy over the others. Eleven of these 'cities of kingship' were reckoned by the scribes before the rule passed finally to Babylon. These include most of the ancient centres of Sumer itself, but, what is more remarkable, the 'lands' have already intruded themselves, and four out of the eleven names are those of foreign cities—Awan and Hamazi in Elam, Mari on the middle Euphrates, and the 'horde' of Gutians, who were simply north-eastern hill tribes. Of the very early dynasties we have no monuments,—writing was probably not yet invented,—but gradually the rise and fall of cities begins to make its way into light independent of the king-lists, as when Enshakushanna of Erech relates his own defeat of Kish under Enbi-Ishtar. A succeeding rule of Adab is also attested by inscriptions; then the power goes to Mari, under the suzerainty of which we may place the brilliant local line of kings inaugurated by Ur-Nina at Lagash. It is a curious freak of chance that this bypath of Sumerian history should be so brilliantly illumined while the main road passes by, only just discernible in the gloom. But the ways join in Urukagina, the last king of Lagash, who was overthrown by Lugal-zaggisi, king of Erech and of all the land. A great conqueror his own inscriptions proclaim him to be, but he was defeated in his turn by an even greater, the celebrated Sargon of Agade. About this man, as about the recent recovery of his true place and importance in history, a fascinating account might be written, if space permitted. But of his date and of his exploits something must be said. It appears certain that we must adopt what seemed at first a too-heroic remedy, and accuse Nabonidus' scribe of exactly a thousand years error in his date of 3750 B.C. for Naram-Sin, the great-grandson of Sargon. It had always seemed improbable, from the time that the early Babylonians and their art began to be known, and, in face of the lists, it is out of the question. Decreased by a thousand—and the difference is only that of a single wedge in cuneiform—the date agrees excellently with all the evidence, and is doubtless authentic, so that we may confidently mark 2750 B.C. as the *floruit* of Naram-Sin. As to the achievements of Sargon and his dynasty, we are not on such sure ground. From his own inscriptions we know that, after reducing all Babylonia, he marched up to the Lebanon, to the

'silver mountains' of the Taurus, and to the Syrian coast. It is clear also that he fought, like his successors, in Elam. But some very far-reaching claims have recently been made, involving the whole of Asia Minor, and even the distant island of Crete! It is by no means certain, however, that the evidence adduced will bear so great a weight. A similar doubt attaches to the conquests of Naram-Sin, and here again the difficulties are mainly those of geographical identification. The assumption that Magan was some part of Egypt may yet prove to have started inquirers on some very false scents.

Of the long domination of the tribes from across the Tigris, known as Gutians, nothing need be said, for scarce anything is known. It is clear that their rule was ineffective and sporadic, or the almost complete independence of Gudea at Lagash would have been impossible. They were evidently loose-knit and predatory hordes ('the host of Gutium had no king,' says the list), and their oppression was finally ended by one Utu-hegal of Erech, who has left us quite a heroic narrative of the last clash. But Erech was not to be the real inheritor of their kingdom, which was reserved rather for the great Third Dynasty of Ur. It would be impossible here to do justice to the power of these kings and to the unparalleled prosperity which the land enjoyed under their sway. But it is at this point that two new forces come into view, and change, for the first time known to history, the whole subsequent orientation of Babylonia's external policy.

The kingdom of Elam has recently been revealed to us by the excavations of Susa. Its inhabitants first appear as the makers of a fine painted pottery and the users of a script clearly distinguished from, yet probably related with, that of the Sumerians, which, however, was destined to disappear early in their history. Speculation as to the race, or even the language, of the Elamites is at present a step in the dark. But they appear first in history at the time of the Agade kings, whose empire clearly extended over Elam, as may be gathered from much scattered evidence. In those days, and for long afterwards, Elam was completely subservient to the reigning power in Sumer and Akkad, and this condition still held during the Ur Dynasty, though the date-lists make it clear that Shulgi and his successors had much hard fighting to do there. So much so, in fact, that their attention was turned



exclusively eastwards, while on the west, after the reign of Ur-Nammu, they maintained a pure defensive. And it is remarkable that henceforth this remained the policy of Babylonia until its very latest days. Never was she free from periodical conflict with Elam, till Elam was annihilated by Ashurbanipal; never did she march again up the Euphrates until the Medes had annihilated Assyria. And this brings us at once to the other Babylonian frontier henceforth to be vital—the northern.

The suzerainty of Bur-Sin I. of Ur was acknowledged, far beyond the limits of Sumer, by one Zariku, governor of a city as yet obscure, but destined to so brilliant a future, the city of Ashur. Of the earlier history of this town we know no more than the names of two rulers, Ushpia and Kikia, who are designated as its first builders, and of the race of the Assyrians, beyond the fact that they were purely Semitic, nothing very precise can be made out. But there is solid ground for holding that their connexions are entirely with the west, despite the Biblical tradition of colonization from Babylon. At this same time of the Ur Dynasty, the city of Ashur was in close commercial relations with a group of Semitic traders, mostly bearing Assyrian names, settled in the neighbourhood of Cæsaræa Mazaca, beyond the Taurus, whose business records, disclosing an extensive trade in metals and woven stuffs, have been recovered in such a multitude from Kala Tepe and along the Habur. The activities of this settlement seem to have been very short-lived, but the race continued to live on in those regions, and was still known to Herodotus and other Greek writers as that of the White Syrians. There is, however, nothing to show that this outpost of Semites was in any way subject to Ashur, itself making at this time so humble a début in history. But this early bond with the west is a symptom of all subsequent Assyrian policy; all her effort is directed to the lands from which she drew the commodities essential to her welfare, and any interruption of these routes is the signal for her decline until connexion can be re-established. We have further glimpses of early Assyrian kings in their recently discovered monuments, and in a notice which brings Ilushuma into connexion with Sumu-abum, the first of Hammurabi's line in Babylon. It is evident that Assyria was now strongly in the ascendant, and there is some reason to believe that Sargon I. (to be sharply distinguished, of course, from Sargon

of Agade, on the one hand, and the more familiar Sargon II. of Assyria, on the other) was a great conqueror; a seal impression bearing his name has been found on one of the Cappadocian tablets already mentioned. But, if so, his empire must have been evanescent, for soon after there ruled over Assyria a king with the name of Rim-Sin, and there is considerable probability that he was none other than Hammurabi's great rival, Rim-Sin of Larsa. Various successors, mentioned in the almost complete lists of Assyrian rulers which we now possess, are otherwise unknown.

Henceforth, apart from their internecine quarrels, the foreign horizons of Babylonia and Assyria respectively extended in opposite directions. The former was to find her problems continually in the eastern and south-eastern hills; invaded by wild Kassites, she was to see the rise of Elam to an independent and formidable kingdom to which she remained for many years a constant prey, while the line of monarchs, inaugurated by Humban-mena, achieved the summit of Elamite power. Assyria, on the other hand, looked ever west and north, often with anxious eyes. For her rise had been premature, and for many years she stood in peril of stifling almost at birth. One of the most striking results of recent research has been the revelation of the great masses of non-Semitic population which stretched across from Cilicia to the Caucasus, and which must inevitably have surged over any less virile nation than the Assyrians, whose survival and subsequent domination appear as one of the marvels of history when viewed in the midst of these sinister clouds. It is no slight test of the progress of ancient studies to reflect that the celebrated Amarnah letters were discovered only just before the time which this survey embraces. Since then an astonishing commentary has been added to these already astonishing documents by that remarkable combination of insight and pure luck which led to the finding of the Hittite archives at Boghaz-Keui, to the unveiling of a whole new civilization and of an ancient world-power. What were the precise relations of the Hittites, the Mitannians, the Urartians, and the people of smaller neighbouring kingdoms cannot as yet be settled with precision. It is, at any rate, unlikely that Indo-European elements, though undoubtedly present, were more than an admixture in the whole mass. It is best, at present, to consider all these kingdoms as political rather than

racial entities, whose wax and wane was continual but did not affect anything more than the precise direction of the policy of Assyria. For instance, in the middle of the second millennium, Ashur was clearly under the domination of Hanigalbat, a kingdom lying east of the middle of the Taurus range, whereas later it was Mitanni and the Hittite power itself, or, later still, the Urartians of Armenia, who constituted the danger. Into the internal and mutual affairs of all these it is impossible here to enter, though the history of the Hittite kings who succeeded Shubbuliuma, their relations with their neighbours, even with the Egypt of Rameses

II., are all set forth at large in their treaties with these states, documents which surely form as notable a corpus of international law as any age could produce. With so advanced a civilization had Assyria to deal in her early days, and at first she was unequal to the task. But, after Ashur-uballit and his third successor, Adad-nirari I., had finally asserted the superiority of the growing state, Assyria never looked back, despite sporadic periods of partial decline, and, if she finally fell, we shall not impute it to lack of virtue in her people or policy in her rulers, if we consider what a world it was that she had so long been bearing upon her shoulders.

## Literature.

### THE CAMBRIDGE MEDIEVAL HISTORY.

It is with peculiar gratification that we receive the third volume of *The Cambridge Medieval History* (Cambridge: at the University Press; 50s. net). Between the second and third volumes came the War, and Dr. Whitney's apology for the delay is readily accepted. The fear was that the War would end the enterprise. And that fear was greatly strengthened by the death of the principal Editor, Professor H. M. Gwatkin. But here it is, and not in any sense unworthy of the first or the second volume. Dr. Gwatkin's place has been filled by Dr. J. R. Tanner and Mr. C. W. Previt -Orton.

What is it that makes the Medieval History a greater book than the Modern? It is greater: we cannot conceive a denial. We had given the credit to the superb genius of its Chief Editor. And we are not yet convinced that we did mistake. For he is here in person still, and when not in person, in spirit. To set up a standard is half the accomplishment. What would the Tabernacle have been without the pattern showed in the Mount?

But the work was not only more grandly conceived; it has been, we think, more greatly executed. There is firmer individual footing; closer co-operation also; above all, there is an attainment to readableness throughout which the earlier work never reached. That must be the doing of the Editors. For let it be understood that an Editor can always secure grammatical English, and even

good style, without sacrificing one jot of his contributors' originality.

This volume deals with Germany and the Western Empire. The authors are Professor R n  Poupardin, Professor Louis Halphen, Mr. C. W. Previt -Orton, Mr. Austin Lane Poole, Mr. Edwin H. Holthouse, Miss Caroline M. Ryley, Professor Allen Mawer, Mr. William John Corbett, Dr. Rafael Altamira, Sir Paul Vinogradoff, Dr. Montague Rhodes James, and Professor W. R. Lethaby.

To Sir Paul Vinogradoff has been entrusted that most difficult subject, Feudalism. We think we can detect advance in intelligibility beyond Maitland, advance also in esteem. 'The lord was a monarch in the manor, but a monarch fettered by a customary constitution and by contractual rights. He was often strong enough to break through these customs and agreements, to act in an arbitrary way, to indulge in cruelty and violence. But in the great majority of cases feelings and caprice gave way to reasonable considerations. A reasonable lord could not afford to disregard the standards of fairness and justice which were set up by immemorial custom, and a knowledge of the actual conditions of life. A mean line had to be struck between the claims of the rulers and the interests of the subjects, and along this mean line by-laws were framed and customs grew up which protected the tenantry even though it was forsaken by the king's judges. This unwritten constitution was safeguarded not only by the apprehension that its infringement might scatter the rustic population on